

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Gerald Lerer, Congregation Beth Ohr, Jewish Community Center of Madison Township, Old Bridge, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ruler of the universe, we earnestly seek and invoke Thy blessing upon our country, the Government of this freedom-loving Republic, the President of these United States, and all who exercise just and rightful authority. Guide and guard them in all their worthy endeavors, so that they may administer all affairs of state in justice and equity, while advancing the cause of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

Help us today and every day to be deserving of our rich heritage in this land of the free and home of the brave. Let Thy sacred light penetrate our midst, so that we may recognize our duties through the fog and mist of our times. Grant us the necessary courage and perseverance, so that we may fulfill our responsibilities, despite the cost and sacrifice.

Inspire those who stand at the helm of our ship of state to continue with even greater zeal and determination their valiant and noble efforts toward making these United States a powerful force for universal peace and freedom from fear. May this country grow from strength to greater strength in the cause of justice and righteousness; and may we, in concert with all people who cherish freedom, speedily achieve the ultimate triumph of Thy kingdom of true and everlasting peace and brotherhood on earth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 3, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

SELECTIVE SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, without being read, will be referred to the appropriate committee, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

THE BACKGROUND

To the Congress of the United States:

The knowledge that military service must sometimes be borne by—and imposed on—free men so their freedom

may be preserved is woven deeply into the fabric of the American experience.

Americans have been obliged to take up arms in the cause of liberty since our earliest days on these shores. From the militiaman who shouldered his musket to protect his community in the wilderness to the young recruit of today who serves the common defense and then returns to civilian life, we have known the price of freedom as well as its glory.

In 1940, the mounting threat of Axis aggression was poised against us. The 76th Congress responded by making compulsory military service a legal obligation in peacetime as well as war. Although this was the first peacetime draft in our history, it was an action consistent with our evolving traditions and responsibilities. As President Roosevelt said on that occasion:

America has adopted selective service in time of peace, and, in doing so, has broadened and enriched our basic concepts of citizenship. Beside the clear democratic ideals of equal rights, equal privileges and equal opportunities, we have set forth the underlying other duties, obligations and responsibilities of equal service.

Americans ever since then have come to know well those "broadened concepts of citizenship" of which Franklin Roosevelt spoke. Little more than a year later, war began. The Selective Service System established by that foresighted 76th Congress mustered the greatest military force in the history of the world.

After the end of World War II, in the face of new hostile threats, the 80th Congress met its obligation by enacting new selective service legislation. Six times since then, succeeding Congresses—the 81st, the 82d, the 84th, the 86th, and the 88th—have kept it alive as an indispensable part of our defense against an aggression which has taken different shapes but has never disappeared. Twice—in Korea, and today in Vietnam—we have borne arms in the field of battle to counter that aggression.

Thus, for more than a quarter of a century, through total war and cold war and limited war, selective service has provided the Nation with the ability to respond quickly and appropriately to the varied challenges confronting our democracy.

THE PROBLEM TODAY

The Selective Service Act under which men today are drafted into our Armed Forces is now almost two decades old, about the age of many of the men who stand watch on the frontiers of freedom throughout the world.

That generation, whose lifetime coincides with our draft law, has grown to maturity in a period of sweeping change. We are in many ways a different nation—more urban, more mobile, more populous.

The youth of the country themselves have added most heavily to our growth in numbers. In 1948, when the present act was passed, less than 1.2 million male Americans were 18 years old. Today that number has increased about 60 percent to almost 1.9 million, and will exceed 2 million in the 1970's.

Because of this population increase, many more men of their generation are available for military duty than are required.

A decade ago, about 70 percent of the group eligible for duty had to serve with the Armed Forces to meet our military manpower needs.

Today, the need is for less than 50 percent, and only about a third or less of this number must be involuntarily inducted—even under the conditions of war. When the firing stops, as we all fervently hope it will soon, the requirements will be for fewer still.

The danger of inequity is imbedded in these statistics. It arises when not every eligible man must be called upon to serve. It is intensified when the numbers of men needed are relatively small in relation to the numbers available.

Fairness has always been one of the goals of the Selective Service System. When the present act was passed in 1948, one of its underlying assumptions was that the obligation and benefits of military service would be equitably borne.

The changing conditions which have come to our society since that act was established have prompted concern—in the executive branch, in the Congress, in the Nation generally—with whether the System might have drifted from the original concept of equity.

That concern deepened as young men were called to the field of combat.

A selective service system, of course, must operate well and fairly in peace as well as in times of conflict. But it is in the glare of conflict that the minds of all of us are focused most urgently on the need to review the procedures by which some men are selected and some are not.

Last July, by Executive order, I appointed a National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, composed of 20 citizens, distinguished and diverse in their representation of important elements of our national life.

I asked that Commission, headed by Mr. Burke Marshall, to study these questions, and indeed whether the need for the draft itself was ended or soon might be.

I instructed the Commission to consider the past, present, and prospective functioning of selective service and other systems of national service in the light of the following factors: Fairness to all citizens; military manpower requirements; the objective of minimizing uncertainty and interference with individual careers and education; social, economic, and employment conditions and goals; budgetary and administrative considerations; and any other factors the Commission might deem relevant.

The Commission undertook this responsibility with seriousness of purpose, and a clear recognition of the abiding importance these issues hold in American life today. It consulted with or sought the opinions of national leaders, Governors, mayors, and officials of the Federal Government; educators and students; business groups and labor unions; veterans organizations, religious leaders and others broadly representing every sector of our society. I asked people across the land to send their thoughts to the Commission and many did.

The Commission's work is now con-

cluded. Its report has been made available to the American public. I have studied that report carefully.

I have also had the benefit of two other recent studies relating to the same problems. Another distinguished group of leading citizens reviewed the selective service situation for the House Armed Services Committee. Its conclusions have been made available to me. Earlier, at my direction, the Secretary of Defense conducted a study of the relationship of the draft to military manpower utilization policies. It was completed in June of last year.

These reports have confirmed that continuation of the draft is still essential to our national security. They have also established that inequities do result from present selection policies, that policies designed for an earlier period operate unevenly under today's conditions, creating unfairness in the lives of some, promoting uncertainty in the minds of more.

To provide the military manpower this Nation needs for its security and to assure that the system of selection operates as equitably as possible, I propose that:

First. The selective service law under which men can be inducted into the Armed Forces be extended for a 4-year period, upon its expiration on June 30, 1967.

Second. Men be inducted beginning at 19 years of age, reversing the present order of calling the oldest first, so that uncertainties now generated in the lives of young men will be reduced.

Third. Policies be tightened governing undergraduate college deferments so that those deferments can never become exemptions from military service, and providing for no further postgraduate deferments except for those in medical and dental schools.

Fourth. Firm rules be formulated, to be applied uniformly throughout the country, in determining eligibility for all other types of deferment.

Fifth. A fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection be established to determine the order of call for all men eligible and available for the draft.

Sixth. Improvements in the Selective Service System be immediately effected to assure better service to the registrant both in counseling and appeals, better information to the public regarding the system's operation, and broader representation on local boards of the communities they serve.

Seventh. A study be conducted by the best management experts in the Government of the effectiveness, cost and feasibility of a proposal made by the National Advisory Commission to restructure the organization of the Selective Service System.

Eighth. The National Commission on Selective Service be continued for another year to provide a continuing review of the system that touches the lives of so many young Americans and their families.

Ninth. Enlistment procedures for our National Guard and Reserve units be strengthened to remove inequities and to insure a high state of readiness for those units.

CONTINUATION OF THE DRAFT LAW

The United States must meet its military commitments for the national security, for the preservation of peace and for the defense of freedom in the world. It must be able to do this under any circumstance, under any condition, under any challenge.

This fundamental necessity is the bedrock of our national policy upon which all other considerations must rest.

To maintain this ability we must continue the draft.

The volunteer tradition is strong in our Armed Forces, as it is in our national heritage. Except for the periods of major war in this century, it has been the chief source of our military manpower since the earliest days of the Republic.

It must remain so. Our Armed Forces will continue to rely mainly on those who volunteer to serve. This is not only consistent with the American tradition, it is also the best policy for the services themselves, since it assures a highly motivated and professionally competent career force.

Improving the quality of service life and increasing the rewards for service itself encourage volunteering. We have taken a number of actions toward this end and will initiate still others:

Four military pay raises in each of the last 4 years, averaging a total increase of 33 percent in basic pay. I shall shortly recommend another increase.

A military "medicare" program which expands medical care for the dependents of those on active duty, as well as for retired members and their dependents.

The cold war GI bill of rights, which provides education, training, medical and home loan benefits to returning servicemen.

The Vietnam Conflict Servicemen and Veterans Act of 1967, which I proposed last month, to provide additional benefits to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

I have asked the Secretary of Defense to submit to me this year a comprehensive study of the military compensation and retirement system.

To attract more physicians, dentists and other members of the health professions to volunteer for military service, I am directing the Secretary of Defense to develop a broad program of medical scholarships. Students taking advantage of these scholarships would commit themselves to longer terms of obligated service.

At the same time that we have been increasing the incentive for volunteer service, we have also taken steps to reduce our requirements for men who must be drafted.

I have directed that the services place civilians in jobs previously held by men in uniform wherever this can be done without impairing military effectiveness. During fiscal 1967, 74,000 former military jobs will be filled by civilians. During the next fiscal year, an additional 40,000 such jobs will be so filled. If these measures were not taken, our draft calls would have to be much higher.

Starting last year, under Project 100-000, the military services have revised mental and physical standards to admit

young men who were being rejected—more than half of whom had sought to volunteer. As a result, the services will accept this year 40,000 men who would have been disqualified under former standards. Next year, the Defense Department's goal is to accept 100,000 such men.

Finally, the Secretary of Defense is taking steps to expand opportunities for women in the services, thus further reducing the number of men who must be called involuntarily for duty.

But in spite of all we can and will do in this regard, we cannot realistically expect to meet our present commitments or our future requirements with a military force relying exclusively on volunteers.

We know that vulnerability to the draft is a strong motivating factor in the decision of many young men to enlist. Studies have shown that in the relatively normal years before the buildup in Vietnam, two out of every five enlistees were so motivated. Since then, the proportion has been considerably higher.

Research has also disclosed that volunteers alone could be expected to man a force of little more than 2 million.

Our military needs have been substantially greater than that ever since we first committed troops to combat in Korea in the summer of 1950. The average strength of our Armed Forces in the years between the end of hostilities in Korea and the buildup in Vietnam was 2.7 million. Today, we have 3.3 million men under arms, and this force will increase still further by June 1968 if the conflict is not concluded by then.

The question, whether we could increase incentives sufficiently to attract an exclusively volunteer force larger than any such force we have had in the past, has been subjected to intensive study.

That study concluded that the costs would be difficult to determine precisely, but clearly they would be very high.

Far more important is the position of weakness to which an exclusively volunteer force—with no provision for selective service—would expose us. The sudden need for more men than a volunteer force could supply would find the Nation without the machinery to respond.

That lack of flexibility, that absence of power to expand in quick response to sudden challenge, would be totally incompatible with an effective national defense. In short, it would force us to gamble with the Nation's security.

We look to, and work for, the day the fighting will end in Vietnam. We hope—it is the most profound hope of this administration as it is of this generation of Americans—that the years beyond that day will be years of diminishing tension in the world, of silent guns and smaller armies. The total efforts of this Government will be constantly directed toward reaching that time.

But although we are hopeful, we are realists too, with a realism bred into us through long and lasting experience. Any responsible appraisal of world conditions leads inevitably to this conclusion: We must maintain the capability

for flexible response which we have today.

The draft is one of the essential and crucial instruments which assures us of that flexibility.

I recommend legislation to extend for 4 years the authority, which expires on June 30, 1967, to induct men into the Armed Forces.

THE ORDER OF CALL

The general procedure today for the selection of draft-eligible men is in the order of "oldest first"—from 26 downward.

In the period prior to the Vietnam buildup, when draft calls were small, the average age for involuntary induction was between 22 and 24 years.

All three of the recent studies of the draft reveal that the current order of call is undesirable from the point of view of everyone involved—and is actually the reverse of what it should be:

For the young men themselves, it increases the period of uncertainty and interferes with the planning of lives and careers.

For employers, it causes hardships when employees are lost to the draft who have been trained, acquired skills, and settled in their jobs.

For the Selective Service System, it proliferates the number of deferment applications and appeals. Claims for dependency and occupational deferments are much more frequent for men over the age of 20.

For the Armed Forces, it creates problems. The services have found that older recruits are generally less adaptable than are younger ones to the rigors of military training.

The time has clearly come to correct these conditions and remove the uncertainties which the present order of call promotes.

I will issue an Executive order directing that in the future, as other measures I am proposing are put into effect, men be drafted beginning at age 19.

DEFERMENT INEQUITIES

Almost 2 million young men—and soon many more—reach age 19 each year. The foreseeable requirement is to draft only 100,000 to 300,000 of them annually. We must ask: How shall those relatively few be selected? As the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service phrased it, "Who serves when not all serve?"

Past procedures have, in effect, reduced the size of the available manpower pool by deferring men out of it.

This has resulted in inequities.

Two separate groups of men have been selected out of consideration for military service:

1. REJECTEES

In the past, many thousands of men were rejected—and put into deferred categories—who could have performed satisfactorily, sharing the burdens as well as the benefits of service. Most of these were disadvantaged youths with limited educational backgrounds or in some cases, curable physical defects.

We are taking action to correct this inequity. I referred earlier to Project 100,000 established by the Secretary of Defense. Under this program, the services are taking in men who would previ-

ously have been disqualified because of educational deficiencies or minor medical ailments.

With intensive instruction, practical on-the-job training and corrective medical measures, these young men can become good soldiers. Moreover, the remedial training they receive can enable them to live fuller and more productive lives. It is estimated that about half the men who enter the Armed Forces under this program will come as volunteers, the other half as draftees.

This will be a continuing program. The Nation can never again afford to deny to men who can effectively serve their country, the obligation—and the right—to share in a basic responsibility of citizenship.

2. COLLEGE STUDENTS

The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service found the issue of college student deferments to be the most difficult problem for its consideration. The Commission could not reach unanimity. This is not surprising, for it was sufficiently representative of the Nation itself to reflect the healthy diversity of opinion which centers on this subject.

Student deferments have resulted in inequities because many of those deferments have pyramided into exemptions from military service.

Deferred for undergraduate work, deferred further to pursue graduate study and then deferred even beyond that for fatherhood or occupational reasons, some young men have managed to pile deferment on deferment until they passed the normal cutoff point for induction.

In this regard, a recent survey revealed that only 27 percent of one age group of graduate school students past the age of 26 had served in the Armed Forces—contrasted with approximately 70 percent of men of the same ages with educational backgrounds varying from college degrees to some high school training.

There is one group of postgraduate students to whom this condition does not apply—men who are studying to be doctors and dentists. About half of them later serve as medical officers in the Armed Forces.

Their service is vital. Because their studies are essential to military manpower needs, students engaged in such programs must continue to be deferred until their education is completed.

I have concluded, however, that there is no justification for granting further deferments to other graduate school students.

To correct the inequities in the deferments of postgraduate students, I shall issue an Executive order specifying that no deferments for postgraduate study be granted in the future, except for those men pursuing medical and dental courses.

Undergraduate students present a different problem for consideration.

Many citizens—including a majority of the members of the National Advisory Commission—hold that student deferments are of themselves inequitable because they grant to one group of men a special privilege not generally available to all. Their concern was heightened by the belief that a student deferment in a time of conflict might be an even greater privilege.

They contend that such deferments cannot properly be justified as being in the national interest. Moreover it is their conviction that the elimination of a student deferment policy would have no harmful effect on the educational process in this country. Indeed, they believe that the Nation's experience with the returning veterans of other wars indicates that interruption of college studies for military service actually results for many men in a more mature approach and a greater capacity for study.

Others—including a substantial minority of the Commission—believe just as strongly that college deferments from service are not unfair—however manifestly unfair are the conditions of life which permit some to go to college while others cannot.

They agree that the unpredictability of world conditions could conceivably work to the advantage of students who were able to defer their service. But they point out that the same unpredictability could work just as easily to opposite effect, that men who were deferred as college freshmen in 1963 would be graduating this spring into a world in which they could face the hazards of combat. Finally, this point of view calls attention to the fact that the elimination of student deferments would unduly complicate the officer procurement problems of the Armed Forces, for almost four out of five officers who come into the services each year come from the Nation's colleges.

An issue so deeply important, with so many compelling factors on both sides, cannot be decided until its every aspect has been thoroughly explored.

I hope and expect that the Congress will debate the questions this issue poses for the Nation's youth and the Nation's future.

I will welcome the public discussion which the Commission report will surely stimulate.

I shall await the benefits of these discussions which will themselves be a great educational process for the Nation.

I will then take the Presidential action which, I believe, will best serve the national interest.

A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL RANDOM (FAIR) SYSTEM OF SELECTION

The paramount problem remains to determine who shall be selected for induction out of the many who are available.

Assuming that all the men available are equally qualified and eligible, how can that selection be made most fairly?

No question has received more thoughtful attention or more careful analysis.

There is no perfect solution. For the unavoidable truth is that complete equity can never be achieved when only some must be selected and only some must serve.

But a decision cannot be avoided. It is due. The question will become more urgent with the passing months and years.

I have concluded that the only method which approaches complete fairness is to establish a fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection which

will determine the order of call for all equally eligible men.

That FAIR system would operate generally as follows:

At age 18, all men would be examined to determine their physical and mental eligibility.

All eligible men reaching age 19 before a designated date would be placed in a selection pool.

The FAIR system would then determine their order of call.

They would be selected in that order of call, for induction at age 19, to fill draft calls placed by the Department of Defense.

Those not reached during this period would drop to a less vulnerable position on the list with the entry of the next year's group of eligible men into the selection pool.

All men would retain their vulnerability to the draft, in diminishing order by age group up to 26, in the event of a national emergency. Those who had received deferments would continue liable, as at present, until their 35th birthday.

This system, giving young men a clear indication of a likelihood of being drafted, in conjunction with the "youngest first" order of call, will further reduce uncertainty in the planning of futures and careers.

I am instructing the Director of Selective Service, working in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, to develop a fair and impartial random—FAIR—system of selection to become fully operational before January 1, 1969. This system will determine the order of call for induction of qualified and available 19-year-olds and older men as their deferments expire.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The proposals I am presenting in this message have one common objective: Insofar as it is possible to do so, to make certain that men who must be called to serve their country, and fight and die for it if necessary, will be chosen equitably and justly.

The governing concept I propose for selection is one of equal and uniform treatment for all men in like circumstances.

The National Advisory Commission has reported that in order to achieve that objective in all its dimensions, the Selective Service System itself should be restructured.

The Commission presented its conviction that the System's decentralized operation, with more than 4,000 neighborhood boards, 56 State headquarters and 95 appeal boards—all functioning under general and sometimes inconsistent guidelines—is not responsive to the requirements of our Nation today. It believed that uniformity of treatment would be difficult to achieve through that System.

The Commission recommended that the Selective Service System be consolidated. It suggested a coordinated structure of eight regions, embracing from 300 to 500 area offices located in major population centers and staffed with full-time Government employees. It proposed a System modernized by means of new management techniques, communica-

tions technology and data processing equipment.

I believe these recommendations should be exposed to further searching analysis and study by management experts building on the work the Commission has done.

The Selective Service System has done a good job for America. For a quarter of a century those who have been responsible for its operation have provided the Nation with an inspiring study of patriotic citizens volunteering their time and devotion to demanding tasks vitally affecting the national welfare.

Moreover, as I have already observed, the System itself has been flexible and responsive, meeting the widely varying calls for manpower placed on it over the past 20 years.

And beyond these considerations are others more difficult to measure, but deeply important nonetheless.

The Selective Service System is a part of America, a part of the process of our democracy, a part of our commitment to a full regard for the rights of the individual in our society. Because of the large number of registrants they must classify, many local draft boards in large cities cannot fulfill completely the function intended for them. But nonetheless the draft board concept is built on a uniquely American belief—that local citizens can perform a valuable service to the Government and at the same time personalize the Government's procedures to a young man fulfilling one of his earliest and most serious obligations of citizenship.

We cannot lightly discard an institution with so valuable a record of effectiveness and integrity.

Neither can we afford to preserve it, if we find that in practice it cannot adapt to the new controlling concept of equal and uniform treatment.

These counterbalancing considerations highlight the need to subject the System's organization to intensive study by experts skilled in management techniques and methods on the basis of the Commission's work.

I am instructing the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Selective Service System, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget jointly to establish a task force to review the recommendations for a restructured Selective Service System made by the National Advisory Commission. This review will determine the cost, the method of implementation, and the effectiveness of the System the Commission recommends, in view of the changes in the System I am proposing in this message.

In the meantime we can make certain changes to strengthen the System.

The Commission study brought into focus areas where immediate improvement can and should be put into effect.

I am instructing the Director of the Selective Service System to:

Assure that advisers and appeal agents are readily available to all registrants.

Examine the System's appeals procedures to insure that the rights of the individual are fully protected.

Improve the System's information policies so that all registrants and the pub-

lic generally will better understand the System's operations.

In conjunction with Governor Farris Bryant, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, work with the Governors to assure that all local boards are truly representative of the communities they serve and to submit periodic reports on the progress in this area.

RESERVE POLICIES

The National Advisory Commission focused attention on the administration of enlistments into Reserve and National Guard units. The Commission expressed concern over the inequities it saw in the enlistment procedures of these units.

The Reserve forces are essential to our military posture and are an integral part of it. My first concern is that these forces be maintained at their authorized strengths, and in a state of readiness for deployment, if and when they are needed.

I also believe that the Reserve components should, like the active forces, be manned primarily by volunteers.

Two steps have recently been taken by the Secretary of Defense to assure greater equity in the enlistment policies of the Reserve components:

Men who meet qualification standards must be accepted into Reserve units in the order of their application.

Reservists who are not satisfactorily fulfilling their obligation will be ordered to active duty for up to 24 months.

Authority to order such reservists to duty is provided in the Department of Defense 1967 Appropriations Act. I recommend that such authority be incorporated in permanent legislation.

I have concluded that two additional actions should now be taken:

First, I am directing the Secretary of Defense to give priority to Reserve enlistees who are under draft age—those young men 17 to 18½ years of age—to encourage a maximum number of volunteers who are not immediately draft liable. Reserve deferments for men who are draft liable will be authorized only to the extent required to fill specific vacancies in Reserve components.

Second, I recommend that the Congress enact standby authority to allow the Department of Defense to draft men into Reserve and National Guard units whenever the authorized strength of these units cannot otherwise be maintained.

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON SELECTIVE SERVICE

The work of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service represents the most comprehensive study of this system since it began 20 years ago. Any citizen who reads the report of the Commission—and I urge all citizens to do so—will recognize that the distinguished members have provided the most penetrating analysis of selective service in our history.

To provide the American people with a continuing review of a system which touches every American family and to assure the diligent pursuit of the actions I have discussed and approved in this message, as well as other suggestions in the Commission report, I am extending

the life of the National Advisory Commission for an additional year.

CONCLUSION

Service performed by the youth of our Nation honors us all.

Americans have good reason to respect the long tradition of service which is manifested in every flight line and outpost where we commit our bravest men to the guardianship of freedom.

We have witnessed in our day the building of another tradition—by men and women in the Peace Corps, in VISTA, and in other such programs which have touched, and perhaps even changed, the life of our country and our world.

This spirit is as characteristic of modern America as our advanced technology, or our scientific achievements.

I have wondered if we could establish, through these programs and others like them, a practical system of nonmilitary alternatives to the draft without harming our security.

Both the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and the group reporting to the Congress posed this question for study.

Both found the answer to be that we cannot.

But the spirit of volunteer service in socially useful enterprises will, we hope, continue to grow until that good day when all service will be voluntary, when all young people can and will choose the kind of service best fitted to their own needs and their Nation's.

We will hasten it as we can. But until it comes, because of the conditions of the world we live in now, we must continue to ask one form of service—military duty—of our young men. We would be an irresponsible Nation if we did not—and perhaps even an extinct one.

The Nation's requirement that men must serve, however, imposes this obligation: that in this land of equals, men are selected as equals to serve.

A just nation must have the fairest system that can be devised for making that selection.

I believe the proposals I am making today will help give us that system.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 1967.

COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 76)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to community work and training program, which, without being read, will be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The President's message was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Once again we have evidence that public assistance is best achieved when we help the poor to help themselves.

This is documented by the report I transmit today on the community work and training program authorized by the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962.

These amendments gave new opportunities for community work and training of thousands of unemployed parents of dependent children.

Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 gave further impetus to this program. It reinforced the original act by providing the counseling, education, health, job placement, and other services necessary to give the individual a new start in life.

Experience under these programs has shown that many people—now unemployed and living in poverty—can help themselves. Three-fourths of the 133,000 welfare recipients who have enrolled in these programs since 1964 have been helped: 22,100 have already found jobs, 70,200 are in training for productive employment, 3,500 are taking advance vocational instruction, 6,700 now have the training and marketable skills that should enable them to find jobs soon.

In short, 102,500 Americans and their families have been given hope where hope did not exist before. This is an impressive record.

But no statistics can measure the gain in self-respect to these parents. These programs substitute a productive job for a life on welfare or in poverty. They provide the opportunity to break the vicious cycle of welfare dependency and poverty which burdens our society.

I urge the Congress to extend and make permanent this program to bring help to unemployed parents and through them hope to our most disadvantaged children.

I urge the States to study the lessons we have learned and to avail themselves fully of the promise which these programs hold.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 1967.

THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the Peace Corps, which, without being read, will be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Of the many efforts undertaken by this Nation to advance peace, prosperity, and understanding, few have inspired greater admiration among the people of the world than the Peace Corps. In 5 years, it has given new purpose to thousands of Americans, and new hope to millions abroad.

In 1968 Peace Corps volunteers will assist more than 400,000 farmers in their struggle against hunger, help educate more than 700,000 schoolchildren, help train 55,000 teachers, provide health services to more than 200,000 persons, help 75,000 men and women help themselves through private enterprise, and bring greater opportunity to thousands of people through community development.

By August 1967 we will have more than 16,000 volunteers serving in 53 countries and one territory. By August 1968 there will be more than 19,000 volunteers—

nearly double the number in 1964—active in 60 countries.

The Peace Corps has captured the imagination of our youth; 210 schools in 30 nations are operating today because American students have voluntarily assisted them under the school partnership program which we initiated in 1964. Their support, together with the help of Peace Corps volunteers, and with labor and land donated by the host country, is providing a home for learning for a great many children around the world. We hope to build 500 schools by mid-1967 and at least 1,000 schools in 45 countries by mid-1968.

The Peace Corps has provided an opportunity for tens of thousands of idealistic and able Americans, young and old, to serve their fellow men—with little thought of self or comfort, and with little recompense other than the reward of seeing human lives made better by their efforts.

It is building a growing reserve of capable and tested citizens devoted to public service. By 1970, there will be some 50,000 returned volunteers in the United States. Many of them, directly or after completing their education, plan to enter Government service. Some have already returned to train new volunteers, and others are helping to administer programs throughout the world.

The Peace Corps produces a high yield in results, at a low budgetary cost. The number of volunteers has increased at a much faster rate than the Peace Corps budget. Over the years, the average cost of the program per volunteer has declined steadily—from a high of \$9,074 in fiscal 1963 to an estimated \$7,400 in 1967.

Today, the Peace Corps idea—the idea of voluntary public service abroad—is spreading to other countries. Already 18 "Peace Corps," most of them based on the U.S. model, have been established by other industrialized nations. This is testimony, not only to the soundness of Peace Corps principles, but also to the living example of Peace Corps volunteers.

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the Fifth Annual Report of the Peace Corps. It will be gratifying reading to all who are interested in this pioneering and humane endeavor.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 1967.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 3, 1967,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on March 3, 1967, reported favorably, without reservation, Executive D, 88th Congress, second session, the Consular Convention between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Moscow on June 1, 1964, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 4) thereon, together with the individual views of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DONN] which was printed.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. RES. 9

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana requesting Congress to provide Federal assistance to domestic gold producers

Whereas, since 1934, domestic gold producers have been required to sell their product only to the Federal Government at the established price of \$35 per ounce, and

Whereas, costs of producing this precious metal have continued to increase at an alarming rate reflecting the impact of inflation upon the economics of gold mining and milling operations with the result that virtually all gold producers in the United States have closed down their properties, and

Whereas, domestic gold production, which amounted to approximately 5,000,000 ounces in 1940, has now dropped to an annual rate slightly in excess of 1,500,000 ounces while current domestic gold consumption for defense and space needs, industrial requirements, the arts and crafts, and dental use has rapidly risen to a significant rate of approximately 6,000,000 ounces per annum, over three times our United States production rate, and

Whereas, the continuing outflow of gold and failure to solve our balance of payments deficit continues to be of ever greater national concern, and

Whereas, the disparity between domestic consumption and production imposes an additional substantial drain upon the monetary gold reserves of the United States, and

Whereas, Federal relief legislation revitalizing the United States gold mining industry could well end continuing substantial depletion of our monetary gold reserves to supply United States internal domestic gold consumption which should alleviate to some extent concern in foreign circles over our monetary policies, and

Whereas, such legislation to stimulate domestic gold production is definitely in the national interest; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, That the members of the Senate of the State of Montana respectively request the Congress of the United States to provide Federal financial assistance payments to domestic gold producers to stabilize the few existing United States gold properties, to reopen dormant gold mines, and to encourage aggressive exploration for new gold ore reserves in this country: be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Congress from the State of Montana.

I hereby certify that the within Resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Fortieth Legislative Assembly of the state of Montana on the 13th day of February, 1967.

JAMES J. PASMA,

Secretary of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Alfred Robert Zipf, of California, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service; and

Dr. Kathryn M. Smith, of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service.

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William P. Kelly, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity; and

William H. Crook, of Texas, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Elzle H. Wooten, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1179. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sales of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Ana Jacalne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1181. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 1182. A bill to provide for the appointment of congressional pages or messengers from among young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1183. A bill for the relief of Benjamin De Kylin;

S. 1184. A bill for the relief of Miss Mariel Madamba; and

S. 1185. A bill for the relief of Sofia Michaelidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. INOUE, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr.

McCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1186. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1187. A bill to establish Cedar Breaks National Monument as Cedar Breaks National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1188. A bill for the relief of Manual J. Tavis; and

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of Sheung Wan Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1190. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1191. A bill to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation in Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1192. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. MUSKIE):

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to designate the 13th day of March in 1967 as "National Electric Car Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

PROHIBITION OF SALES OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES TO PERSONS UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase in the District of Columbia the minimum age for the purchase of any alcoholic beverage.

At the present time the minimum age for the sale of hard liquor is to persons 21 or older. But there is an exception that permits the sale of beer and light wines to persons 18 and older. This bill would eliminate that exception.

In doing so, I want to serve notice that I will exert every effort to have this bill enacted or to have its provisions incorporated into other legislation by amendment.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, I have noted with interest the reintroduction, in the other body as H.R. 822, of legislation, to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. This bill would implement recommendations made some years ago by a blue-ribbon commission appointed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to review the operations of the act.

H.R. 822 contains a mischievous, if innocent looking, provision. I refer to paragraph (5) of section 1 which, by adding the words "an original" to section 14 of the present act, is an attempt to hamper the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board's right to review a license application to assure conformity with the criteria specified in section 14 to an original application only and not to the subsequent annual applications for license renewals. This "sleeper" was incorporated into H.R. 10744 during its consideration in the other body last year at the suggestion of the local restaurant operators, but was vehemently opposed by the District Commissioners and the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board.

It would be presumptuous for a Senator to give advice to Members of the other body on legislation coming before them. As an interested citizen, however, I hope that in committee or on the floor they will see fit to delete that little provision from H.R. 822 and, for good measure, to add the substance of the bill which I am introducing today. Otherwise, I assure the Senate that I stand ready to do these things when H.R. 822 or its Senate companion, which has not yet been introduced, comes before the Senate for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1179) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXEMPTION OF A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM SERVICE IN A COMBAT ZONE WHEN SUCH MEMBER IS THE SOLE SURVIVING SON OF A FAMILY

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BYRD of Virginia, BURDICK, CANNON, EASTLAND, FONG, FULBRIGHT, HATFIELD, HOLLAND, JACKSON, KENNEDY of New York, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MONDALE, MOSS, PELL, RANDOLPH, SCOTT, SMATHERS, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes.

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

The bill (S. 1181) to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. INOUE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the manpower demands of our present conflict in Vietnam are most unique. Of those eligible to serve, many are able to defer their military service for the period of their college education and longer.

Others enjoy exemptions on the basis of family support. I have no quarrel with these provisions for under the circumstances of this war, which is not a national emergency, such exemptions are wise and necessary.

Nevertheless, it is paradoxical that when so few must bear the burdens of so many, some families are assuming double risk and suffering, while other families remain virtually untouched by the tragic conflict. There have been instances in my own State of Hawaii where two men within a single family were killed as a result of the Vietnam conflict. Also, there have been cases where two brothers were seriously wounded while serving concurrent tours of duty in the combat area. I am sure that in each of your States these situations can be duplicated and multiplied.

At the present time, Department of Defense regulations offer two bases for deferment of military service in a combat area:

First. When one or more members of a family have been killed, or have died from injuries incurred in a combat area, the sole surviving son will be exempt from combat duty if he so requests.

The member of the military service must initiate the action by giving this information to his superiors. If, however, he wishes to stay on, he may sign a waiver forfeiting his right to be removed from the combat area.

Second. No two members of the same family are sent into a combat zone at the same time, provided one of the two members requests to have his service delayed.

But the member of the military service must initiate the action by giving this information to his superiors. If, however, he wishes to stay on, he must sign a waiver forfeiting his right to be transferred out of the zone for the length of time the other member of the family is serving there.

At the present time, the Department of Defense does not keep records which would reveal death of a next of kin, or concurrent duty of a next of kin.

My proposal would deny any surviving member of a family in which one or more members have been killed or died as a result of injuries incurred in a combat area, the option of serving in a combat zone. Second, this bill would forbid the assignment of a second member of the same family to concurrent duty in a combat area unless the two specifically volunteered for such service.

I believe the requirement that the member of the military service initiate the action in these circumstances is an unfair obligation to assume. I am sure all of us understand how a young man filled with esprit de corps after training with his unit might easily sign a waiver to enable him to stay with his friends and buddies. He could, of course, refuse to sign the waiver and by so doing avoid combat. But he would suspect that his leaving was a cowardly act. Certainly, it might appear so to his buddies. Also, a member of the armed services often is motivated by a deep sense of service and patriotism. Each of these are pressures which constrain him from exercising his rights as now delineated in Armed Forces regulations.

Not only his interests but the interests of his loved ones are involved. Part of the right to make a decision must be freedom from coercion. With a decision of such far-reaching implications as this, and in view of the availability of so many men, no coercion should be possible.

Out of consideration, therefore, to his family and to the young man himself, I solicit your support for these reforms.

YOUNGSTERS OF COLLEGE AGE AS SENATE MESSENGERS—SCRAP ARCHAIC PAGE SYSTEM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the present method of selecting congressional pages is archaic and troublesome. The time is long past due for the Congress to give serious consideration to establishing a more equitable and sensible system of hiring pages.

Under the present system pages may be employed in the House of Representatives at the age of 14 and continue until they are 18. In the Senate pages start at 14 and some remain in this employment until they are too large to serve inconspicuously—a rather nebulous standard for terminating employment.

The boys who presently serve as pages in the Senate and the House of Representatives are fine boys. However, they are a part of a system which developed historically but has no validity today.

Historically, the custom of hiring pages goes back to the first Congress. In those days Members of Congress who knew of young orphan boys in destitute circumstances had their sympathies aroused and they were successful in having officers of the House of Representatives employ these boys as runners.

Originally, in 1789, a few runners were employed. The earliest records show that in the 20th Congress, which sat from 1827 to 1829, three boys were employed as runners. In succeeding Congresses the number changed, but the custom continued.

Through the years this practice has been modified, so that today a large number of boys between the ages of 14 and 18 are hired to serve at salaries in excess of \$5,000 a year. This is indeed a handsome salary for a young boy just out of grade school who answers telephones and delivers messages and documents. It is more money than is paid to many officers and soldiers serving in combat in Vietnam.

When these youngsters come to Washington they are left on their own to secure adequate housing and meals. They are without the benefit of the parental guidance that is so necessary for young people. They attend the Capitol Page School for 3 hours daily and sometimes work as much as 40 hours a week, or longer. This schedule would not be tolerated in any job covered by Federal child labor regulations.

Difficulties in the past have caused some Senators to propose that the Federal Government provide a \$1 million dormitory for the 80-odd youngsters who work as pages. I spoke out against that proposal in July 1964, at that time urging that the page system be abolished. This would be an unconscionable waste of taxpayers' money. It would only

serve to compound an already unwieldy situation and perpetuate an outmoded, unnecessary, archaic, and unjustified system.

In my judgment consideration should be given at this time to the advisability of employing college students, young men and women, from the ages of 17 to 22 to serve as pages in both Houses of Congress. This would give youngsters who are college students the valuable opportunity to view the work of Congress firsthand, help them to pay their way through college, and relieve Members of Congress of the responsibility of looking after the welfare of very young boys, many of whom are on their own for the first time, far from their parents and homes.

Today, most Capitol policemen, elevator operators, Post Office employees, and other patronage jobs on Capitol Hill are filled by young men attending colleges and universities in the Washington area. This has provided a wonderful opportunity for them, and I am sure has helped many a young man to graduate who otherwise might not financially have been able to make his way through college.

I realize that whenever a long-established tradition or custom is set aside, very careful consideration should be given to the reasons for doing so. I am convinced that in this fast-moving space age of change and challenge, the present method of selecting very young teenage boys as pages for Congress is outmoded and really serves no useful purpose.

Therefore, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of congressional messengers from young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1182) to provide for the appointment of congressional pages or messengers from among young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college, introduced by Mr. Young of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1182

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person shall serve as a page of the Senate or House of Representatives—

(1) before he or she has attained the age of seventeen years, or during any session of the Congress which begins after he or she has attained the age of twenty-three years; or

(2) during any period when he or she is not regularly pursuing a full-time course of study in a recognized college or university, if such period exceeds (i) thirty days, or (ii) four months if the period is between school years and such person has a bona fide intention to pursue a full-time course of study in a recognized college or university during the semester (or other period into which the school year is divided) immediately following such period.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 243 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 88a),

and the proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Education of Senate and House Pages" in title I of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (2 U.S.C. 88b), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. This Act shall become effective at the beginning of the first session of the Ninety-first Congress.

CARE OF FOSTER CHILDREN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators INOUÉ, FONG, FULBRIGHT, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MORSE, PELL, RANDOLPH, and YARBOROUGH, I am reintroducing proposed legislation to establish a new program of grants to the States to provide aid to children in foster care.

The Federal Government acknowledges the fact that it has a definite responsibility for the well-being of our needy. This philosophy holds true especially when we concern ourselves with the plight of dependent children.

It is unfortunate that the law makes a distinction between a foster child and a dependent children living with his family. No child is more dependent on outside help than the child separated from his parents by death or disaster. Until now, because of an arbitrary distinction in the law, the Government has, in practical effect, ignored the plight of the foster child.

Aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—provided under title IV of the Social Security Act, is a typical example. The purpose of this program is to provide needy children with the economic support they need for their health and development. Presently Federal law requires that a foster child receiving AFDC aid must have been placed in foster care by court order and he must also have received aid from the State AFDC program in or for the month in which court proceedings were initiated. Furthermore, AFDC funds are not available to children in public child-care institutions.

Although foster care is included in the definition of child-welfare services under title V, Federal funds are not earmarked specifically for foster care purposes. Moreover, appropriations for title V programs are limited, and the results have been that States have seen fit to use Federal funds to bolster other child-welfare programs.

Today, there are approximately 300,000 children in foster care. The financial burden of providing care and services for these children falls primarily upon State and local governments and upon voluntary agencies supported by charitable contributions.

Because the bill that I am reintroducing establishes a new program exclusively for children in foster care, funds received under this program would in no way reduce a State's share of Federal money for general child-welfare programs under title V of the Social Security Act.

This bill provides that each State may receive a Federal grant, on a 50-percent-matching basis, of not more than \$45 a month for each child living in a foster family home.

This bill also provides that each State

would receive a nonmatching Federal grant of \$20 a month for each child receiving care in a public or private non-profit child-care institution.

In addition, the Federal Government would provide 75 percent of the cost of those services provided by State and local personnel which have been determined necessary to promote the welfare of children in foster care, and the Federal Government would underwrite the total cost as determined necessary for training personnel for work with the State and local agencies. Fifty percent of the cost necessary for the efficient administration of this program would be underwritten by the National Government.

In order to qualify for assistance under this program, each State would be required to have its plan of welfare and related services for children in foster care approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Criteria for the State plan are modeled after those required for States for aid to families with dependent children. In addition, States would be required to take appropriate steps to assure that Federal funds will not replace State and local funds now used to finance foster care services.

The provision in this bill for maximum Federal grants of \$45 a month for children in foster family homes is intended to help more families assume responsibility for foster children. Except for the child who is unable to conform to a normal family life, it seems to be the consensus among the experts that foster family care is preferable to institutional care.

A foster child's needs are extremely complex. Their often deeply imbedded hostilities toward adults make it extremely difficult for a foster couple to establish a true parental relationship with the child. In fact the turnover among foster parents runs as high as 33 percent a year. It is hoped that the provisions of this bill for professional services and the training of personnel will greatly assist remedying these situations.

I believe New Jersey is representative of the basic programs of other States. In New Jersey each child boarding in a foster home receives \$77 a month in State and local funds.

For children requiring specialized programs for treatment of physical handicaps or emotional disturbance, the State of New Jersey will pay up to \$153 a month.

Although the New Jersey program is not substantially different from foster care programs in other States, there are, however, notable variations. In New Jersey the cost of foster care services generally is borne equally by the State and county governments. Several States rely almost exclusively on State funds. A few States, however, provide virtually no State money or administrative machinery for foster care programs, preferring instead to allow local governments and voluntary agencies to do the job.

Approximately 75 additional children each month enter the New Jersey foster care program. As of November 1966, 8,616 children boarded in foster homes.

Numerous State and Federal officials I have talked to express increasing con-

cern. They view the already substantial increase in the number of foster children with alarm in view of the inadequate foster care services available. Many States' budgets are now so overburdened that only limited numbers of new children can be admitted into foster care.

It seems clear that Federal assistance is mandatory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point an explanation of this proposal and that the bill be permitted to lie on the desk for additional cosponsors for a period of 10 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier I introduced a bill and asked unanimous consent that it lie at the desk for additional cosponsors. The bill deals with grants-in-aid for children in foster care.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that part of my request, that it remain at the desk for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The bill (S. 1186) to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1186

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the Social Security Act is amended by (1) redesignating part 5 thereof as part 6, (2) by redesignating section 541 as section 551, and (3) by inserting after part 4 thereof the following new part:

"PART 5—GRANTS TO STATES FOR AID TO CHILDREN UNDER FOSTER CARE

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 541. For the purpose of facilitating the proper foster care of children whose welfare can best be advanced through such care by enabling each State to furnish financial assistance and needed welfare services, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to children placed under foster care, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this part. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payment to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans for aid and services to children under foster care.

"STATE PLANS FOR AID AND SERVICES TO CHILDREN UNDER FOSTER CARE

"SEC. 542. (a) A State plan for aid and services to children under foster care must—

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them;

"(2) provide for financial participation by the State;

"(3) provide that the State public-welfare agency which administers the child-welfare services plan developed as provided in part 3 of this title shall be designated as the State agency to administer, or supervise the

administration of, the State plan under this part;

"(4) provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any person whose claim for aid to children under foster care is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"(5) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the State plan;

"(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) provide that (A) the amount of aid, if any, to be provided under the State plan with respect to any child under foster care shall be determined on the basis of his need therefor, taking into consideration any income and resources of such child which are available to defray the expenses of his care; and (B) the State agency shall not deny or limit the amount or extent of the aid otherwise available under the State plan to any child, on the ground of his lack of need for such aid, until such agency is fully satisfied, as the result of affirmative evidence, that there is a lack of need on the part of such child for such aid;

"(8) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients of aid to children under foster care to purposes directly connected with the administration of the State plan (except that this requirement shall not be applicable in the case of aid under such plan provided to children placed in a child-care institution);

"(9) provide that all persons wishing to make application for aid to children under foster care shall have opportunity to do so, and that such aid shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible persons;

"(10) provide that aid to children under foster care will not be provided to any child with respect to any period for which such child is receiving aid under the State plan of such State approved under section 402 of this Act;

"(11) provide for the development and application of a program for such welfare and related services for each child who receives aid to children under foster care as may be necessary to promote the welfare of such child, and provide for the coordination of such program, and any other services provided for children under the State plan, with the child-welfare services plan developed as provided in part 3 of this title, with a view toward providing welfare and related services which will best promote the welfare of such child;

"(12) provide for the development, with respect to each child who receives aid to children under foster care, an individual welfare plan, which shall include a continuing study of the child's needs, of the most suitable available home in which he can be placed, and a periodic review of his case, and provide that, in carrying out such welfare plan, use may be made of services of private nonprofit child-care agencies and organizations; and

"(13) contain or be supported by assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that amounts payable to such State under section 543 to carry out the State plan will be so used as to supplement the level of non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of

such amounts, be available in the State for the purpose of providing aid and welfare services to children who are under foster care in such State.

"PAYMENT TO STATES

"SEC. 543. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this part, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1967—

"(1) an amount equal to 50 per centum of the total amount expended under the State plan during such quarter as aid to children under foster care with respect to children in foster family homes (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of \$90 multiplied by the total number of children who were recipients of such aid for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (A) the number of children in foster family homes with respect to whom such aid in the form of money payments is paid for such month, plus (B) the number of other children in such homes with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to children under foster care in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care);

"(2) an amount equal to 100 per centum of the total amount expended under the State plan during such quarter as aid to children under foster care with respect to children in child-care institutions (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of \$20 multiplied by the total number of children in such institutions who were recipients of such aid for such month;

"(3) an amount equal to 75 per centum of (A) the total amount expended during such quarter in providing services (as prescribed by the Secretary under regulations) necessary to promote the welfare of children receiving aid to children under foster care under the State plan, plus (B) the total amount expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"(4) an amount equal to one-half of the total sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, including services and training referred to in paragraph (2) and provided in accordance with the requirements of this part and regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

The services referred to in paragraph (3) (A) shall include only services provided by the staff of the State agency, or the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision, except that, subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, there may be included services provided by nonprofit private agencies under contract with the State agency, if, in the judgment of the State agency, the State agency cannot provide such services as economically or as effectively by its staff or through a local agency as such services can be provided under contract with nonprofit private agencies.

"(b) (1) Prior to the beginning of each quarter, the Secretary shall estimate the amount to which a State will be entitled under subsection (a) for such quarter, such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropri-

ated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if such amount is less than the State's proportionate share of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other investigation as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary shall then pay, in such installments as he may determine, to the State the amount so estimated, reduced or increased to the extent of any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determines was made under this section to such State for any prior quarter and with respect to which adjustment has not already been made under this subsection.

"(3) The pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary, of the net amount recovered, during any quarter by the State or political subdivision thereof with respect to aid to children under foster care, shall be considered an overpayment under this subsection.

"(4) Upon the making of any estimate by the Secretary under this subsection, any appropriations available for the payments under this section shall be deemed obligated.

"OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 544. If the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under this part, finds—

"(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 542; or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State (or, in his discretion, that payments will be limited to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure) until the Secretary is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied he shall make no further payments to such State (or shall limit payments to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 545. For the purposes of this part—

"(a) The term 'child' means a needy child who (1) has not attained the age of eighteen, (2) has been deprived of parental support or care, and (3) is not (and upon making proper application therefor would not be) entitled to receive aid to families with dependent children under the State plan, approved under section 402 of this Act, of the State in which he lives;

"(b) The term 'aid,' when applied to a child under foster care, means (1) money payments with respect to such child, plus (2) medical care in behalf of or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of such child;

"(c) The term 'foster family home' means a private family home, which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved, by the agency of such State responsible for licensing homes of this type, as meeting the standards established for such licensing;

"(d) The term 'child-care institution' means a public or nonprofit private institution which provides foster care for children and which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved, by the agency of such State for licensing institutions of this type, as meeting the standards established for such licensing.

"(e) A child shall be considered to be 'under foster care' only if (1) he is actually living in a foster family home or a child-care institution, and (2) (A) he has been placed

in such home or institution as a result of a determination, by a court of competent jurisdiction or of a public welfare or other public agency having a legal responsibility for his welfare, to the effect that his welfare can best be promoted by his placement therein, or (B) his having been placed in such a home or institution is approved by a State or local welfare agency having legal responsibility for his welfare."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 408 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "Effective for the period beginning May 1, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "Effective for the period beginning May 1, 1961, and ending with the close of June 30, 1968.)

(b) (1) Section 1116(a) (1) of such Act is amended by inserting "or part 5 of title V," after "XIX".

(2) Section 1116(a) (3) of such Act is amended by inserting "544," after "404."

(3) Section 1116(b) of such Act is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V," after "XIX".

(4) Section 1116(d) of such Act is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V," after "XIX".

(c) (1) Clause (1) of the first sentence of section 1901 of such Act is amended by inserting "and needy dependent children under foster care entitled to benefits under part 5, title V" after "families with dependent children".

(2) (A) Section 1902(a) (10) of such Act is amended by inserting ", and part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

(B) Section 1902(a) (17) is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

(3) Section 1902(c) of such Act is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

(4) Section 1903(a) (1) of such Act is amended by inserting "or part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

(d) Section 121(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by inserting ", or part 5 of title V" after "XVI".

The explanation presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AMEND TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE GRANTS TO THE STATES FOR AID AND SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

The bill provides a Federal contribution equal to one-half the amount appropriated by the state, up to \$45 of Federal money per month, for each child living in a foster family home.

In addition, each State would receive a non-matching Federal grant of \$20 a month for each child receiving care in a public or private nonprofit child-care institution.

The Federal Government would provide 75% of the cost of those services provided by State and local personnel which have been determined necessary to promote the welfare of children in foster care. Under certain conditions the services of private nonprofit agencies under contract with the State agency may also be included.

The Federal Government would also underwrite the total cost determined necessary for training personnel for work with the State and local agencies.

And, the Federal Government would underwrite 50% of the cost necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

Because the bill establishes a new program exclusively for children in foster care, funds received under this program would in no way reduce a State's share of Federal money for general child-welfare programs under Title V of the Social Security Act.

The bill authorizes an open-end appropriation and requires that States take appropriate steps to assure that Federal funds will not be used to replace State and local funds now used to finance foster care services.

The bill includes standard provisions establishing the method for making payments to the States for reimbursement in the case of overpayment, and for the termination of payments under specified circumstances.

Any child under age 18 who is living in a foster family home or in a public or private nonprofit child-care institution would be eligible for aid under this program.

The program will be administered by the State agency responsible for other child-welfare programs operating in the State. In most cases, this agency will be the State Welfare Agency.

In order to qualify for assistance under this program, each State would be required to submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for his approval a plan of welfare and related services for children in foster care.

Requirements for the State plan parallel the statutory requirements now in effect for assistance under Title IV of the Social Security Act which provides aid to families with dependent children.

The State plan must call for the development of an individual welfare plan for each child receiving aid under this program. Individual welfare plans will include a continuing study of the child's needs and of the most suitable available home in which he can be placed, and a periodic review of his case. In carrying out each plan, the services of private nonprofit child-care agencies and organizations may be used.

States are required to permit all persons seeking aid under this program to apply for such aid and to furnish aid to eligible individuals within a reasonable time.

Children in foster care will also be eligible for medical benefits provided under Title XIX of the Social Security Act in States where the Kerr-Mills program is in effect.

The provisions for foster care, Title IV, Section 408 of the Social Security Act (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) will be allowed to expire and foster children who received AFDC aid will be entitled to assistance under this program.

CEDAR BREAKS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, situated high on a plateau in southern Utah, 23 miles from Cedar City, is the grand mountainside amphitheater known as Cedar Breaks National Monument. An immense half bowl, 2,000 feet deep, 4 miles long, 2½ miles wide, and covering almost 10 square miles, Cedar Breaks exhibits what is probably the world's most breathtaking exposure of flamboyant color.

Within the steep-walled amphitheater, visitors see limestone eroded into many fantastic shapes that have been formed by the never-ending efforts of rain, wind, snow, and ice.

Geologists tell us that this all started about 55 million years ago when a limy ooze was deposited in shallow lakes on a land surface near sea level. About 13 million years ago the land surface was slowly uplifted to its present elevation of around 10,000 feet. As the plateau lifted, it produced a steep, westerly facing escarpment of limestone, which became exposed to the elements of erosion. The rock, varying in hardness, became susceptible to the rain and snow water rushing down the cliffs and aided by frost and wind, erosion occurred, some slow and some quickly, leaving us the resistant spires and ridges we have today.

The first protection afforded this unique region was in 1905 when it was

included as part of the Sevier—now Dixie—National Forest and was administered by the Forest Service. On August 22, 1933, the area was placed under the National Park Service administration as a national monument.

Now, Mr. President, the time has come to designate this region as a national park.

I am, therefore, introducing today legislation to change the designation of the Cedar Breaks National Monument to Cedar Breaks National Park.

My proposal is another step in upgrading Utah's tourist potential and giving proper recognition to the outstanding scenic attractions of the State.

The establishment of a Cedar Breaks National Park has long been a dream of local civic leaders and other State officials since it would give the Cedar Breaks attraction the status which it well deserves in the national system of recreational areas. In addition, Cedar Breaks would receive greater development and much wider recognition and promotion which would attract many additional visitors to the tourist mecca of southern Utah which is fast coming to be known as the Land of the Rainbow Canyons.

Under my bill there would be no acreage increases over the current 10 square miles within the national monument boundaries.

Earlier this year interested parties came to me with a proposal to add the so-called Bristlecone Pine Tree area to my Cedar Breaks National Park plan. I asked for a review and a report from persons involved in the area, from the U.S. Forest Service, mining, grazing, and other interests as well as making a study of my own on the merits of adding the bristlecone pine region to Cedar Breaks.

After reviewing all of the information gathered I am inclined to agree with a majority of those involved that the 1,400 acres proposed for addition should remain a part of the Dixie National Forest. However, in making my study I called attention to the Forest Service that some protection should be given to the ancient bristlecone pine trees which eke out an existence on the relatively poor limestone soil that is along the rim of the amphitheater.

I have been told that the bristlecone pine area has been and will continue to be of major interest to the Forest Service and that its value for recreation and research is fully recognized.

I feel, and I think the Forest Service agrees, that added emphasis should be given to protection for the bristlecone pine from vandalism and destruction. Along these lines the Forest Service has developed a plan for access roads, barriers, trails, camp and picnic facilities, as well as signs and informational programs for the protection, development, and public use of the entire Cedar Breaks, bristlecone pine complex.

In this manner, the 1,400 acres can remain under the Forest Service multiple use program which would eliminate the significant economic impact on grazing, hunting, and other resource uses in the area.

Mr. President, it is obvious to me from the interest generated by my proposal

this year and in the past that a Cedar Breaks National Park has widespread support. I am hopeful that the Interior Department's National Park Service and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will give my proposal early consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1187) to establish Cedar Breaks National Monument as Cedar Breaks National Park, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1187

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Cedar Breaks National Monument in the State of Utah is hereby established as the Cedar Breaks National Park to be administered as a national park under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 as amended and supplemented.

THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish in Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

My colleagues are thoroughly familiar with this proposal. On two previous occasions the Senate has acted favorably on it. S. 936 of the 89th Congress died in the House Rules Committee in the last days of the session.

The bill I am introducing today is identical to the measure reported favorably by the House Interior Committee last year. It calls for a 61,171-acre park that includes both North and South Manitou Islands and numbers 64 miles of shoreline, half of it on the mainland. The House Interior Committee added to the Senate-passed measure the 14,100-acre North Manitou Island plus a buffer zone along M-22 on the mainland.

This bill is the product of a great deal of Committee work, both in House and Senate.

The need for action was forcefully stated last Wednesday at a luncheon meeting of the Michigan delegation and executives of the State conservation department.

Ralph MacMullan, the department's director, made it clear that the State administration wholeheartedly backs the park as necessary to maintain decent recreational facilities in the State.

Last year 55,700 families were turned away from crowded Michigan State parks. There is urgent need to get this national lakeshore established.

Hopefully the introduction of this "finished product" will help speed it through the congressional committees. It represents the fullest consideration of the Senate Interior Committee, the Senate, and the House Interior Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of October 18, 1966, from the Bay City Times, which in turn is a reprint from the Grand Rapids Press, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 1192) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The editorial presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times, Oct 18, 1966]

WHAT OTHERS THINK: "JOB ON PARKS ONLY HALF DONE"—THE GRAND RAPIDS PRESS

Completion of congressional action on a proposal to establish Pictured Rocks National Seashore preserves for the enjoyment of all Americans one of Water Wonderland's most scenic attractions.

Aside from the benefits Michigan will reap from the tourist trade this newest of the national parks will attract, the important thing is that an area of rare beauty is being saved.

Commenting on completion of congressional action on the Pictured Rocks proposal, Rep. Raymond F. Clevenger, who co-sponsored it with Sen. Philip A. Hart, said, "We are looking forward for everyone in the Middle West to come to Michigan's Upper Peninsula and see what we have been looking at and enjoying for years."

Why just the Middle West? As a national park, embracing the Grand Sable sand dunes and numerous colorful waterfalls, the Pictured Rocks National Park is a magnet for any travel-minded American.

It is only to be regretted that members of the House and Senate should regard approval of Pictured Rocks park as lessening the need for similar approval of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the lower peninsula's beautiful Lake Leelanau country.

The Washington news story reporting approval of Pictured Rocks park said of the Sleeping Bear bill, "It still has a chance for House passage, but there is opposition to giving Michigan two parks in one year."

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore should be considered solely on the basis of merit. It is geographically located within easy accessibility of the midcontinent's peak population density, with its unsatisfied demands for pleasant outdoor space for vacation and recreation.

Long before Congress, the need for this national park has been amply substantiated through repeated and exhaustive studies, and the bill has been tailored to meet any reasonable objection from residents of the proposed park area. Supported by Sen. Hart, a Democrat, Sen. Griffin, a Republican, and by all state agencies in any way involved, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore should be made a reality now.

NATIONAL ELECTRIC CAR DAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a joint resolution to declare the 13th day of March in 1967 as National Electric Car Day.

On March 14, the Committees on Commerce and Public Works will open hearings on S. 451 and S. 453, bills to pro-

mote the development of electric vehicles and other alternatives to the internal combustion engine. Enactment of these bills, authored by Senator MUSKIE and myself, would be a great step forward in combating the increasing air pollution problem and in alleviating the snarl of urban congestion.

On March 13, in the upper level garage of the New Senate Office Building, the two committees will sponsor an exhibit of electric vehicles. This exhibit will help answer arguments about feasibility which many have raised. Some of these detractors of the electric car who have been looking too hard at their mathematical calculations can now look at actual vehicles.

All Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, their staffs, and the public, are invited to this exhibition.

The American Public Power Association has been a leader in promoting electric vehicles. Alex Radin, the general manager, has suggested this resolution. I ask unanimous consent that this letter and the joint resolution be printed at the close of my remarks. I am pleased to have Senator MUSKIE as a cosponsor.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) to designate the 13th day of March in 1967 as "National Electric Car Day," introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. MUSKIE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 48

Whereas air pollution results in environmental discomfort and may be injurious to public health; and

Whereas there is a great need to develop an additional and practical source of transportation for use in urban and suburban areas of the United States; and

Whereas the development of electrically powered vehicles capable of reducing air pollution and performing transportation tasks should be encouraged: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 13th day of March in 1967 as "National Electric Car Day" and inviting the Governors of the several States and the chief officials of local governments and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate activities.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1967.
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The joint hearings planned by the Senate Commerce Committee and the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Public Works Committee concerning electric vehicle research and development afford an excellent opportunity to inform the people of this nation about the progress being made in the development of practical and non-polluting electric vehicles. It also seems to me that the demonstration of currently operating

vehicles which is planned during the week of the hearings will be an effective way of showing that electrically powered vehicles already are capable of performing a variety of transportation tasks.

In order to attract further attention to the hearings and the demonstration, I urge you to introduce the enclosed resolution which would designate March 13, 1967, the day of the demonstration, "National Electric Car Day". Such a resolution would help alert Members of Congress and the public to the importance of the hearings scheduled to begin the next day.

Sincerely,

ALEX RADIN.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the names of my colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] may be added as cosponsors of S. 889, to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 275) to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 14) establishing a Standing Committee on Urban Affairs.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 883) to permit a compact or agreement between the several States for the uniform treatment of certain matters related to taxation.

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 5—THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on Thursday, April 13, on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. The hearings will commence at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will continue on April 14, 17, 18, and 19.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with this bill should notify Mr. Kenneth

A. McLean, professional staff member, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-3860.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON SALINE WATER PROGRAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on April 3 the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will conduct hearings on S. 1101, to authorize the appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes.

The program for the development of saline water conversion processes is making significant progress in its efforts to develop economic methods for producing fresh water from saline and brackish waters. It has also supplied the incentive for the development of desalting technology and has encouraged the growth of an increasingly valuable and scientific program.

The program originally authorized under the act of July 3, 1952, was focused primarily upon basic research. These efforts must continue, but the program is at a stage now where it must place more emphasis on the practical application of the research efforts. To achieve this purpose it is necessary to increase the conversion program authorization in order to provide for fiscal years 1968 through 1970.

Anyone interested in testifying on the proposal is welcome and should so advise the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

LEAD-ZINC HEARINGS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Interior Committee I announce that the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels has scheduled an open, public hearing for April 12 on S. 289, a measure designed to bring stability to our lead-zinc industry which is so basic to our security and economic development. S. 289 was sponsored by the very distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, Senator ANDERSON, for himself and 27 other Senators of both political parties and from several different areas of our country.

S. 289, the title of which is the "Lead and Zinc Act of 1967," would provide for calculation and application of an import quota on either lead or zinc ores and metal, if domestic stocks of either metal reach levels defined in the legislation as being well above normal inventories required to service the needs of consumers of lead and zinc. Accumulation of stocks of these metals above those levels have in past years resulted in marked market disruption and instability which has proved detrimental to all phases of the lead-zinc industry—producers, smelters, fabricators, and consumers alike. The term of the legislation and the terms for quotas are limited to permit a reevaluation of the measure by the Congress at the expiration date and to provide the

executive departments an opportunity to formulate a minerals policy for this as well as other mining industries.

The sponsors are convinced that authority for application of quotas should be enacted during the current period of improved business conditions, so that prompt action could be taken when and if needed.

The committee will welcome participation in this hearing by all Members of Congress and other interested persons.

NATIONAL CARIH ASTHMA WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 63, Senate Joint Resolution 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4) authorizing the President to proclaim "National CARIH Asthma Week."

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am obligated to the Senator from Montana for bringing up Senate Joint Resolution 4 at this time. I hope that it will receive immediate and favorable action. I also hope that the resolution will receive priority attention from the House of Representatives.

This resolution authorizes and requests the President to proclaim the week beginning May 1 as "National CARIH Asthma Week." This will focus the Nation's attention on the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital located in Denver, Colo., and will bring this remarkable institution the recognition it so well deserves.

This unique national institution sponsors the only program solely concentrated on allergic diseases of which asthma is the most severe. CARIH provides treatment and care for intractable asthmatic children from all parts of the country. The care offered emphasizes the "total child" and is much more than just treatment. Education, recreation, and other normal pursuits are stressed equally in the program, accompanied by careful medical treatment.

CARIH's research facilities, under the supervision of its dedicated physicians and scientists, are being used in answering many of the questions now unanswered about the disease of asthma. A recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post described CARIH's efforts as "calm and thoroughgoing, with emphasis on frequent medical consultation." The article says that CARIH has proved that asthma "can be controlled—even conquered." Entitled, "Kids Who Conquer Asthma," the article is worthy of careful reading by all of us, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

KIDS WHO CONQUER ASTHMA

(By Steven M. Spencer)

Hidden in a pile of stones on top of Mount Morrison, in the Rockies west of Denver, sits a gallon jar containing a list of names—Stanton Chew, of San Francisco; William Heinig, of Chicago; Jack Lazar, of Windsor, Ontario; Mike Gallagher, of Henrietta, N.Y., and some 30 more. Each summer the list lengthens as new groups of hikers toil up the trail, lift a few rocks off the cairn, reopen the jar and proudly add their signatures.

Thousands of youngsters climb mountains every year; and except for the sense of achievement that surges through them there is nothing very remarkable about it. But the kids who planted their names on Mount Morrison did so to mark a crucial turning point in their lives—lives which often had been swathed in the soft, cottony wrappings of caution and overprotectiveness. Some of them, before coming to Denver, had never walked to school alone, much less climbed a mountain. Most had lived in panicky fear of the penalties of overexertion. All of them carried, though concealed now like spare socks in their rucksacks, the label of chronic, severe and intractable asthma.

The hikers were resident patients of the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital (shortened to C.A.R.I.H.), a free, privately operated establishment in Denver. For many years it was known as the Jewish National Home for Asthmatic Children, but it is nonsectarian. In its cluster of small buff-brick buildings on a 17½-acre campus it houses and treats, for periods of one and a half to two years, 165 of the most difficult asthma patients (ages 6 to 16) encountered by doctors all over the United States and in many foreign countries. A hand-lettered sign outside one residence cottage room reads: No body here only Moshe Frankel, Haifa, Israel.

The cairn on Mount Morrison is not the only symbol these youngsters have raised in triumph over near-invalidism. Most of them participate in C.A.R.I.H.'s full sports program, which includes competition with healthy children from Denver's public schools and community centers. Last summer the "Asthmatic Nine," mostly fifth- and sixth-graders, won the league baseball championship.

The team's youngest member was eight-year-old Mark Campbell, of Orange, Calif. Allergic from birth and racked by asthma from the age of one and a half, Mark had never been able to play ball at home. Yet a few months after arriving at C.A.R.I.H. he was displaying his new-found talents at second base and in the outfield. In a 33-to-3 walkaway over the Jewish Community Center Dodgers last August, just before his ninth birthday, Mark chalked up four runs and, in his own words, "stole from first base all the way home."

Such records are genuine miracles for youngsters whose lives had previously been ruled by a steady stream of such maternal admonitions as:

"Don't play too hard."

"Don't get too hot."

"Don't get excited."

These warnings have not all been without justification. The asthmatic child teeters on a precarious ledge. A few grains of pollen, a nibble of chocolate, a single peanut, a romp with a dog, a family argument over neglected homework—any of these may pitch him into a dangerous bout of wheezing and gasping for breath. His face turns blue, and in panic he cries out for help. Usually he can be brought around with a few puffs of bronchodilator medicine from a nebulizer, one or more adrenalin injections, or, if those don't work, a mad dash to the hospital. But each year in this country 5,000 such asthmatic attacks end in death.

Asthma affects some 5,400,000 persons in

the United States, of whom more than three million are children up to 16. And the problem continues to grow. A Boston allergist has reported that children's hospital admissions for acute asthma have doubled there and in several other cities since 1960. Allergies are involved in a majority of cases, and many patients have both hay fever and asthma. As in other allergic conditions there is a strong hereditary tendency. Polluted air, infections and emotional disturbances are major contributing causes. But the psychological factors are so difficult to weigh, and all the troublesome ingredients are so subtly intermixed, that much of asthma is a mystery and each patient is an individual puzzle.

The symptoms are produced by a sudden narrowing of the smaller bronchial tubes in the lungs. This narrowing may result from muscle spasm, from swelling of the tissues, from mucus plugs or from all three. The victim struggles with all his strength to draw his breath in and force it out. The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, which allocates over nine million dollars a year to research in allergy and related immunology, warns that repeated asthmatic attacks may eventually cause a stretched-lung condition known as emphysema and may place an extra load on the heart.

The majority of asthmatic children are kept under fair control by bronchodilator medicines, by avoidance of allergenic foods and by injection of pollen and dust extracts to reduce their sensitivity. But about 10 percent are so seriously afflicted that they gain little help from any therapy. These are the refractory or intractable cases—about 300,000 in this country—from which C.A.R.I.H. and 13 smaller homes in the United States and Canada draw their 625 patients.

Nearly all chronic diseases disrupt family life, but few can match asthma in its demand on the patience and resources of the parents. They drag the sick child from doctor to doctor, try one medicine after another, move to what they've been told is a more favorable climate, exhaust their savings and run up debts, resent the fruitless expenditure of money and then feel guilty about feeling resentful. The youngsters miss weeks or months of school. ("I missed all of the fifth grade, half of the eighth and half of the ninth," a 14-year-old California boy told me.) Frequent respiratory illnesses and sharply restricted diets leave many children frail and scrawny. About one in five of those on prolonged therapy with cortisone and related hormone products is severely stunted in growth by these drugs. Frustrated by their inability to keep pace and by their exclusion from normal fun and games, the asthmatic children become irritable and tense, and their emotional episodes touch off more attacks of asthma.

How to break this cycle is the challenge being taken up by the residential research and treatment centers, among which C.A.R.I.H. is the pioneer and world's largest, and the one to which many of the most stubborn cases are brought. In Tucson, Ariz., 13-year-old Connie Swanick, a sweet, poised, freckle-faced child who aspires to be a ballerina, had been fighting asthma since she was three. Her family had been advised to move from their old home to a new house in a supposedly more dust-and-pollen-free suburb, but Connie did not improve. She was so chronically short of breath that she attended school only half days and spent the afternoons in her air-conditioned home. Excitement, contact with animals, being away from home and suddenly finding she'd forgotten her medicine—any of these situations would throw Connie into an asthmatic attack. On family outings—she is one of eight children—she was often left at home for her own protection.

Finally, early last year, Connie was brought to Denver. "I was homesick at first," she said later, "but now I love it." Connie now plays freely and goes on hikes. Her hopes about ballet, dimmed at home because asthma prevented her from taking lessons, have revived. "And if I can't become a professional ballet dancer—after all, thirteen is pretty old to start—I'd like to take it just for fun, and study to be a doctor," she says.

Just what happened in Denver to quiet Connie's asthma? How does C.A.R.I.H. transform intractable "cases" into healthy, vigorous, near-normal youngsters? First, the doctors appreciate the complexity of the disease. They know that a child is seldom allergic to just one thing but is explosively reactive to many elements of his environment. He suffers, as a New York psychiatrist once put it, from an "allergy to life." One secret of C.A.R.I.H.'s success is that so many aspects of the child's life are changed all at once. Suddenly, he is free of the old household allergens and family frictions. "We've jokingly said the rate of improvement seems proportional to the distance traveled," observed C.A.R.I.H.'s medical director, Dr. Constantine J. Falliers.

Although all the patients have long histories of severe asthma, and 90 percent are on cortisone-type drugs when they arrive, the vast majority of the whole group—about 80 percent—are rehabilitated at Denver. Fewer than 25 percent continue to require corticosteroids and are classed as "steroid dependent," and even for them the dosage levels are usually tapered down. About 40 percent can be controlled with milder forms of medication. And what is most astonishing, 30 percent of the arriving patients—the so-called "rapid remitters"—begin to improve the moment they step off the plane and stay well with almost no medication for the rest of their residence period.

"It may, of course, be partly the change in climate," Dr. Falliers says. "Denver is five thousand feet high and the air is fairly clear and dry, although recently it has become smoggier and this may be why the proportion of 'rapid remitters' has declined somewhat."

However, Dr. Falliers knows that questions cannot be left half-answered if the improvements the child makes in Denver are to be maintained when he goes home. Although the word "cure" isn't used, follow-up studies are continued for at least two years after the children return home from C.A.R.I.H. and show that 80 percent maintain a remarkable degree of improvement, and many never suffer another asthmatic episode.

In dealing with a disease that fluctuates notoriously from hour to hour, day to day and season to season, the C.A.R.I.H. doctors find it essential to observe everything. The large and closely organized staff includes 8 full-time pediatricians and allergists, 7 psychologists, 17 nurses, 20 house parents, 5 night attendants, a dietitian and her helpers and a number of research chemists and laboratory technicians. These skilled observers note the way the young patient eats and plays and sleeps. Some of them are making a study of dreams as a possible trigger of night attacks. They watch how a child reacts to exercise and games and other children. A program is under way to monitor several hours of his daily routine with microphones that pick up his conversation and his breath sounds. Are asthma symptoms more often touched off by anger and aggression, the doctors ask, or by anxiety and withdrawal?

The research tasks are endless. Just the symptoms alone may present a confusing combination of factors. "A child may eat eggs in the winter without bad effects," Dr. Falliers points out, "but if he eats an egg during the August ragweed season, he may have trouble. He may have even more trouble if at the same time he gets into an

argument with his parents about why he can't go swimming. By feeding all the data into computers, we can detect the interplay of many factors. We can see the variations in biological rhythms, the daily, weekly or monthly changes that may, for example, suggest that medication is more effective at one hour of the cycle than at another."

The total environment at C.A.R.I.H. provides a kind of instant therapy. The new arrival, previously alone in his terrifying battle for breath, is immediately sustained and encouraged by 164 other youngsters who have successfully faced the same threat, and whose lives are obviously now freer of restrictions than his own has been.

Everything is at hand to cope with an emergency, and the young patients know it. At the first hint of trouble the child may leave a baseball game, run to the hospital in the center of the grounds, take a few deep breaths from a "neb" (a bronchodilator nebulizer), rest for several minutes and then dash back to the game. Even the severe night attack, which at home often meant a terrified child, a distraught family, a struggle for breath during the long ride to the hospital and an oxygen tent, is here dealt with simply and calmly. The child who feels his symptoms coming on climbs out of bed, pushes a button near the dormitory door to flash a light alerting the nurses, and walks with his house parent the few steps to the hospital.

Nor is there panic in class. C.A.R.I.H. children attend public schools—and their teachers know all about asthma and have medication on hand.

At times familiarity breeds a youthful contempt for the common enemy, an almost reckless disregard that calls for adult measures of caution. This is true especially of the boys, who predominate here in a ratio of 2½ to 1, about usual for asthma.

"I've watched these kids at ball games," a nurse said. "Sometimes they'll turn blue and almost fall on their faces before they'll ask for help."

A typical C.A.R.I.H. experience was that of Howard Kipnes, a slender 15-year-old with an engaging grin, who returned home to the Bronx last summer after 20 months in Denver, six inches taller and a lot healthier.

"Howard had never really known anyone with asthma before he went out there," explained his mother, Mrs. Irving Kipnes. "And when he saw boys who had been worse off than he, but who were able to do so many things without having attacks, that made a lot of difference in his attitude."

In Denver, Howard played baseball and basketball, swam and went on camping trips. "We weren't coddled out there," he said. "If you coddle kids too much they don't get enough exercise, and exercise is what helps us. It's what improves our breathing capacity."

Mrs. Kipnes smiled. "Yes, but there were times when you had to be coddled. When you were about six years old you asked me one day—you were having a terrible time getting your breath—whether you were going to die."

Although it costs \$6,000 a year to house and treat a child at C.A.R.I.H. the parents are not charged. They supply only \$20 or \$30 a month for clothing and spending allowances. The institution's support comes almost entirely from private contributions, including about half a million dollars a year raised by a nationwide network of 140 women's auxiliary chapters.

A happy discovery most patients make as they settle into the life at C.A.R.I.H. is that they aren't allergic to as many things as they thought. On the wall of the big, sunny kitchen is a blackboard where Mrs. Jo Ann Pegues, a dietitian, keeps an up-to-date list of who can't eat what.

"Usually when a child first comes in he has a whole list of things he is allergic to,"

she said. "Then as the doctors test and study him the list narrows down to two or three items."

"No one here gets peanuts or peanut butter. But next to that there are more fish and egg allergies than anything else. We've had as many as thirty children sensitive to fish at one time."

Few threads in the puzzling skein of allergic asthma are so snarled in notions, unproved theories and rampant controversy as this business of food. At C.A.R.I.H. the task of straightening out the tangle has been assigned to a brisk, outspoken young pediatrician named Edwin Bronsky.

"Some doctors say all intractable asthma is due to food allergy," he told me. "Others believe that forty percent is directly caused by food and forty percent has some connection with food. And a few doctors are positive asthma is never caused by food. All of them get together at conventions and argue. So we are trying here to find out just what part food does play."

In an effort to get an exact picture, Dr. Bronsky is placing a few children at a time on a program in which he knows the ingredients of every bite of food each consumes. He can then watch closely to see what symptoms or measured differences in breathing follow.

Virtually all species of family pets, with the possible exception of goldfish and turtles, are assumed allergically guilty until proven otherwise. But so strong are personal attachments for a dog or cat that parents will sometimes refuse to give it up, or will deny its existence when filling out an application for a child's admission to the treatment center. One family replied "none" to the dog-or-cat question, only to be found out later when their son, discussing with a C.A.R.I.H. doctor the parents' forthcoming visit, asked "Can they bring Spot with them?"

Parent-child relationships have long been the favorite hunting ground of the psychologists and psychiatrists. Many have discussed the effect, in asthma, of a type of "smother-love" that originally flows from concern about the youngster's health but eventually expresses itself in oversolitious or overrestrictive behavior. Some parents, on the other hand, have been described as resentful of the burden that the child's asthma places on them, or as holding an ambivalent attitude of love and rejection.

Today's debate often focuses on whether the emotional tensions between parent and child are primary causes of asthma or are only secondary effects which then enter into the cycle that aggravates and perpetuates the condition. The C.A.R.I.H. physicians and psychologists believe asthma is a heterogeneous symptom, and that it is important to identify for the individual patient which factors are primary and which secondary. They don't see parent-child emotional conflicts in every case, but in many families the evidence is so clear that they recommend psychological counseling for parents and child.

A youngster from the Midwest illustrates the common theme of the child whipsawed between conflicting parental attitudes toward him. The father was a violent, overbearing and demanding man, and insisted on high academic marks. The mother was clinging and overprotective. Neither parent would admit his own faults, and each blamed the other for the child's problems. "Donald is afraid of his father," the mother told a psychiatric interviewer. "No wonder he wheezes and gasps." Said the father, "I'm sure I've had nothing to do with his symptoms. But my wife simply spoils the boy, and that's why his asthma doesn't get better." Donald, timid, shy and in the middle, was made to feel guilty because his asthma caused so much parental wrangling, and yet the only way he could stop the painful, ac-

cusatory quarreling was to bring on asthmatic attacks to divert their attention.

The fact that so many children suddenly improve when separated from their parents is seen by some observers as proof that family stresses and conflicts are, indeed, a major causative element. "Our ultimate goal," says Dr. Falliers, "is the happy and healthy reunion of child and family. But we believe that temporary separation is helpful to the parents as well as to the child. Most parents need a rest. And getting the child away does relieve tensions and permit the family to settle down, take a fresh look at things and perhaps develop a calmer atmosphere for the child to come home to."

Searching for helpful leads in the parent-child relationship, a C.A.R.I.H. psychologist, Dr. Kenneth Purcell, compared the parents of the "rapid remitters," with parents of the "steroid dependent" youngsters, those who continued to require medication. He discovered that the parents of the "rapid remitters"—those who get better as soon as they leave home—were more apt to be authoritarian and restrictive in their ideas on child-rearing.

A high proportion of the parents of the "rapid remitters" expressed agreement with such concepts as:

"It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will."

"A good spanking is often the only way to convince children you mean it when you tell them to go to sleep."

Such an approach is hardly recommended, even for the infant under 18 months, but, says Doctor Purcell, if continued as the child grows and strives for independence, it can cause trouble.

"It is during this period of early childhood stress," the psychologist concludes, "that the child may be highly motivated to learn to use asthma as a neurotic response to cope with neurotic conflict and anxiety." He may do this subconsciously or deliberately. Several children, talking with C.A.R.I.H. psychologists about what seemed to turn their wheezing on and off, frankly admitted they had been able to bring it on at home by breathing hard, coughing or running. Why did they do it? Usually, they said, to get out of something they didn't want to do. It was encouraging, though, Dr. Purcell commented, to find that some youngsters who were once adept at producing asthmatic attacks were later, after some months at Denver, unable to do so.

Asthma specialists have always wondered why so many of the attacks come at night. Now Dr. William Hahn, a young psychologist and physiologist at C.A.R.I.H., is looking into the possible role of dreams.

He told of a girl of about 12 who reported that she had a recurring dream of falling into a monster's mouth. She would then wake up in an asthmatic attack. "By her account the dream caused the attack," said Dr. Hahn. "But did it? Or did the discomfort of the asthma cause the nightmare?"

To help Dr. Hahn find the answers, teenage patients volunteer to sleep in his laboratory. Electrodes are taped to the patient's head to record brainwaves, which indicate the various depths of sleep. Wires from the eyelids record the rapid eye movements that accompany dreams, and chest leads measure respiration and signal the on-set of wheezing.

Eventually the dream project and other research studies may lead to better ways of managing this vicious affliction. And in the meantime C.A.R.I.H.'s calm and thoroughgoing approach, with its emphasis on frequent medical consultation, has proved that the disease can be controlled—even conquered. For the fortunate youngsters at Denver, asthma has finally lost its terror.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, we in Colorado are extremely proud of this

national institution, and I am pleased that the Senate has seen fit to give recognition to CARIH through Senate Joint Resolution 4.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleagues in their remarks and express my deep personal satisfaction in seeing this laudable resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 4—adopted by the Senate.

By authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning May 1, 1967, as National CARIH Asthma Week, we give deserving recognition and support to the tremendous work and research being done by the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital.

CARIH was organized to fight a disease which today afflicts 5,400,000 Americans. It is the largest asthma facility in the Western Hemisphere. The techniques pioneered by this organization have been freely shared with physicians and clinics all over the world.

There remains a great deal to be learned about the care, treatment and cure of asthma. CARIH's research center is attempting to answer many of the questions still left unanswered about the disease. This clinical research is backed up and paralleled by the only basic research program in the United States exclusively devoted to asthma.

It has been estimated that 80 percent of the children who have been treated at CARIH have become asthma-free or greatly improved. The great effort, time, and money that have been expended have benefited these children and asthmatics elsewhere beyond measure.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution and am hopeful that Governors of the States and territories of the United States will issue proclamations for like purposes and recognize the outstanding contributions being made in asthma treatment, care, and research by the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 4

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) designating the week beginning May 1, 1967, as "National CARIH Asthma Week", (2) inviting the Governors of the States and territories of the United States to issue proclamations for like purposes, and (3) recognizing the outstanding contributions being made in asthma treatment, care, and research by the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital (CARIH), the national facility at Denver.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 60), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 1, 1967, as "National CARIH Asthma Week."

STATEMENT

This resolution was introduced in the U.S. Senate by 36 Senators to call attention to a broad program of clinical and basic research at the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital in Denver, Colo., and is the only program working solely in the field of allergic diseases, of which asthma is the most severe. The incidence of asthma in the United States was estimated to be 5,020,000 in 1961 to 1963. With the population increase since then, there are approximately 5,400,000 bronchial asthmatics in this country. This figure may be compared with the 830,000 people in the United States under treatment for cancer in 1964.

The patients treated at the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital are ones who do not improve at home but who in many instances improve markedly when placed in a specialized treatment care center such as CARIH. Only children with intractable asthma are eligible for the free care and treatment offered at CARIH.

Established in 1907 as the Denver Sheltering Home, CARIH was originally a haven for orphaned or homeless children of tubercular parents who had come to the high, dry mountain city of Denver in hopes of a cure. Founders of the home had been a small group of philanthropic Jewish women, who shortly developed it into the National Home for Jewish Children. Then when TB was virtually conquered in the late thirties, the trustees decided that the facilities and services of the home should be used for the treatment of intractable asthma in children. Since then the home has been open to severely asthmatic children of every race, color, and creed, from every State in the Union and several foreign countries.

The care at Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital is free. Selection of applicants is based on the severity of the disease and a number of other factors as well as need.

The institution is concerned with the whole child, not just his asthma. Dentists, dermatologists, eye specialists, and other consultants regularly check on the youngsters. Still every child is treated more as a child than as a patient and goes to school every day that he possibly can.

Unfortunately, a great deal still remains to be learned about the care, treatment, and cure of asthma. CARIH's research center is attempting to answer many of the questions still left unanswered about this disease. This clinical research is backed up and paralleled by the only basic research program in the United States exclusively devoted to asthma.

The committee is of the opinion that this resolution has a meritorious purpose and will call to the attention of the people of the United States the great work done in the treatment of asthma.

Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 4, without amendment.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGES P. VANIER, GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we are saddened this morning to learn of the death of Maj. Gen. Georges P. Vanier, Governor General of Canada.

Not only do we mourn him as Governor General of Canada, but as a man

who has served in the interest of his country and of humanity for nearly 50 years.

During this period, he became widely known for his service as a soldier and a diplomat and since September 15, 1959, as Governor General of his native Canada.

He was not only the first French Canadian, but actually the first native Canadian to be appointed to this high position.

General Vanier's record has been long and varied and most praiseworthy.

I am sure that his loss will be mourned by all the Members of this Senate.

To Mrs. Vanier and his sons and daughter, I wish to express our deepest sympathy.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the ranking Republican in this body and the chairman of the Canadian-United States parliamentary group, in expressing the deep regret of the Senate on the passing of the Governor General of Canada, Georges P. Vanier.

The Governor General has had an exceedingly outstanding record, as the Senator from Vermont has indicated, as a soldier in two World Wars, as a diplomat of outstanding abilities, and as a man who has conducted the office of Governor General with dignity and decorum. He has been an asset to the nation which he has so ably and proudly represented, and he has always been a Canadian first in his heart and in his thoughts.

We mourn his passing, but he has left behind monuments which will live long after he is gone.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS REPRESENT NEW INTERNATIONAL EFFORT TO SECURE WORLD PEACE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I rise again today to urge Senate ratification of the human rights conventions, I wish to answer the criticism that these conventions are a marked departure from our traditional American concept of the treaty-making power.

As I pointed out last week on the Senate floor, the United States was a signatory to and ratified the 1926 Convention on Slavery. This convention, submitted by President Coolidge and ratified during the administration of President Hoover, was the intellectual and diplomatic ancestors of the human rights convention now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The human rights conventions—forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery—represent a concerted universal effort to promote human rights throughout the world. These conventions constitute a recognition that world peace is ultimately a matter of human rights; that any nation which is dedicated to the preservation and protection of human rights at home is very unlikely to jeopardize the human rights of others through foreign aggression.

Human rights and world peace are intimately related and frequently interdependent.

The human rights conventions are a departure from the traditional treaty-making function of settling commercial and promoting international trade. But who can maintain that the immediate promotion of human rights and the ultimate preservation of human peace is not a far better, far nobler, and far wiser exercise of the treaty-making power?

We have seen and been victim to international failure to protect human rights. The horrors of World War II had their preview in the total disregard of the human rights of the Axis Powers' own citizens.

During those crucial hours, when the world could have averted the holocaust to come, the Western nations cringed—frozen in a moral neutrality. These human rights conventions are not merely pretty platitudes on legislative sermonizing. They are far more than that. They are a conscientious and positive effort to establish minimum universal standards of human dignity and achieve world peace.

John Morley perhaps best characterized the case for U.S. ratification of the human rights conventions when he wrote almost a century ago:

Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other.

WASTE IN FEDERALLY FINANCED RESEARCH UNVEILED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is not the first time I have risen to speak out against what has become a national scandal—the totally uncoordinated and leaderless state of federally financed research.

This year we will be asked to appropriate \$16 billion to be tossed into the bottomless pit labeled "research." Research has become one of those magic, politically positive, unchallengeable words. A spender who says "research" is 90 percent of the way home. If you are against research, you are against the future. How silly. Some research programs are necessary. Many are not. No Senator here is unaware of some vital research programs that must be continued. Those programs will need money this year they will need it in the years to come.

But the sad thing is that no single department, no one agency, no office, or no one person is in charge of this wild spending.

Now, we have available a detailed and documented report of wasted money and uncorrelated research—all financed by the Federal Government. William Schulz, a Washington reporter, has produced a devastating and penetrating study of the waste disguised as research for the March issue of Reader's Digest.

So that my colleagues might have the advantage of this important analysis, I ask unanimous consent at this time that Mr. Schulz' report be inserted in the RECORD.

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

THE GREAT RESEARCH BOONDOGGLE

(By William Schulz)

Last October in Washington, D.C., newsmen were summoned to a press conference in the offices of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. There publication was announced of a new book in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation was assailed for exaggerating the nation's crime rate.*

Headlines carried the sweeping attack. Less publicized was this fact: the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) ladled out \$231,000 to finance the study. Why? Simply because NASA thought that sponsoring such research, so remote from its official mission, would, in the words of a Washington Post reporter, lend it an image of "social concern!"

Fantastic as it may seem, the foregoing is a fairly typical episode in today's Washington. At this moment, when we are being told that government is paring expenditures to the bone, scores of similar projects are being financed in the sacrosanct name of "research" by a maze of government bureaus. What we have is, quite literally, a federal research craze, and it has mounted to absurd proportions.

No one denies that U.S.-supported research has led to gains in military technology, health and science. But this government-subsidized "research and development," now the second largest item in the bloated federal budget, has multiplied five times in the past decade—to a staggering total of \$16 billion a year. Inevitably, this unchecked proliferation has brought on vast boondoggles, and also a regrettable waste of scientific manpower.

Researchers and scientists are alarmed. Famed biologist Dr. Paul A. Weiss, now on the staff of New York's Rockefeller University, says that the excessive federal largess has encouraged "shoddy, redundant, uncritical and ill-conceived research." Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation-March of Dimes, says, "The log-rolling and sheer waste which accompany ill-advised, massive government appropriations could undermine the public's confidence in the whole scientific enterprise."

Most concerned of all is Congress. A half-dozen committees have launched full-scale investigations, audited books, held hearings, quizzed federal officials and issued reports. After years of hacking his way through the complex jungle of federal research, Rep. Richard Roudebush, of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, concludes that there have been "senseless, tragic abuses of legitimate scientific inquiry." The Indiana lawmaker says bluntly: "The public has been taken."

Here are the main reasons why:

Everybody's in the act. Recently, the Library of Congress attempted to index the government's sprawling research program. After months of digging, the Library's experts reported that no one in the federal government knows precisely how many government-supported laboratories are in operation where they are located or what they are doing.

The Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and NASA are the giants of federal research. But more than 30 other agencies have hopped aboard the bandwagon. The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare spends more than \$100 million a year on research ventures, among them: "Understanding the Fourth-Grade Slump in Creative Thinking." The Department of Agriculture spent five years revising pickle standards, spelling out in minute

* The FBI flatly denies the charge. "The high volume of crime nationally," says Director J. Edgar Hoover, "is a fact which cannot be rationalized away."

detail the difference between curved and crooked pickles.

The Commerce Department hired a private accounting firm to determine why shipping rates are lower on imported goods than on exported ones. Among the explanations: It is "more expensive to load and stow cargo than to unload it." Chairman John Rooney, of the House appropriations subcommittee overseeing Commerce, blew up. "Did you have to spend \$95,000 to find that out?" he asked. "Any hatch boss on the Brooklyn waterfront could have given you the answer, without cost."

One consequence of the research craze is that federal agencies have orbited into areas far beyond their legitimate purview. For example, despite the reams of election analyses offered by news media, the National Science Foundation has doled out taxpayers dollars for a computerized study of the 1966 Maryland gubernatorial campaign.

Much of the federally financed research fails to meet what a House Government Operations subcommittee has termed "the test of urgency." The number of trivial projects has led one prominent scientist to exclaim: "We see bewildered youngsters composing research papers like abstract paintings, picking some colorful and fashionable words from recent literature, then reshuffling and recombining them into another conglomerate, both undigested and indigestible. Narrow specialists lavish their pet techniques in yet another dozen ways on what has already been superabundantly established to everyone's satisfaction."

Many projects are "makework." Sen. William Proxmire, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, has repeatedly accused federal officials of engaging in "research for the sake of research," in costly projects of little benefit to the taxpayer. "And the worst offender of all," Proxmire adds, "is the National Institutes of Health." The Senator maintains that there can be no justification for NIH support last year of such marginal projects as "A Social History of French Medicine, 1789-1815" (\$11,782); "Emergence of Political Leadership: Indians in Fiji" (\$10,917); and "Changing Patterns of (Moslem) Family Life" (\$28,755).

The research bug has also bitten the commanding generals of the War on Poverty. Hardly a month goes by that the Office of Economic Opportunity does not award lucrative contracts to private researchers who operate what the magazine *New Republic* terms a "profitable parasite industry at the fringes of government." National Analysts Inc., a Philadelphia research firm, was asked, for instance, to gauge "low-income" reaction to "It's What's Happening, Baby!", a nationally televised rock 'n' roll show extolling the Job Corps. Critics roasted the program as "tasteless, degrading and obscene," but OEO shelled \$39,000 to determine why some underprivileged youths reacted favorably to it, while others did not.

The National Science Foundation has financed individual foreign junkets of what might well be considered dubious worth. Consider the case of Stephen Smale, a University of California mathematician working on an NSF project who spent the summer of 1966 traveling in Europe, with taxpayers picking up the \$6556 tab. A virulent foe of U.S. policy in Vietnam, Smale had organized California demonstrations aimed at halting troop trains. In Paris, he helped drafting an anti-American resolution. In Moscow for a mathematicians' convention, he held a press conference at which—although he attacked Moscow's repressive intellectual atmosphere—he called what his own government was doing in Vietnam "much more dangerous and brutal" than the Soviets' massacre of Hungarian freedom fighters ten years earlier.

Outraged, Representative Roudebush fired off an angry letter to NSF director Leland Haworth, insisting that federal tax funds

should not be used to send abroad individuals who would "run down the policies of the United States government."

Universities scramble for the dollars. Government agencies annually underwrite \$2 billion in university research alone. Intensive investigation convinced the members of the House Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs that massive research grants have actually harmed higher education by "excessively diverting scientific manpower from teaching."

Rep. Henry S. Reuss, chairman of this group, estimates that more than 40,000 faculty members have left the classrooms to work on federally financed research. He echoes the warning of Dr. W. T. Lippincott, a professor of chemistry at Ohio State University, that government support of research is "potentially the most powerful destructive force the higher education system has ever faced."

One institution, the University of California, receives \$400 million a year in federal research funds—and leading members of its faculty are apprehensive about this. Sociology professor Robert A. Nisbet recently charged that many of the research projects at California and other large public universities could "more easily and appropriately be placed in non-university settings." He noted disapprovingly the growing practice in many universities of opening Washington offices, manned by "experts in the art of catching the scent of dollars over the horizon." (More than two dozen colleges and universities now employ Washington lobbyists.)

Several colleges receive more than 40 percent of their operating budgets from federal research projects. The vast majority of these grants go to a relatively few universities. Result? Says a North Dakota educator: "The small institutions have been subject to so much faculty raiding by the more successful applicants for federal research funds that higher education of acceptable quality is moving beyond the reach of many young Americans."

Smoke screens veil waste. It is difficult for any member of Congress to question the massive research expenditures earmarked for "national defense." But the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee uncovered a shocking situation when it probed the Aerospace Corporation, a "non-profit," Pentagon-created missile-research firm. To put it bluntly—and the subcommittee did—Aerospace officials have been getting fat at the public trough. For instance, president Ivan Getting received a pay hike of \$45,000 when he left private industry (Raytheon Co.) and joined Aerospace at \$90,000 a year—a salary more than double that paid to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. In addition, Getting was given a \$350,000 life-insurance policy, a retirement program that costs taxpayers \$9000 a year, and an expense account that covered such incidentals as \$3113 for transporting his yacht from Massachusetts to California.

Investigators for the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee uncovered a similar situation when they audited the books of another government-financed research firm. One of its vice presidents, apparently unable to make ends meet on a \$42,900 salary plus a \$5000 expense account, was handed another \$22,381 in taxpayer funds for the mortgage payments and caretaker fees of his private estate. From 1956 to 1964, the Pentagon funneled more than \$40 million into this firm. Yet nowhere in the government files are records of its contract negotiations to be found. Appropriations Committee Chairman George Mahon says flatly that the records, required by law, "do not exist."

Then consider the infamous case of Project Mohole, unveiled in 1961 as a "truly exciting" attempt to gain knowledge of our planet's structure by boring a hole three miles beneath the bottom of the Pacific Ocean into

the mantle of the earth. National Science Foundation officials assured Congress that the project would cost no more than \$20 million. Within five years they had hiked the price tag to \$127 million!

Why the spiraling cost? The record shows that an NSF panel set up in 1961 to review potential contractors rated the Texas firm of Brown and Root as least qualified of five companies under consideration. Nevertheless, Brown and Root (with virtually no experience in deep-water or deep-well drilling, but with White House connections) was later awarded the Mohole contract, at a price almost double the lowest bid.

By 1966, Project Mohole was so far behind schedule that disgusted members of the House Appropriations Committee refused to approve that year's \$19.7 million request. But at this point the President made an extraordinary appeal for the restoration of funds, as did administration lobbyists.

Then came the bombshell. It became known that shortly before the President turned the screws on a reluctant Congress, the family of Brown and Root's board chairman, George Brown, had contributed \$23,000 to the "President's Club," a Democratic fund-raising group. Outraged Congressmen now killed off Mohole—at least temporarily.

Research dollars are used to influence public opinion. The Pentagon, often accused of news management, contracted in 1966 for a \$69,400 study of public reaction to controlled press releases and the withholding of information. The project was canceled only after Rep. John Moss, crusading chairman of the House Subcommittee on Government Information, denounced the plan as "totally inappropriate to our free society."

The Office of Economic Opportunity announced with fanfare last year that it would hire prominent social scientists to conduct "independent" appraisals of the War on Poverty. What the OEO didn't say was that anti-poverty officials would retain absolute authority to prohibit publication of the investigators' findings. "These scholarly studies of the War on Poverty will be used to defend future budget requests and to persuade public opinion," the *Washington Post* commented sharply. "The public, which is paying for them, would like to see the adverse results as well as the favorable ones."

Fifteen miles from downtown Washington, in Springfield, Va., stands the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, a brick-and-glass monument to government's obsession with research. Occupied for less than three years, the 30,000-square-foot warehouse is already bulging at the seams. Nearly half a million federally financed scientific reports are stacked in piles 15 feet high, and as many as 65,000 more are expected this year.

Government publicists grandiosely speak of a federally spurred "knowledge explosion," but leading scientists dissent. Dr. Paul Weiss, for one, argues that the sheer number of reports is no more indicative of progress than "the amount of junk mail reflects economic growth." It is time, he says, to replace the fetish of unfettered research with the maxim that scientific inquiry "should have a purpose and be selected with a sense of relevance."

At its current rate of increase, the annual price tag for federal research is expected to reach \$20 billion by 1970. Here is an opportunity for all political leaders who believe in responsible government to express themselves. Here is a specific area where, irrefutably, the monstrous federal budget can be cut—now.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 64, 65, and 66.

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

BANKS LAKE RECREATIONAL AREA

The bill (S. 605) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable, was announced as next in order.

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

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate is S. 605. This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable.

Banks Lake is an equalizing reservoir on the Columbia Basin project. Under the original authorization and at present, the lake is operated for purposes of irrigation alone. As a result, the water level is subject to periodic surges and fluctuations of as much as 18 feet. These fluctuations have the effect of making the use of the lake for recreational purposes almost impossible.

The purpose of the bill is to permit the Secretary of the Interior to determine that limited costs related to pumping water to stabilize the lake's level are nonreimbursable. The Department's report estimates that these costs would average about \$21,000 per year. The recreational benefits which would accrue are estimated at over \$60,000 per year.

The bill proposes an interim arrangement, as the authorization runs for only 6 years, at which time the arrangement would be reevaluated in light of studies now being made of recreational opportunities on Federal water projects.

Banks Lake is an important recreational resource in the eastern half of the State of Washington. In addition to being an excellent area for fish and wildlife, it is a popular recreational area that is used by residents from all over the State when water level conditions permit.

In view of the small cost involved, the uniqueness of the situation, and the present trend of allocating an increased cost of water facilities for recreation and wildlife purposes, the committee, following public hearings which were held on February 23, 1967, unanimously endorses the enactment of S. 605 and urges its passage by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

S. 605

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

ing additional development of the Columbia Basin project, Washington, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, when estimated added benefits will at least equal added costs, to operate and maintain Banks Lake of said project for recreational purposes consistent with authorized project functions, valid contracts, and within limits of pump and canal capacities, and that any increased operation and maintenance costs for filling of Banks Lake and for maintaining water levels for the benefit of recreational purposes, including fishing and hunting, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided*, That the provisions of this Act shall not extend beyond the end of the sixth calendar year following the date of enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 61), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to provide that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreation purposes are nonreimbursable. Qualifications imposed by the bill are that the estimated additional benefits shall, at least, equal the added costs and that the operation shall be consistent with authorized project functions, valid contracts, and within limits of pump and canal capacities. This bill is intended as an interim arrangement pending complete development of the Columbia Basin project. It was testified that a comprehensive long-range study of total project operations and benefits is now underway.

Under the present irrigation operation, Banks Lake fluctuates considerably during the year. These fluctuations are normal for such equalizing and reregulating reservoirs in an irrigation system, but they have a very detrimental effect upon recreational and fish and wildlife uses. There are years when the available water supply and other conditions would permit pumping additional water to reduce reservoir fluctuations, but this would involve additional pumping costs. Under the present project authorizations such operating costs are reimbursable. The committee does not believe it is appropriate or consistent with longstanding policy to include such costs in the water charges of the irrigation districts.

The best information available estimates that the benefits resulting from the reduction of reservoir fluctuations would provide recreational benefits estimated to be \$60,000 for Banks Lake. The average annual costs are estimated to be about \$21,000.

The committee anticipates that annual reports will be furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation as to the costs and effects of the approval of this proposal.

In view of the present trend of allocating an increased cost of water facilities for recreation and wildlife purposes the committee in executive session unanimously endorses the enactment of S. 605.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments,

on page 1, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000"; in line 8, after "\$35,000,000", to strike out "for fiscal year 1968" and insert "for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; in line 11, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; in line 13, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; in line 14, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; and, in line 16, after the word "Pacific", to insert "Islands"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 303

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat. 171), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and \$35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969, to remain available until expended, to carry out the provisions of this Act and to provide for a program of necessary capital improvements and public works related to health, education, utilities, highways, transportation facilities, communications, and public buildings: *Provided*, That except for funds appropriated for the activities of the Peace Corps no funds appropriated by any Act shall be used for administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands except as may be specifically authorized by law."

Sec. 2. The offices of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall hereafter be known as the Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Lieutenant Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, respectively. Appointment hereafter made to the office of the Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senate is about to approve vital and important legislation. By its action in the next few months, this House of Congress will have placed its stamp of approval on a measure leading to fulfillment of our Nation's obligation to the people who now live in the trust territory. These islands in the Far Pacific are administered by the United States under a trusteeship agreement with the United Nations.

There are some 2,100 of these islands spread in a sea as large as continental United States. Yet their total land area is about one-half that of Rhode Island. Ninety-seven of these islands are inhabited. They are home to some 90,000 persons of diverse languages, customs, and origins.

America's goal as trustee is to develop the conditions of life of the peoples of the trust territory so that they can assume the responsibilities of self-government, to stimulate them to become as nearly economically self-sufficient as possible, and to encourage them to foster respect for their culture while affording them an opportunity to take on those aspects of Western life which will enable them to lead richer lives. S. 303 will help to turn those words into reality.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I

wish to join the distinguished acting minority leader in what he has just said.

I am afraid that for too many years since the end of the Second World War we have been treating the trust territory as a poor relation. This bill attempts to go further in giving to the people of the trust territory the rights, the consideration, and the privileges which are their due, and which have long been overdue.

I hope that the stepchild relationship between this Government and the trust territory will be overcome, and that the people of the trust territory will be given a good deal more than they have had in the way of rights, confidence, and in the way of a reasonably good and profitable future.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that appropriate excerpts from the excellent report which accompanies the bill from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 303, introduced by Senator Jackson, is to authorize increased appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for civil works and administrative costs. The bill, as amended, increases the present appropriation authorization of \$17,500,000 annually to a maximum of \$25 million for fiscal year 1967 and \$35 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. The bill also designates the High Commissioner and Deputy High Commissioner as Governor and Lieutenant Governor, respectively, and provides that appointment hereafter made to the office of Governor of the trust territory shall be made by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

BACKGROUND

The islands which form the trust territory lie in three major archipelagoes to the north of the Equator in the western Pacific. The land area totals less than 700 square miles, but it is scattered over almost 3 million square miles of open ocean. About 97 of the more than 2,000 islands are inhabited; they range from low-lying coral atolls to high islands of volcanic origin. The Marianas Islands, which stretch to the north of Guam, and the western Caroline Islands, are typically high islands, although coral atolls, such as Ulithi, do occur. The eastern Caroline Islands are similarly a mixture of high islands and coral atolls. The Marshalls are entirely low coral atolls, usually a loose string of narrow sandy islands surrounding a lagoon.

These islands were governed between World War I and World War II by the Japanese as a League of Nations mandate. Converted into military bases by the Japanese, they were captured by allied forces during World War II and placed under Navy military government. Japanese colonists and military personnel were returned to their homeland after the war and in July 1947 the United States placed the former mandate under the newly established United Nations trusteeship system. Under a trusteeship agreement, the United States has undertaken to promote the educational, social, political, and economic development of the people of the territory.

U.S. authority is vested in a High Commissioner, who is presently appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The High Commissioner's legislative authority was granted to the Congress of Micronesia on the day of its first session in 1965, but the High Commis-

sioner retains veto power over measures passed by the Congress of Micronesia.

Six administrative districts, which roughly conform to geographic and ethnic divisions, have been established and have formed basic elements in American administration of the area.

During the period of July 1, 1951, through the end of fiscal year 1966, a total of \$121,905,000 has been appropriated to the Department of the Interior for administration of the area, including capital improvements. (This total is exclusive of funds appropriated to the Navy for the northern Mariana Islands during the years 1953-62.) For fiscal years 1952 through 1962 the annual appropriation ranged from \$4,271,000 to a high of \$6,304,000 in fiscal year 1962. These funds were within the \$7.5 million authorization approved in 1954, and provided minimal basic services to a people who were largely on a subsistence economy.

Enactment of Public Law 87-541 in 1962 increased the Federal appropriation authorization for the trust territory from \$7.5 to \$15 million for fiscal year 1963 and \$17.5 million thereafter.

The following information furnished the committee in May 1966 by the Department of the Interior indicates recent achievements in the trust territory and the projects and development recommended for completion in the next few years.

HEALTH

Under the accelerated program commenced in fiscal year 1963, improvement in health services to the Micronesian people has been considerable.

At the present time, funds are available for the first increments (at about \$1 million each) for new hospitals at Truk and Ponape, but funds are not available for their completion. Nor do we have amounts available for construction of a badly needed 100-bed hospital at Yap; replacement of completely inadequate subdistrict health centers at Ebeye and Kusaie; construction of regional health centers; and urgently needed community dispensaries. If we are to bring the medical facilities of the trust territory to an acceptable level reasonably soon, that is, in 5 years, an expenditure of \$30 million must be anticipated.

These funds would provide for completely new hospitals of 200 beds at Truk, 150 beds at Ponape, and 100 beds at Yap; additional beds and improvements to those at Palau, Majuro, and Saipan; and construction of seven subcenter health facilities of 30- to 50-bed capacity in Ebeye, Kusaie, Jaluit, the northern Marshalls, the Mortlocks, Woleai, and Ulithi. In order to provide adequate services, some of these regional service centers must be provided with small support vessels. These vessels would not only be medical vessels but would also provide for the transportation of other personnel, such as education supervisors and agricultural extension agents who would be working directly with the communities. At present time a need is foreseen for four service vessels to be stationed at Jaluit and Ebeye, in the Marshalls; in the Mortlocks, at Truk; and at Ulithi in the Yap District. These vessels would primarily be personnel carriers of less than 100 feet which could respond swiftly to emergencies, be in constant radio contact with the regional service center and the smaller communities, and generally provide the vital link that would bring governmental services to people living on small islands.

The other service centers are close enough to the district centers to be supported by present vessels. In addition to the vessels, there is the distinct possibility that small support aircraft with water landing capabilities will be utilized.

These funds would also provide for about 75 community dispensaries, of two to four

beds each, which would be located in smaller communities in outer-island areas throughout the trust territory. These communities are now served by tin or thatched-roof dispensaries. We would propose that radio equipment be installed at each community so that word of emergencies and other illnesses could be received at the pertinent district center or the regional service center. These improvements are considered to be the minimum needed by 1972. The public health operational program must be greatly improved over the next 5 years in order to bring more effective health services to the people of Micronesia. Under the proposed bill, additional doctors would be recruited to augment the doctors now practicing. It is planned that 20 medical doctors would be added to the staff by 1972 in order to bring the total number of medical doctors and medical practitioners to 60.

Registered nurses would be recruited both for medical care in the hospitals and for public health duty. By 1972 a total of 36 registered nurses and 13 to 21 public health nurses should be added to the staff to provide improved medical care, training for Micronesian nurses, and increased public health services to many communities.

Adequate medical and paramedical staff should be employed to operate district center facilities, regional health centers, and outlying dispensaries. Laboratory technicians, X-ray technicians, hospital administrators, and health workers of all kinds should be recruited. The trust territory will, of course, train and employ as many Micronesians as possible for these posts.

Special programs for the detection, isolation, treatment, and rehabilitation of patients ill with tuberculosis, leprosy, filariasis, and other diseases would be mounted. Provision should be made for close cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service, as well as bringing short-term consultants on special problems to the trust territory.

The estimated cost of the operational program for public health by fiscal year may be seen in attachment II, which indicates that the cost will range from an estimated \$4,500,000 in fiscal year 1967 to an estimated \$7,400,000 in fiscal year 1972.

EDUCATION

The accelerated program from 1963 to the present has resulted in 330 new classrooms for the trust territory school system, and enrollment has increased to about 21,500 pupils. Of this 21,500, about 19,000 are in elementary school, compared to about 12,000 in 1960. Approximately 2,500 are attending public secondary schools, compared to 135 in 1960.

The construction of sufficient classrooms and related facilities, including teachers' quarters to house adequately all eligible elementary pupils by the fall of 1972 will cost an estimated \$28 million. This will provide 834 classrooms, for a total enrollment of more than 29,000 pupils. A construction program for secondary and vocational facilities, including teachers' quarters, in order to house adequately all eligible secondary students by 1972, will cost an estimated \$49 million. At that time, an enrollment of more than 8,000 is anticipated at 13 high schools located at the six district centers and the regional centers.

The entire secondary program must be evaluated in terms of the goals of Micronesians and special emphasis must be placed on training for the employment opportunities which economic development specialists see as the future of the trust territory. Guidance for the high school students should be provided and opportunities must be provided beyond high school for those who will be seeking employment in specialized, technical, or professional skills.

The adult segment of the population should be helped to understand the nature

of the change that is taking place in Micronesia and to bring to that change the old values that make for strength in newly emerging Micronesia. In addition, all who can be taught to read and write English should have that opportunity and other skills should not be neglected.

Special teacher training courses have already been set up at Ponape for Micronesian teachers. These courses would be greatly expanded and opportunities for teacher training provided in other districts. The teacher training program will augment the ongoing college training program.

The estimated program cost for education ranges from an estimated \$6 million in fiscal year 1967 to an estimated \$16,500,000 in fiscal year 1971.

HOUSING

It is proposed to initiate a territorywide low-cost housing program to be administered by the government and to function in the pattern established by HUD for the self-help Indian housing program.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

Improvements in transportation and communication facilities are of the utmost importance if health, education, and economic advances are to be expected.

Airfields which have been built must be surfaced and protected from erosion; runway lights should be installed; the airport at Ponape must be completed; and other airport improvements should be provided, such as runway lighting, navigational aids, parking ramps, and terminal facilities. The estimated amount for airport capital improvement purposes is \$7 million.

One of the most vital elements of supporting facilities is the network of communications among the islands. Health, education, and economic development cannot be expected to function effectively without adequate communications. Urgently needed communications facilities include improved radio equipment at each district center and regional service center, and the installation of two-way radio communication equipment in each community in the trust territory with a population over 50, to connect with the regional service centers. A microwave system is planned for the Guam-Saipan circuit in order to enable voice communication between Saipan and Guam, and on to the mainland United States. It is also necessary to provide adequate telephone systems within the district centers for both commercial and government use. Installation of new and improved communications facilities is estimated to cost \$2.8 million.

If the improved sea transportation schedule is to be made most effective and if regional service centers are to be adequately supplied by sea transportation, additional investment must be made in docks and related facilities. Needed dock facilities and harbor improvements are estimated in the amount of \$2 million.

HIGHWAYS

An adequate road system is essential in order to transport children to school. With a road system it will be possible to consolidate elementary schools on many islands and achieve better educational results as well as significantly lower costs. In addition, many of the high school children will be able to live at home in a family atmosphere instead of having to live in a dormitory at the school—an expensive and frequently unrewarding means of education at the secondary level. Adequate roads are also essential for transporting patients to medical facilities and for transporting agricultural and other products to marketing or shipping centers, thereby encouraging commercial and agricultural production. As to this last point, it has been estimated that if suitable roads were available on the major islands, for improved copra collection and transport, the production of this valuable crop would

double. Copra is now the leading source of commercial income, and a major source of tax revenue.

It is planned to construct some 290 miles of road at an estimated cost of \$10.7 million. On a district basis, there is need for 70 miles in the Marianas, 90 in Palau, 25 in Yap, 30 in Truk, 70 in Ponape, and 5 in the Marshalls. Of the total, 190 miles would be gravel or coral surfaced at an estimated cost of \$30,000 per mile, and 100 miles would be asphalt surfaced at an estimated cost of \$50,000 per mile.

UTILITIES

In order to provide the utility systems needed, \$7 million will be needed to construct the necessary sewage disposal facilities, \$13 million will be needed to provide pure water supplies, and \$12 million will be needed to provide generating and distribution systems.

These estimates anticipate that adequate water, sewage disposal, and power services would be installed to meet the need of both public and private consumers at each of the six district center communities as well as the seven regional service centers. By this means approximately 40 percent of the people of the trust territory would have these services. It is planned, of course, that these services would be available for commercial and home consumption.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The economic resources of the trust territory are limited, yet with suitable guidance and assistance, the potentials that exist can be developed. At the present time most of the population is on a subsistence economy. However, at least in the district centers and on Ebeye, this pattern is changing and there is significant movement into a limited cash economy.

Exports from the trust territory in 1964 totaled \$2,700,000, of which all but \$400,000 represented copra sales. The largest single employer is the trust territory government with some 3,000 employees receiving close to \$4 million annually. Another 2,000 to 3,000 are employed in the private sector, with total wages of \$2 million to \$3 million annually.

At the present time a thorough analysis of the economic structure of the territory is underway. This analysis is being conducted by a team from Robert R. Nathan Associates and will not only involve a comprehensive economic development plan but will assist in implementation of promising potential projects.

While the economic development plan is not yet complete, some indications of the future are already becoming clear. It is almost self-evident that the resources of the sea will play a major role in the economic future of Micronesia. A tuna freezing plant at Palau has been extremely successful and planning is proceeding for construction of additional plants in Palau, in Truk, and possibly in Ponape. Other fishery resources remain to be explored.

There are other promising aspects of possible economic development which appear to hold promise. Tourism, which is largely undeveloped, appears to be a major possibility. The beauty of these islands, the warm water of the lagoons, the increasing ease of transportation as well as other factors are making the territory increasingly attractive as a tourism investment area.

Agriculture, even though the land area is limited, is capable of greatly increased production. Cattle raising, specialty crops such as cacao and pepper, increase of copra production and market gardening all present distinct possibilities.

The economic effect of the proposed capital improvement and operations program cannot be overestimated. Planned in connection with a coherent economic development program it will provide a powerful stimulus to development but superimposed painlessly on the narrowly based economy of

the trust territory, the effect could be devastating.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

KENNEWICK IRRIGATION DIVISION EXTENSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 370) to amend the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "to the extent they may be in excess of Yakima project net power revenues in that period after meeting the requirements specified in (1), (2), and (3) above shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration from the McNary Dam project: *Provided*, That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the McNary Dam project." and insert "shall be charged to and returned to the reclamation fund in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200), as amended by section 6 of the Act of September 7, 1966 (80 Stat. 707): *Provided*, That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the Federal Columbia River power system. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Kennewick extension shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him." and, on page 3, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "\$5,155,000 (October 1964 prices)" and insert "\$5,352,000 (October 1966 prices)"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Insert the words "and Kennewick division extension", after the words "Kennewick division" in section 1 and add the following items to the principal units listed in said section: "Klona siphon" and "Relift pumping plants".

(b) Insert at the end of section 3 the following: "Costs of the Kennewick division extension allocated to irrigation which are determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the water users' ability to repay within a fifty-six-year repayment period following

a ten-year development period, shall be charged to and returned to the reclamation fund in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200), as amended by section 6 of the Act of September 7, 1966 (80 Stat. 707): *Provided*, That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the Federal Columbia River power system. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Kennewick extension shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him."

Sec. 2. No water shall be delivered to any water user on the Kennewick division extension for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this authorizing Act for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the new works associated with the Kennewick division extension \$5,352,000 (October 1966 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein, as shown by engineering cost indexes, and, in addition, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the extension.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate is S. 370. This bill would provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick Division Extension, Yakima project, in the State of Washington.

The purpose of S. 370 is to bring 6,300 acres of land in the Kennewick Division under irrigation. This would be accomplished through appropriate amendments to the act of June 12, 1948, which authorized the Kennewick Division. The act of 1948 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct extra capacity in the division's main canal to provide for future irrigation of approximately 7,000 acres. S. 370 would make use of this extra capacity and bring operating capacity of the division up to full efficiency.

This bill is, with the exception of two amendments, identical to S. 794 which passed the Senate in the 89th Congress. The first amendment substitutes the entire Federal Columbia River power system for McNary Dam as the source of financial assistance for the project. This conforms the project to legislation which was passed last year establishing a Columbia Basin account. The second amendment updates the cost figures in the project authorization to October 1966 prices.

This project has an extremely high benefit-to-cost ratio in excess of 3.5 to 1.

While the Kennewick division extension is basically an irrigation development which will be especially suitable for the production of specialty crops, there would also be substantial benefits to wildlife resources.

Following hearings which were held on February 23, 1967, the committee ordered the bill favorably reported on March 3,

1967. The committee unanimously endorses the enactment of S. 307, and recommends its prompt passage by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 63), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

The purpose of S. 370, which is sponsored by Senators Jackson and Magnuson, is to bring an additional 6,300 acres of land under irrigation in the Yakima River Valley in the southern part of the State of Washington. This purpose would be attained through amendment to the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), the measure authorizing the parent Kennewick division of the Yakima project, to provide for construction, operation, and maintenance of the necessary additional works to the existing facilities of the Kennewick division. The presently proposed extension was contemplated in the construction of the existing facilities.

Almost all of the lands in the extension area are dry, supporting for the most part only sagebrush and native grasses used for livestock grazing and other uses are impracticable under present conditions. When irrigated, the land will be especially suitable for production of general row crops, and for specialty crops and fruits, such as grapes, sweet cherries, prunes, peaches, and apricots.

The project has a benefit-cost ratio of 3.5 to 1.

S. 370 is similar to S. 794, 89th Congress, as approved by the Senate on February 10, 1965; final action was not taken in the House prior to adjournment.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The existing Kennewick division serves approximately 19,000 acres of land. It is the most recent of the six operating divisions of the Yakima project. Section 6 of the 1948 authorization act provided for extra capacity in the division's main canal sufficient to irrigate approximately 7,000 acres over and above the lands in the division, and recognized the cost of the construction of such extra capacity as a deferred obligation.

The extension proposed in S. 370 would fully utilize this previously provided capacity, built at a cost of \$341,000. Major new facilities would be a third pump at Chandler pumping plant, the mile-long Kiona siphon, six small relief pumping plants, 24 miles of canals and conduits, a lateral distribution system, and drainage facilities.

The average annual diversion requirement for the extension would be 31,500 acre-feet and would consist primarily of return flows from irrigated lands upstream, supplemented by natural flows of Yakima River. In 1931 the Bureau of Reclamation obtained a permit from the State of Washington for the Kennewick Irrigation District to divert up to 1,600 cubic feet per second for irrigation and power purposes. This permit fully covers the diversions to the extension lands.

The Kennewick division extension is basically an irrigation development, but benefits to wildlife resources will also be realized. The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that irrigation of these lands will be beneficial to upland game birds. Opportunities to develop significant benefits to recreation, flood

control, municipal and industrial water supply or other purposes are not available.

COSTS

The total investment in the Kennewick division extension would be \$6,141,700, reflecting an updating of the cost estimate in our feasibility report (H. Doc. 296, 88th Cong.) which was \$5,250,400 (January 1962 prices). This current estimate is made up of \$5,353,000 in construction costs (October 1966 prices); \$341,400 in deferred costs of the Kennewick division attributable to enlarged main canal capacity and assignable to the division extension; \$189,000 for the extension's pro rata share of storage costs of the Yakima project, \$27,000 for settlers assistance, and a \$259,300 suballocation of the Federal Columbia River power system costs to irrigation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the ranking minority member, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and all members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the dispatch which they have shown year after year in reporting good legislation, and the active interest they have provided in trying to bring about the corrections in certain areas under their jurisdiction, such as the trust territory and other parts of the country.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend the majority leader that there is not a finer, more hardworking committee in the Senate than the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has as its chairman your friend and mine, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. The Democratic majority and the Republican minority work together with a minimum of friction and a minimum of politics. I am delighted to have been able to have tenure on that committee while I have been in the Senate.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, March 6, 1967, marks the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate. For that reason, I wish to make a few remarks about the committee which was formulated on March 6, 1867, and consisted of seven members. I believe it is worthwhile to name these members. They were Lott M. Morrill, of Maine, who was the first chairman; James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Timothy O. Howe, of Wisconsin; Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts; Roscoe Conkling, of New York; James Guthrie, of Kentucky; and Cornelius Cole, of California.

As a personal note, may I say that at the age of 99, Cornelius Cole came from California to Washington, and on June 26, 1922, I heard him deliver a brief but interesting address on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Since its formulation the committee has been presided over by 16 different

chairmen. There have been a total of 209 members.

To call the roll of these members would be to name some of the most illustrious patriots who have guided the course of this Nation in the past 100 years. I shall name but a few of them. Two who became Presidents served on the committee: Lyndon B. Johnson and Harry S. Truman. Three Vice Presidents have also been members: HUBERT HUMPHREY, Charles Curtis, and Henry Wilson. Two Justices of the Supreme Court were committee members: Harold H. Burton and James F. Byrnes. Another, Roscoe Conkling, was appointed to the Supreme Court but declined to serve. Among the Presidents pro tempore of the Senate who have been committee members were Carter Glass, Kenneth McKellar, and Styles Bridges.

Appropriations enacted during the period total over \$2.3 trillion. These appropriations have not only affected the lives and well-being of every living American, but in relatively recent years have profoundly and beneficially influenced the welfare of countless millions spread over the surface of the entire globe.

The committee has, in its routine procedure, provided year after year the funds which the departments and agencies of the Federal Government have required for their normal operations. The importance of this must not be underestimated, for through the actions of the committee and the Congress the work of the Government has been maintained.

Equally important has been the influence of the committee's judgment in initiating new measures and giving impetus to lagging programs through the appropriations process.

In a deeper sense the accomplishments of the committee are a tribute to the understanding and cooperation of the members of the committee, the Congress itself and, behind this, that of the American people. This spirit is the cornerstone of our democracy.

I think that the seven members who comprised the committee 100 years ago would look with pride and satisfaction at the work of the committee since then. Today we can pay tribute to them, and to those who followed them, in formulating the policies and procedures in the appropriating process which today provides one of the great stabilizing factors in our Federal Government. This process did not present itself full blown upon the national scene, but was hewn with patriotic sweat and fervor from the forests of trial and error. The stability of our system of checks and balances among the three coordinate branches of the Government owes much to the evolution of the present appropriations process.

Thus it is only fitting that we salute those members of the committee, past and present, who through the years have demonstrated a minimum of partisanship and a maximum of national interest, representing their constituencies to the full degree but never obscuring the larger objective, the welfare of our Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr.

President, I wish to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his remarks concerning the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I have had the honor and privilege of serving under three of the 16 chairmen who have presided over the committee since its establishment. I am sure that no chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been more faithful, more effective, and more able than our present chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He has a long and commendable record as a member of the committee and as its chairman.

Mr. President, there is an old saying that in order to be popular as a Member of Congress one should vote for all appropriations and vote against all tax measures. I wish to state from my experience in serving on the appropriation committee that oftentimes one has to vote against appropriations that have great merit and appropriations that one might even vote for if one were not a member of the committee.

The committee has served a most useful purpose over the years. I think that the combined judgment of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives results in a better final judgment than we would have if only one committee were handling appropriations matters.

I am indeed happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in commemorating this 100th anniversary of the Committee on Appropriations.

LETTER FROM ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a letter written last fall has just come to my attention. Addressed to all Americans, the letter comes from the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, and it sets forth a formidable series of arguments against recognition of the Red China regime by the United States or its admission to the United Nations. As a matter of fact, words set down in this letter of last November seem particularly pertinent in light of the tremendous political upheaval in Red China at the present time.

It is extremely interesting that before the United States was fully aware of the ramifications of the Red Guard revolution, the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League was setting forth a fairly accurate picture of today's developments.

Mr. President, I think the letter warrants close attention by all members of the Senate, particularly in view of our wholehearted and deserved preoccupation with our present problems in southeast Asia, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE,
November 15, 1966.

DEAR AMERICAN FRIENDS: For the last several months, some self-styled "China experts"

in your country have opposed aid to South Vietnam, have demanded the withdrawal of American troops from that country, and now have gone so far as to urge a policy of "containment without isolation" toward the Chinese Communist regime. They seek to appease the Chinese Reds through enlarged contacts and even admitting the Peiping regime into the United Nations. In so doing, they hope to transform the militant, belligerent Chinese Communists and persuade them to coexist peacefully and amiably with the United States and other free world countries.

We are well aware of the heavy responsibilities your country is shouldering and the price you have paid to check Communist aggression and safeguard freedom. We appreciate your anxieties and those of your government about the international situation and your earnestness in seeking world peace. However, we wish to point out that although peace is the common goal of all free men, a peace obtained by surrender, appeasement or even compromise is dishonorable and will only lead to an earlier war. Without freedom, peace is impossible. Many farsighted people in your country long have recognized the truth of these words. But others are now advocating a softer U.S. policy toward Red China. If this tendency continues, the policies of your government will be affected, the confidence of the Asian peoples in the United States will be undermined, and the Communists' Asian appetite will grow larger. The result will be the exposure of your continent to direct Communist threat, and the jeopardizing of world peace, with all the ensuing implications for America. In view of the traditional friendship between America and the Asians, and of our common destiny, we the members and participants of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League feel honor-bound to offer our since counsel to you our American friends.

It seems to us that intellectuals of your country who advance the policy of containment of Peiping without isolation, believe that the Red regime is firmly established and in effective control of the Chinese mainland. They also believe that the Peiping leadership will become less aggressive in future, and that the second-generation Chinese Communists will undergo a peaceful transformation. They see Chinese Communism as merely transformed Chinese cultural tradition which does not seek to communize the world.

But these suppositions are based on either incomplete knowledge or on preconceived ideas. The Chinese Communists have certainly had the Chinese mainland under their despotic rule for more than 17 years. Yet only a few Asian countries have recognized the Peiping regime, and anti-Communist uprisings on the Chinese mainland are mounting in fury. Anti-Mao, anti-Communist sentiment has so increased among the masses as well as among intellectuals, Communist Party cadres and even members of the Red armed forces, that the government has been compelled to undertake a bloody purge in the name of the "great cultural revolution". The mainland had been thrown into chaos by the outrageous acts of the "Red Guards" who have been officially described as destroying the old and establishing the new. What they are actually doing is to terrorize and impoverish the population. They ransack private homes leaving desolation behind them. They are reducing the people to rags once again wiping out any possible improvement in their standard of living. At the same time, they are building up a smear and slander campaign against non-conforming party leaders and members who are more flexible in their thinking and believe in good sense in policy making. These fanatical, militant "Red Guards" are the "second generation" that the Chinese Communists are cultivating. But the "Red Guard" so far from being less aggressive, has clamored to march on to the world stage and bury all the people of the free world. How can such

"successors" be expected to make a transition to peace?

China's cultural heritage emphasizes ethics, morals, benevolence, love for mankind, and peace. These values are the opposite of those of Communism, which sneers at ethics and morals, propagates hatred, and is militantly bellicose. China's culture stresses humanitarianism and is an important part of the Oriental humanitarian system. The materialism of the Chinese Communists has contrary values. Humanitarianism regards man as of supreme importance; materialism views man as a vehicle for exploitation and enslavement. The Chinese Communists are carrying out the great cultural revolution in order to negate China's history and destroy China's cultural heritage. Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao have vowed to uproot China's old culture and thought. Communism is no product of China's cultural heritage.

We know from bitter experience that Communism is at the root of all calamities in East Asia and is the public enemy number one of freedom-loving peoples. Only when it is overthrown can the freedom and peace of Asia and all the free world be preserved. So at a time when the Chinese Reds are encouraging the Viet Cong to enlarge the VN war rather than accept peace talks, and are planning for encroachment upon and invasion of their Asian countries, we must place our earnest hopes on your country as leader of the free world. We trust that you and your government will reject the illusion appeasing the Communists through containment without isolation and will act in accordance with the U.S. tradition of upholding freedom and justice. In Vietnam, we hope you will adopt a policy of winning total victory, for only so can you restore peace and security to Asia. We sincerely trust that you will take a resolute stand against the admission of the Chinese Communist regime by the United Nations. For Peiping plots to sabotage the world body from within. We are unanimously of the view that this is the time to support wholeheartedly the effects of the Republics of China, Korea, and Vietnam to destroy the Asian Iron Curtain and overthrow the Communist regimes installed in parts of these countries.

We are wholly convinced that the aggressiveness of the Chinese Communists betrays their internal weaknesses. The Reds are not invincible. But the hesitation and vacillation of the democracies could make them so. The United States is the leader of the free world. Your policy toward the Peiping regime will have a direct bearing on the future of Asia and the rest of the world. We sincerely hope therefore that your government and people, upholding the glorious tradition of freedom and justice, will adopt a wise and correct Asian Policy under the strong and able leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson. We appeal to you to abandon all illusions of appeasement, see the Communists for what they are and act accordingly against them without compromise.

SIGNATORIES

Member units

Mr. Chung Yul Kim, Chairman of the 12th APACL Conference.

Australia, Hon. Marie Breen O. B. E., Senator.

Ceylon, Mr. Valentine S. Perera, President of APACL Ceylon Chapter.

China, Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, President of the China Chapter, APACL; Member of National Assembly and Vice Chairman of Commission for the Study on Constitutional Affairs.

Hong Kong, Mr. Chang Kuo-sin, Director of the Asia Publishing Company.

India, Mr. Rama Swarup, Responsible person of APACL India Chapter.

Iran, Dr. Parviz Kazemi, Senator.

Japan, Prof. Juitsu Kitaoka, Secretary General of APACL Japan Chapter.

Jordan, Mr. Hani Tabbara, Responsible person of APACL Jordan Chapter.

Kenya, Hon. John Okwango, Member of Parliament.

Korea, Dr. Choi Doo Sun, Former Premier of the Republic of Korea.

Laos, Hon. Cho Sopsaisana, Congressman of Laos.

Liberia, Hon. Nathan Ross, Mayor of Monrovia.

Libya, Mr. Zahri Muntassern, Entrepreneur.

Macao, Hon. Leonel Borralho, Senator.

Malaysia, Hon. Dato Hussein, Member of Parliament.

New Zealand, Mr. E. O. E. Hill, Chairman of Wellington Branch, the Labor Party.

Pakistan, Dr. Mahmud Brelvi, Professor, Philippines, Hon. Cornelio T. Villareal, Speaker of House of Representatives.

Ryukyus, Mr. Tsai Chang, External Minister, Nationalist Party.

Thailand, Dr. Vibul Thamavit, Professor; Chairman of APACL Thailand Chapter.

Turkey, Hon. Fethi Tevetoglu, Senator.

Vietnam, Dr. Nguyen Tien Hy, Secretary General of National Party, former Minister of Education.

Observer units

The American Afro-Asian Educational Exchange, Prof. David N. Rowe, Member of Board of Directors and concurrently Chairman of Publication Committee of AAAEE.

All-American Conference of Combat Communism, Mr. Donald L. Miller, Executive Director of AACCC.

Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Mr. Yaroslav Stetsko, Chairman of ABN.

Assembly of Captive European Nations, Mr. Vachlav Sidzikauskas, Chairman of ACEN. Belgium, Knight Chevalier Marcel De Roover, Chairman of Belgium Committee of C.I.A.S.

Chile, Hon. Sergio Fernandez Larrain, former Senator and Ambassador to Spain.

International Conference on Political Warfare of the Soviets, Madame Suzanne Labin, Writer, Publicist and Sponsor of the CIGP.

Congo (Leopoldville), Mr. Phillibert Luyeye, President of Anti-Communist League of Congo.

Denmark, Hon. Ole Bjorn Kraft, former Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Free Pacific Association, Father Raymond de Jaegher, Representative of FPA.

Inter-American Confederation for the Defense of the Continent, Admiral Carlos Penna Botto, Chairman of IACDC.

West Germany, Prof. Theodor Oberlander, former Refugee Minister of West Germany.

Italy, Hon. Ivan Matteo Lombardo, former Trade Minister of Italy.

Lebanon, Mr. George Elias Bitar, Beirut Bureau Manager of UPI.

National Captive Nations Committee, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman of NCNC.

Union of Russian Solidarists, Mr. Vladimir Poremsky, Chairman of NTS.

Saudi Arabia, Mr. Shakeeb Amawi, Writer.

Spain, Hon. Alberto Martin Artajo, former Spanish Foreign Minister.

Sweden, Mr. Arvo Horm, Secretary General of the Baltic Committee.

THE UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR TREATY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, unusual attention has been devoted to the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention, both in the Senate and by the general public. Any proposed change, no matter how slight, in our relation with the Soviet Union, must be weighed solely in terms of its effect on the interests of the American people.

The Consular Convention is not a dramatic new proposal to remake our policy toward the Communist world. Negotia-

tion of this treaty is part of the course of normal diplomatic relations. There may be those who believe that the United States should never have recognized the Soviet Union. In my opinion, their view ignores history and accepts the argument that even communication with a potential Communist adversary means eventual submission to its false ideology. Today the need for communication between our two nations, which jointly control a near monopoly of the obliterating power of the world's nuclear weapons, is vitally important if we are to try to avoid nuclear war.

The issue of a Consular Convention is neither partisan nor new. The first concrete proposal to negotiate a treaty came 26 years after the establishment of diplomatic relations, when General Eisenhower proposed it to Premier Khrushchev at Camp David in 1959. Subsequent administrations continued this initiative. General Eisenhower endorsed the finished product as recently as February 2, 1967, when he announced to the press:

I have not changed my belief that such a convention is in our national interest, that it will not impair our national security, that it should enlarge our opportunities to learn more about the Soviet people and that it is necessary to assure better protection for the many thousands of Americans who visit the Soviet Union each year.

The Consular Convention is not a proposal which the Soviets have sought to push down our throats. On the contrary, our Government proposed it, rather than the other way around. If the conclusion of a consular treaty were a vital Soviet objective, why was it up to us to press for negotiations? If the reciprocal establishment of consulates is so important to the Soviets, why did they not jump at Vice President Nixon's 1959 offer to exchange consulates in Leningrad and New York? Clearly the Soviets did not believe these moves were as much in their interests as we have believed they are in ours.

The Consular Convention is not a measure which this administration has forced on Congress. It has been before us for 3 long years—and before it was even signed, the Under Secretary of State discussed its draft provisions with the Foreign Relations Committee. It has been given careful consideration in public hearings in 1965 and 1967 and it has been fully aired in public.

The Consular Convention is not a threat to our internal security. The President and the Secretary of State have given assurances that if an exchange of consulates is proposed, with, or without a treaty, some 10 to 15 Soviet consular personnel would come to this country. President Johnson, General Eisenhower, the Attorney General, and FBI Director Hoover are all on record as saying that such an influx of Soviet officials on top of the 1,018 already here would create no problems with which the FBI cannot deal effectively and efficiently.

The Consular Convention does not provide aid and comfort to the enemy in Vietnam. It offers timely and prudent protection to American citizens who are

in the Soviet Union. In these crucial times, they badly need such protection, as the tragic case of Newcomb Mott clearly demonstrates. Refusal to ratify this treaty which the United States asked for and worked for, would not be a blow to the Russians, but a denial of our own self-interest.

What, then, is this treaty? I believe it is a necessary step which ought to benefit the United States more than the Soviet Union. The convention provides us with something we very much need—better tools to aid and protect our fellow citizens. Last year, 18,000 Americans visited the Soviet Union. The treaty will not, of course, cloak American tourists with immunity from Soviet law—nor Soviet tourists with immunity from American law. But its concrete, carefully negotiated provisions for prompt notification will serve to bring every case of arrest of an American traveling in the U.S.S.R. to the attention of our Government within 3 days so that we can seek at once to provide assistance to him and to obtain his release. At the same time, such cases will be brought to the attention of the highest levels of the Soviet Government, where they can be considered from the point of view of Soviet foreign policy and national interest, rather than the narrow point of view of the internal police policy of the KGB. Access by U.S. consular officials within 4 days after the arrest of an American and on a continuing basis thereafter, will enable us to break down the isolation in which all prisoners are held in the Soviet Union and reassure them that their Government will not rest until they are free.

The treaty provides far better rights of access and notification for Americans than the Soviet Union gives its own citizens. These rights are vital to an American under continuous interrogation in a police state where hope dies fast.

The treaty also provides reciprocal authority for the conduct of normal consular activities, such as the rendering of commercial information to American businessmen, the issuance of passports and visas, the drafting of legal documents, and the usual services rendered in maritime and estate matters.

The treaty provides that the consular officials of both countries will be immune from criminal prosecution by the host nation in exactly the same manner that diplomatic personnel of the two countries, now serving in Washington and Moscow are immune. In a police state like the Soviet Union it is essential that this immunity not only cover our consular officers, but secretaries, code clerks, and other consular staff members who are conducting the business of the American people. In view of the many difficulties encountered by American Foreign Service personnel in conducting their official duties behind the Iron Curtain, I believe that the extension of immunities both to our officers and their staff is essential. A Soviet employee arrested in the United States, even if he had no immunity would be treated fairly, I have no doubt. But, from our point of view, this is not so in the Soviet Union, where a person may

be held for investigation for as long as 9 months without being charged or having access to counsel.

There are a number of safeguards, should any aspects of the treaty fail to serve American interests. All nominees for consular assignments are to be screened in advance by the receiving state. If they do not respect the standard of conduct expected, they can be declared persona non grata and expelled from this country. As a final protection against abuse, there is a provision for termination of the treaty by either party by giving 6 months' notice.

In short, I do not believe this treaty represents any sort of dramatic development, nor any vast change in our dealings with the Soviet Union. Examined on its own merits as an agreement which we worked for over many years on a bipartisan basis and obtained on favorable terms, I believe it deserves the support of Senators regardless of their position on bridge building or détente. It is not a question of extending a hand of friendship to the Soviet Union but rather our extending a hand of ready and constant assistance to American travelers, assistance they may badly need if they run afoul of Soviet authorities during a period of strained United States-Soviet relations.

America is an open society; the Soviet Union is closed. Many more Americans go to Russia than Russians visit here. I, for one, believe we will benefit from this treaty and that its ratification is justified solely in the interest of service to the American people.

General Eisenhower supports this treaty. Barry Goldwater supports it. Our leader in the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN, supports it. But, however persuasive these endorsements, this treaty ought not to be judged on a partisan basis. The sole, relevant question is: does it serve the interests of the United States? After careful study, I have concluded that it does.

LIMITATIONS IMPOSED ON AMERICAN MILITARY COMMANDERS IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, this morning I invite the attention of the Senate to a portion of a newspaper column written for publication yesterday by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers.

Mr. Hearst protests strongly that—

American fliers are still not permitted to bomb the communist airfields in North Vietnam. If ever there was a more ironic demonstration of the foolishness of this particular kind of restraint, it would have to top what happened at Da Nang.

The incident at Da Nang to which Mr. Hearst referred occurred a week ago today when Russian-made and Russian-supplied 140 millimeter artillery rockets were fired on the American airbase there. These were the most powerful weapons the Vietcong has used in the war to date.

They were fired from a distance of almost 2 miles from 134 emplacements. In one attack, Mr. Hearst pointed out, they killed 12 Americans and wounded

32 more. Some 35 South Vietnamese troops were killed at the same time and 70 wounded. Eleven of our planes were damaged.

Mr. Hearst asks this question:

Did you hear any of our companions speak out that the North was escalating the war? I didn't.

The veteran newspaper editor who has been to southeast Asia many times said:

I am convinced that from now on the only way to get the enemy to talk peace and really mean it is for us to make the going too rough even for him.

To me, this seems logical. Bear in mind that the United States is suffering 1,000 casualties a week, or an annual rate of 50,000. During the calendar year just passed, the calendar year of 1966, American casualties totaled 35,000.

To me, this seems logical.

The attack on the American airbase at Da Nang last week by Russian-made and Russian-supplied artillery rockets dramatizes the need to remove the limitations now imposed upon American military commanders in Vietnam.

To me it is tragic that we should have 415,000 ground troops in Vietnam fighting in the jungles and swamps and caves—and yet simultaneously prevent the military commanders from hitting vital military targets in North Vietnam.

The airfields of North Vietnam which now are in effect a sanctuary—safe from attack—is the dramatic case in point.

Like Mr. Hearst it does not seem logical to me that American fliers should be prevented from bombing and straffing this obvious and meaningful military target.

I want to say again, as I said on the floor of the Senate on January 23, and again on February 15, that so long as we have great masses of American troops in Vietnam, more freedom must be given our military leaders in determining how best to protect American troops and to bring the war to an early and honorable conclusion.

I say today that the place to start in removing those restrictions would be to permit the bombing of the enemy airfields and the bombing or straffing of those enemy planes on the airfields.

The American airbase has been attacked. Yet American military commanders are prevented from attacking the enemy airfields. Does this make sense? To my way of thinking, it does not.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, today is the beginning of Law Enforcement Week, and significantly tomorrow the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures begins the first of a series of hearings on various bills designed to strengthen the arm of law-enforcement officials in the fight on crime.

One of these bills is the President's proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, a long-range measure en-

titled "A bill to assist States and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes."

While that type of approach to the problem is necessary, and I support it, the more immediate, pressing, and urgent question is what can be done now to stop our trial courts from having to turn loose upon the public unpunished murderers, rapists, and other dangerous and vicious criminals, solely because of recent ill advised, unsound, and unjust 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. President, every newspaper we pick up contains some news item like the following in the Washington Daily News of February 28 under a New York dateline:

A 21-year-old confessed rapist was freed in Bronx Supreme Court yesterday when the court was told he had not been advised of his Constitutional rights before he made his confession.

The defendant, Michael Stern, was arrested on February 27, 1965, and charged with first degree rape of a 75-year-old widow. Her name with withheld.

Bronx Assistant District Attorney Seymour Rotker told State Supreme Court Justice Mitchell D. Schweitzer that while Stern had signed a confession it was invalid in the light of the U.S. Supreme Court's 5-4 decision in the *Miranda* case of June 13, 1966. Judge Schweitzer dismissed the case without comment.

On March 3, at my request, there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by James J. Kilpatrick, published in the Washington Evening Star of February 21. After commenting upon the long-range proposals made by the President's National Crime Commission, Mr. Kilpatrick concluded:

The figures compiled by the commission on the incidence of crime are as familiar as they are appalling. They need no recapitulation. What matters to the average citizen is not so much the abstract of statistical problem, or even the sociologists' long range solution. His concern goes to the mugger, the rapist, the dope-crazed thief, the arrogant young punks who infest his streets. What can be done about them now? One of the commission's answers is to provide textbooks for slum schools that are written in slum English. Okay, okay. But what can be done tomorrow, next week, next month, to lock up the hoods and thieves?

Mr. President, I agree with the sentiment expressed in this editorial. Congress needs to pass legislation that will be effective, and produce some corrective results, now—not just laws that it is hoped will reduce crime in future years. We need to enact some laws that will put a stop now to this utterly ridiculous spectacle of justice denied that is frightening and demoralizing our people, demoralizing our law enforcement personnel, and contributing immeasurably to the alarming increase in the incidence of violent crime.

Many, many letters are pouring into my office from police chiefs and other law enforcement officers, from all over our country, urging action and commending those of us in the Congress who are seeking the enactment of legislation to alleviate the conditions resulting from

recent 5-to-4 Supreme Court decisions. Their damaging effect, foreseen and predicted by the dissenting opinions of the other four Justices, is now being positively and painfully demonstrated. We do not need to rely on the views of police officials, district attorneys, and lower court judges to thus characterize these majority rulings. The predictions of the other four Justices as to the harvest that would be reaped by these rulings are now daily coming to pass.

Those who speak of our being able to live with these decisions—and what a sad commentary that is, to live with—do not take into consideration the thousands of criminal cases that will go unsolved and the countless number of vicious criminals who will go unpunished because police officers, under these restrictive and obstructive decisions, cannot act with commonsense in the performance of their duties to solve crimes and bring the guilty to the bar of justice. One chief of police writes me:

The entire situation is absurd * * * Despite the lack of figures, the *Miranda* case has hampered the administration of justice and law enforcement. Our office has dismissed numerous felonies, including murder cases, where the defendant had made written confessions. The confession would have been inadmissible if presented in court because of a lack of an affirmative waiver of a lawyer.

Another police chief characterizes the present deplorable situation in our criminal courts as a farce. Another writes that he is so disgusted with what he has to contend with, as a result of what he considers the reckless interpretation of the law by the Supreme Court, that he is resigning. His letter is rather brief. Listen to it:

The recent Supreme Court decisions favoring the criminals at the expense of our citizens is shameful. Chief Justice Warren has set law enforcement back a hundred years. His fifth deciding vote has made it well nigh impossible to punish the guilty criminal element. The innocent public, police who are hamstrung in trying to perform their duties, judges whose hands are tied in deciding a case, all these are practically at the mercy of any person who decides to commit a criminal act.

I never arrested, or tried to convict an innocent man. Today I fear making an arrest because of the loopholes expressly put into the law by the courts to aid a criminal to avoid paying the penalty for his misdeeds.

I am so disgusted with what we have to contend with in law enforcement since the U.S. Supreme Court saw fit to so recklessly interpret the law to benefit lawbreakers, to misinterpret the will of our law makers, that I am resigning my position as chief of police, effective 31 December 1967.

Another police chief writes in part:

Senator, as a career man in law enforcement and Chief of Police for the past thirty-four years, I am wholeheartedly in favor of your bill to try to give the police officers part of the rights back that rightfully belong to them. We are operating under conditions now where the criminal is the most respected person and the law enforcement officer is the out-cast. Unless the law enforcement men of this country get some relief from some of the Supreme Court decisions rendered, then I feel that in a matter of a few years true law enforcement will become a thing of the past and the criminal element will take charge. I am sure you

are aware of what this will mean to society and our way of life.

Common Pleas Judge Vincent A. Carroll is quoted in an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 4 as saying:

Maudlin sentimentality gets in the way of proper law enforcement and there has been a wave of hysteria about rights in the last ten years. But there doesn't seem to be much heard about the rights of those who get hurt.

Peter J. Gannon, Chief, Bureau of Navigation, Trenton, N.J., has forwarded to me a memorandum prepared by Mr. William H. Fennecken, who is division chief of the marine patrol. This memorandum so well expresses, from the policeman's viewpoint, the plight of law-enforcement officers that has been brought about by the present majority on the Supreme Court, that I feel it highly appropriate to quote it in full:

It is common knowledge today that a police officer's lot is not a happy one. Pressures from all sides, particularly in the field of civil rights and recent Supreme Court decisions, has lowered the police image to below that of the local garbage collector. With the bombardment of his image, his morale has also tumbled. The average Cop today is a disgruntled individual, who is doing only what is necessary in the performance of his duties; to have a spark and be energetic is to look for trouble and further criticism.

The picture was not always thus. When I first entered the police field thirteen years ago, it was on the way to becoming an honorable profession. I can recall how proud I was when I first donned the uniform. Walking my post as the local symbol of justice, I felt more like a knight in shining armor, ready to protect the proverbial damsel in distress. No apprehension entered my mind. All people from all walks of life were treated with equal candor.

As a police officer, I soon learned that in Rome you do as the Romans do. As I gained experience I learned to size people up. Basic philosophy began to take hold. I found that all people desire to be treated as individuals, to be accepted for their own sake regardless of their position in life. Everyone wants to be understood and in their own way be important. The wise guy had his underlying motive, the recidivist his.

Today the task of getting to the underlying motive has all but vanished. The police officer's approach to people has, by mandate, radically changed. The violator of public trust seeks no help because he expects none from the man in blue. The once human bond, the old avenue to justice is as cold as a weather front from Canada.

Recent Supreme Court decisions have heaped coals upon the relationship between the law enforcement officer and the accused. The policeman, must of necessity, change his entire outlook bringing into enforcement a different approach. An approach that is cold and calculating. For an officer with years of experience, this becomes a bitter pill to swallow and is not easily comprehended.

Most police officers today are disillusioned men, fighting frustration at every turn. Nothing to an officer can be more heartbreaking than to see weeks of work for naught, because of some court technicality. When the criminal is turned loose to ply again on the public, the officer wonders why he ever pinned a badge on in the first place.

Something must be done in the immediate future to restore the policeman to the symbol of old; the pillar of the community; respected as the protector of every citizen's rights, and a very pleasant help in time of trouble.

The foregoing are but representative samples of the letters I have received within the past 2 weeks from police chiefs in villages, towns, and cities in practically every State of the Union. I could go on and on quoting similar comments, but time will not permit. I ask unanimous consent that a representative group of such letters be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do, however, want to take time to call attention of my colleagues to another editorial that has come to my attention. It is written by a professor of law at Northwestern University, Prof. Fred E. Inbau. It is published in the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science in the December 1966 issue. It is entitled "Playing God: 5 to 4."

Professor Inbau reminded his readers that for several years prior to the Miranda decision the American Law Institute had devoted a tremendous amount of time and effort toward the formulation of a proposed tentative legislative code prescribing interrogation procedures for the police, and that the printed draft had been disseminated at least 3 months before the Miranda decision. He also called attention to the fact that the American Bar Association's Committee on Minimum Standards of Criminal Justice had been working closely with the institute members, and the President's Commission on Law Enforcement was also deeply engaged in a study of the problem, as was the District of Columbia Crime Commission, the Georgetown Law Center, and others under a Ford Foundation grant. He concluded the editorial as follows:

All of these efforts would have resulted in a full airing of the interrogation-confession problem, based upon practical as well as legal consideration. But a one man majority of the Court in *Miranda* "pulled the rug" from underneath all of these studies and research groups, and effectively foreclosed a final evaluation of their ultimate findings and recommendations. * * *

Considering the complexity of the interrogation-confession problem, a summary 5 to 4 nullification of much of the aforementioned group efforts directed toward the preparation of the legislation guidelines is awesomely inconsistent with fundamental democratic concepts.

It's more like "Playing God: 5 to 4."

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 2.)

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. President, as I came to the Senate Chamber this morning, I was handed the March 1967 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. The initial article

in the issue is a message from the Director, John Edgar Hoover.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD first among the articles immediately following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. I read three short paragraphs from the editorial:

The American public is seeking and sorely needs, a proven formula to deter crime. The people are growing tired of substitutes. Swift detection and apprehension, prompt prosecution, and proper and certain punishment are tested crime deterrents. As we have seen, however, this combination of deterrents can be ineffective because of breakdowns in one or all of its phases. That is why we cannot expect high-quality police service alone to bring full relief from the crime problem. If the hardened criminal is arrested but not punished, he is not long deterred from his criminal pursuits.

One State supreme court justice recently stated that it is completely unrealistic to say that punishment is not a deterrent to crime. "It is simply contrary to human nature" the justice explained, "not to be deterred from a course of action by the threat of punishment." This is the kind of reasoning and straight talk that makes sense to both the public and law enforcement. It is a refreshing contrast to the weak theories which rationalize criminal behavior and make villains of all policemen.

Coddling of criminals and soft justice increase crime; denials to the contrary have no valid support. Yet these truths are still lost in the maze of sympathy and leniency heaped upon the criminal. Lame excuses and apologies offered for the lawbreaker are exceeded only by the amount of violence he commits. Meantime, law-abiding people who have a right to expect protection from criminals have this right abused and ignored.

Mr. Hoover concludes his article with this statement:

Let the public remember, however, that detecting and apprehending criminals are not the whole answer. The criminal must know that his destiny also includes prompt prosecution and substantial punishment.

I wish that some of that sentiment, logic, and profound wisdom would become and have a guiding influence upon the Supreme Court of our land, especially those five Justices who, I think, have so grossly erred in their opinions that the law now favors the criminal to the detriment of society.

I hope that all Senators will attentively follow the hearings which commence tomorrow, and give us the benefit of their counsel, so that when the bills reach the floor for consideration we will be able to speedily pass the most effective legislation we are collectively able to formulate. The gravity of the situation, and the great public concern require it.

EXHIBIT 3

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Could it be that 1967 will be remembered as the year the American people demanded respect for law and order and a halt to rising crime in our country?

While this hope may not fully materialize, there are some promising symptoms of growing public concern. In many areas, citizens are genuinely alarmed, and rightly so, by increasing criminal violence. Indications are that more and more people want effective enforcement of the law and realistic punishment of those who break it. Federal, State, and local governments are initiating new

and broader programs to aid law enforcement and to provide better training and equipment for the enforcement officer. Civic and patriotic groups are rallying to support police and are calling for citizens to obey the law and to help prosecute those who refuse to obey it. These are encouraging signs.

Actually, the American public is seeking, and sorely needs, a proven formula to deter crime. The people are growing tired of substitutes. Swift detection and apprehension, prompt prosecution, and proper and certain punishment are tested crime deterrents. As we have seen, however, this combination of deterrents can be ineffective because of breakdowns in one or all of its phases. That is why we cannot expect high-quality police service alone to bring full relief from the crime problem. If the hardened criminal is arrested but not punished, he is not long deterred from his criminal pursuits.

One State supreme court justice recently stated that it is completely unrealistic to say that punishment is not a deterrent to crime. "It is simply contrary to human nature," the justice explained, "not to be deterred from a course of action by the threat of punishment." This is the kind of reasoning and straight talk that makes sense to both the public and law enforcement. It is a refreshing contrast to the weak theories which rationalize criminal behavior and make villains of all policemen.

Coddling of criminals and soft justice increase crime; denials to the contrary have no valid support. Yet, these truths are still lost in the maze of sympathy and leniency heaped upon the criminal. Lame excuses and apologies offered for the lawbreaker are exceeded only by the amount of violence he commits. Meantime, law-abiding people who have a right to expect protection from criminals have this right abused and ignored.

Certainly, the American public must soon take positive action to curtail crime and violence. Good intentions are worthless. Funds for better law enforcement will help, but will not do the complete job. Community and civic authorities, educators, religious leaders, and prominent men and women from all walks of life must speak out, demand justice for law-abiding citizens, and unite the people in a forceful campaign against crime. There is nothing wrong with the clergy's warning against excessive compassion for the criminal at the expense of innocent victims. There is nothing wrong with educators' denouncing rabble rousers and agitators who disrupt the orderly processes of the academic community and defy authority. And there is nothing wrong with community and city officials' crusading to rid their streets of thugs, rapists, and robbers.

Law enforcement, of course, is gratified with the great strides that have been made in the profession in recent years. It is also appreciative of new efforts to make its fight against crime more effective. Law enforcement will take full advantage of all aid and assistance and meet its obligations with a determination to give the public adequate protection. Let the public remember, however, that detecting and apprehending criminals are not the whole answer. The criminal must know that his destiny also includes prompt prosecution and substantial punishment.

J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

EXHIBIT 1

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Huntington, W. Va., March 2, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Law abiding citizens have every right to be concerned over the rapid rise in the crime rate. Each day there is an increase in the citizen's chance of becoming a victim of crime. Even if they are not in-

volved they are exposed to the higher cost of crime, inadequate police protection, lessening of their personal liberties, and the ever present fear for their life and property.

The plight of the law enforcement officer whose duty it is to protect life and property is becoming more and more difficult. The law enforcement effectiveness is being curtailed by some recent U.S. Supreme Court rulings.

The citizens in many parts of the United States are now paying because of some of the recent Supreme Court rulings that seem to serve the purpose of throwing protection around the criminal. Those who think that the police officer can cope with crime under these conditions should try to question a criminal. The police depend a great deal on their ability to interview and interrogate. Approximately seventy percent (70%) of the major crimes are solved by interviews and confessions.

Locally in the City of Huntington, West Virginia, our criminal judge will not allow a confession or statement entered as evidence in his court even if the officer has obtained a waiver.

The responsibility of a police officer is great. The police officer's daily task is not one of research, nor are his decisions made in the quiet of the Judge's Chambers with time to arrive at a decision with all the rules and guidelines to study. Instead, his decision is made hurriedly and most often amidst disorder and confusion. Not only must the officer protect the innocent, find the guilty, but he must also protect the public. Ours is a government of laws—not men. Woodrow Wilson once said, "The first duty of the law is to keep sound the society it serves."

The law enforcement officer today already has a greater responsibility than he can fully understand and is capable of discharging. We feel the Scales of Justice have been dipped too far in favor of the criminal. You are in the position of possibly bringing the scales more in balance and giving the officer an equal chance. You can be assured of our one hundred percent (100%) cooperation in this mutual effort.

Sincerely,

G. H. KLEINKNECHT,
Chief of Police.

By Sgt. SAM WATKINS,
Commander, Investigations Unit.

OKLAHOMA CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Oklahoma City, Okla., February 28, 1967.
Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: I join with, I am certain, the overwhelming majority of law enforcement officers in wishing success for your efforts to improve the condition under which officers must operate. While there is an abundance of groups and individuals arguing the cause of the criminal, there is a dearth of such advocates on the side of law and order.

For too many years, the psyche of social welfare has been allowed to supplant social responsibility and one of the results is reflected in a growth of lawlessness that threatens the roots of this nation in a way exceeding the wildest dreams of the international communist conspiracy. The most recent example of this philosophy was evidenced in the *Miranda* decision, but despite the notoriety of *Miranda*, it would be inaccurate to blame much of what is now history on that or indeed, any single ruling of the Court.

Too often, in fact *ordinarily*, the concern of society has been with protecting the rights of accused, including analyzing his subconscious, without regard for the rights of society or the victim of crime. If, as some say, the criminal is the product of his environment, then what of the other and much larger public that is of this same environ-

ment but respects the law? Responsibility, or the absence thereof, is the difference between orderly and lawless society.

A second element appears in the recent decision of the Supreme Court: that is the obvious and announced intent to "control" the police. Repeated reference is made to the Wickersham Crime Report of the early 1930s as though law enforcement had not had enough sense to change one whit in over thirty years.

The Court has confused the understandable desire of the framers of this Constitution to escape oppression at the hands of a foreign king with the right of a housewife to escape assault in the parking lot of a supermarket.

Consider the "police" that were known to colonial times and imagine their effectiveness in any matter of more consequence than discovering a fire. The power was then and is now in the military establishment. The police are neither capable nor desirous of overthrowing the government. They are capable of enforcing the criminal laws but are not allowed to do so. The early distrust of the Crown has been transferred to the police operating in a field foreign to that which gave rise to the historical distrust. To this mania to control the police has been added the psyche of social welfare so that now a man is not even responsible for what he says, much less what he does, and especially so if he says he did it and can show that he is of humble origin or is a member of a minority.

The "blameless" philosophy is exemplified in the bit of doggerel by the unknown author who paraphrased the story of Tom the Piper's Son to show the current thinking of those who say the criminal is the misunderstood product of psychological trauma, as follows:

"The pig was hissed, but Tom was kissed
And sent to see a psychiatrist."

This sounds extreme and even silly, but really is this not the case when automobile owners are told that *they* are to blame for car thefts by virtue of leaving their vehicles unattended? Such thinking zeros in with deadly accuracy on the entire system of property rights as known in this nation. It is but a matter of degree to shift the blame for bank robbery to those wicked bankers who have all that money lying around . . . and besides, it's all insured so nobody really gets hurt!

The insurance is a story by itself. It has advanced to such a degree that it would come as no surprise if a professional thief's policy were placed on the market with low monthly premium, providing a policy to cushion the impact of arrest with its attendant inconvenience and expenses. (Ultimately, I suppose the "Company" would provide a substitute to serve the "insured's" time if all legal appeals failed.)

This department has noticed, as I am sure have others, a growing trend by victims of crime, especially national chain stores, to provide only sketchy details of crimes which appear to have their base in some sort of company policy related to the concept that whether solved or unsolved, the loss is insured and if solved, there could be recuperations in the form of law suit, producing of records, witness time away from the job, intimidation of witnesses, and other related phenomena. If the police feel that they are in some way being "used" it is because they know that the insurance companies uniformly require that crime be reported before a settlement can be made. We receive daily numerous reports of crimes that were discovered days and sometimes weeks earlier. The delay is explained by the victim when he reports that his company required that the incident be reported to the police. The age of insurance and irresponsibility seems to be upon and a part of us. There is hope though that a distinction can be made that will distinguish between asocial acts and anti-social acts.

Whether a man pay his bills, support his children, work for a living or not do these things should have no bearing on his personal responsibility if he decides to steal, rob, rape or murder. There is a difference between flunking school and stealing cars. There is a difference between assembly and petition and looting and burning. Illiteracy should not be confused with burglary. Surely, the United States of America and the several states have the ability and the sovereign right to make such distinctions that will prevent establishment, on an all-encompassing front, of a police state but will assure responsibility for those acts which have, since recorded time, been crimes. It is perfectly reasonable to set all sorts of technical rules around technical crimes. It is an absurdity to so surround crimes at common-law.

Sincerely yours,

HILTON GEER,
Chief of Police.

[From the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, December 1966]

"PLAYING GOD:" 5 TO 4

(The Supreme Court and the Police)

Over the past several years, whenever the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision that imposed a new restriction upon the police, many persons were heard to say: "If only the police, prosecuting attorneys, the organized bar, the state courts, or the legislatures had taken the initiative and done something about the situation there would have been no need for the Court to step in." To some of us this always seemed to be a naïve explanation of the motivation of a majority of the Justices.

Recent developments have established, to my satisfaction, the fact that the Court's majority has been determined all along to do its own policing of the police *regardless* of what any other group or any other branch of government might do by way of attempting to solve the law enforcement problems about which the Court has been so concerned. The Court's one man majority was going to continue to "play God". And "play God" it did in its June, 1966 decision in *Miranda v. Arizona* (384 U.S. 436).

For the past several years an American Law Institute committee, composed of lawyers, law teachers, and judges, with divergent viewpoints upon the subject, has devoted a tremendous amount of time and effort toward the formulation of a proposed tentative legislative code prescribing interrogation procedures for the police to follow. These endeavors of the American Law Institute began a year before the Court's 5 to 4 decision of June, 1964 in *Escobedo v. Illinois* (378 U.S. 478), and the tentative draft of the Committee's proposed code had been printed and disseminated at least three months before the *Miranda* decision.

As the Institute's committee was working on its project, so was a comparably composed American Bar Association Committee on Minimum Standards of Criminal Justice. One of its sub-committees had been assigned to deal specifically with the police interrogation problem and to make recommendations, and it was working closely with the Institute's committee toward that end. Its existence and activities were also known to the Court long before the *Miranda* decision.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Criminal Justice was also deeply engaged in a study of many aspects of criminal investigation that inevitably would have produced facts and figures helpful to a full consideration of the interrogation-confession problem. And other studies were underway, such as those by the District of Columbia Crime Commission and the Georgetown Law Center. Also, the Ford Foundation had recently awarded a grant of \$1,000,000, in part, for a study of arrests and confessions in New York.

Here, then, was action—in truly democratic fashion—seeking to find a proximate solution to some very difficult problems.

All of these efforts would have resulted in a full airing of the interrogation-confession problem, based upon practical as well as legal considerations. But a one man majority of the Court in *Miranda* "pulled the rug" from underneath all of these studies and research groups, and effectively foreclosed a final evaluation of their ultimate findings and recommendations. It did so by branding as unconstitutional a substantial segment of the very practices and procedures that were under consideration by these various groups. As Justice Harlan said in his dissenting opinion in *Miranda*, "the legislative reforms" that may have emanated from such group efforts "would have had the vast advantage of empirical data and comprehensive study" and "they would allow experimentation and use of solutions not open to the courts". Also in Justice Harlan's opinion, "they would restore the initiative in criminal law reform to those forums where it truly belongs."

With its *Miranda* limitations upon the validity of a suspect's waiver of the Court's newly conceived "rights" about which he must be informed, there will be many instances where police investigators are deprived of an essential means for the solution of a substantial percentage of the serious crimes that now plague this country. Only by a deliberate evasion of the *Miranda* rules might the police prevent this consequence; and this they should not do! Legally, as well as morally, the police have no alternative but full and good faith compliance. Whatever deleterious effects their compliance may bring with respect to the safety and security of law abiding citizens do not constitute a responsibility with which they should concern themselves. To use the words of one of the Supreme Court Justices in another context, "There are others who must shoulder much of that responsibility".

Considering the complexity of the interrogation-confession problem, a summary 5 to 4 nullification of much of the aforementioned group efforts directed toward the preparation of legislative guidelines is awesomely inconsistent with fundamental democratic concepts.

It's more like "Playing God: 5 to 4".

FRED E. INBAU, *Editor-in-Chief*.

CITY OF XENIA, OHIO,
DIVISION OF POLICE,
March 3, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.*

HONORABLE SIR: Thank you for your request asking for my views and suggestions regarding the decisions of the Supreme Court. Although many of the decisions of the Supreme Court have affected the Police Service, I doubt whether all of them collectively have caused an impact such as the *Miranda* decision.

It seems to me that the Supreme Court has attempted to right the wrongs of a few policemen by penalizing all of us. There is no denying that many citizens were denied their constitutional rights before we started to train our men; there is no denying that many policemen guarded the citizen's constitutional rights and obtained convictions through the practice of proper investigation techniques, thus giving society proper protection and service—these officers have been slapped down for doing a good job for the actions of a few.

It seems inconceivable that we, as police officers, are not allowed to question a suspect without the suspect's counsel present. Are we allowed to be present when the suspect confers with his attorney?

I do not advocate an unreasonable period of time for questioning, however, it seems

that we should be allowed a sufficient period of time to question a suspect in proper surroundings, without interference from outside sources. Proper questioning will many times eliminate suspicions from a subject completely. Proper questioning will many times solve a case in a very short time. Thus, with proper questioning, under proper conditions, without interference or outside influences, we would be able to serve the citizens of our City in the manner they demand.

How are crimes to be solved when the required evidence is non-existent?

We are not asking for complete freedom in our investigations; we are asking for realistic procedures that we can follow with the knowledge that our properly conducted investigations will be accepted and not thrown out of court by a technicality.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD W. MILLER,
Chief of Police.

BOROUGH OF RIVER EDGE,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
River Edge, N.J., February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: In compliance with your request that members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police write to you expressing their views and offering suggestions regarding the Supreme Court decisions, I am writing to you to give you an example of one instance in which the efforts of this department were thwarted in the prosecution of complaints of larceny against two adults and one juvenile. The matter was dismissed upon the mere allegation that the defendants had not been advised of their rights.

I realize that the instance I cite is indeed minor compared to the many perpetrators of heinous crimes who have gone scot-free because of the effect of recent Supreme Court decisions. Not only have these culprits gone unpunished for the crimes they have committed but also are free to prey upon society with what amounts to immunity from the law.

The last thing that those of us in law enforcement desire to do is to deprive any individual of his rights. It is part of our duty to protect the rights of the citizenry. It is also part of our duty to protect life, limb and property and to apprehend those people who have violated the laws of the land so that they may be brought to the bar of justice.

We do not want to judge the guilt or innocence of any defendant but we do want to have the tools with which to gather the true facts of a case and present the evidence found as the result of a good and honest investigation, made in good faith and taking every reasonable means to protect the rights of the accused. It cannot be expressed too emphatically that to lose the right to interrogate a suspect is tantamount to losing the ability to fight crime at all.

The seasoned criminal does not have any need for advice as to what his rights are, because he knows them better than anyone else. He is hoping for the police to make that one mistake which will enable him to claim a violation of his rights so that any physical evidence which may be used against him will be barred from being introduced into the proceedings. This is not an individual viewpoint; it is an actual fact.

I cannot express too emphatically the disastrous effect that recent decisions have had upon the morale of the police. This effect is even being felt by the dedicated policeman who, in the past, has risen above the obstacles placed in his path in his fight against crime. How much longer can he be expected to dedicate himself to his job if he is thwarted and frustrated in his every effort?

We, in law enforcement, hope that men such as you will take up this fight and return to the police those tools which are necessary for them to do an honest job of protecting all of the Citizenry.

With thanks for anything you may be able to do in aiding the fight for law enforcement against crime, I am,

Respectfully yours,

EVERETT M. CRANDELL,
Chief of Police.

THE TOWNSHIP OF BRIDGEWATER,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Somerville, N.J., March 1, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I have been informed that you, as Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, have scheduled hearings on March 7, 8 and 9, 1967, regarding the United States Supreme Court decisions which have so much affected local law enforcement.

The most recent decisions have placed a severe hardship on the local enforcement officer and his supporting taxpayers, as an example; this department was bothered by a rash of break, entry and larcenies in one section of our municipality where there are new homes being erected. At 3:00 a.m. one morning, one of our patrol cars found a man coming out of a woods in the midst of this housing development. This person is well known to the department because of his prior criminal record. When the officer stopped to question the man and informed him of his rights under the recent Supreme Court decision, the suspect stated that he did not wish to be questioned and our man could go no further because if he were detained and brought to headquarters, we would be violating his constitutional rights by questioning him in a "custodial atmosphere."

I am sure you are well aware of the recent bitter dismissal in New York State, of murder convictions against a man who very frankly admitted killing six people. It is horrible to think that this person is free to roam the streets and commit his atrocities again.

I don't believe any police department is seeking a completely free hand in the apprehension of criminals or would deny anyone the due process of law, but we do very strongly feel that the Supreme Court has overstepped its bounds, especially in the *Miranda et al* case.

I realize you are fighting a tremendous uphill battle in attempting to lessen the burden placed on police officials, and I wish you the very best in your endeavors.

Very truly yours,

DIX R. M. FEYZER,
Chief.

MARYLAND POLICE TRAINING COM-
MISSION,
Pikesville, Md., February 27, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Crimi-
nal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building, Washington,
D.C.*

SIR: The International Association of Chiefs of Police has called to my attention the hearing scheduled before your Committee on March 7, 8 and 9, 1967, relative to S. 674 intended to amend Title 18, U.S. Code with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

Without commenting in any way as to the correctness of recent Supreme Court decisions dealing with the conduct of law enforcement in the course of criminal investigation, I cannot help but express my sympathy with any legislation having as its object the lessening of such restrictions placed upon law enforcement. I am completely

mindful of the necessity for zealously protecting the rights of individuals, which rights have been granted to them by the Constitution of the United States. I cannot help but wonder, however, at the necessity of some decisions, particularly where there has been a close division in opinion on the part of Justices when such decisions obviously favor the rights of an individual over the seemingly more important rights of society, particularly with respect to the protection of society against the actions of criminal and subversive elements.

Accordingly I should like to commend your Subcommittee for its concern in this respect and its efforts within the framework of the Constitution to make easier the role of law enforcement in the protection of society.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. VAN WAGONER.

CITY OF GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS,
Columbus, Ohio, February 24, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: With respect to your proposed legislation, S. 674, I would like to offer the support of our small municipal police agency. We are a suburban community of approximately 10,000 population, located in the metropolitan area of Columbus, Ohio.

The resultant theory to the recent Escobedo, Miranda, Mapp, and other Supreme Court decisions, that police investigations must rest basically upon scientific evidence is, in my opinion, a gross injustice to the law abiding American citizen. It is unreasonable to believe that the majority of enforcement agencies can equip, train, or hire personnel so as to conduct criminal investigations with the same professional approach as that of the Federal Agencies or the large metropolitan departments.

We, of course, cannot permit police misconduct, third degree tactics, nor the abridgment of our civil liberties, however, I sincerely believe that the rights of the innocent must take precedent to those of the criminal.

I, therefore, urge and support your committee's efforts to correct, through legislation, the adverse effects imposed upon local law enforcement by the United States Supreme Court.

Very truly yours,

D. L. MILLER,
Chief, Division of Police.

OFFICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Saugus, Mass., February 24, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is gratifying to know that someone knows about the problems of Law Enforcement Agencies and is doing something about it. You are to be congratulated for your stand in reference to the recent U.S. Supreme Court one-man majority decisions.

Much has been said about these decisions and how they hamper the normal process of reasonable criminal investigations, and whatever I may say would be superfluous.

I do find from my own personal experience, as a law enforcement officer, that many cases have been lost in court as the result of these decisions and some cases did not even reach the court because the police were unable to interrogate the suspect.

Time will not permit me to give you the facts on every case but here are a few examples.

1) A short while ago we had an epidemic of school, church and hospital fires. We apprehended the culprit responsible for the school and church fires because he did not invoke his constitutional rights. The per-

son responsible for the hospital fires refused to say anything and although our investigation disclosed that he was responsible for the fires, the evidence was not sufficient to prosecute. Needless to say he committed similar crimes with the same results.

2) Two burglaries occurred one night in Saugus. A few days later culprits were arrested in another jurisdiction for crimes committed there. At the time of the arrest property was seized including property that had been stolen in two Saugus burglaries. The subjects refused to speak invoking their constitutional rights. When brought before the court the judge sustained a motion to suppress all evidence for the illegal search and seizure and the case was dismissed. Is it any wonder that the crime rate is increasing enormously year after year in every city and town of our country? With the ridiculous decisions of individual rights for the criminals, the crime rate is going to increase rather than diminish.

I believe that greater latitude should be given to Law Enforcement Officers in the field of Arrest, Search & Seizure and interrogation in order to combat crime.

Thank you for your cooperation and with deep personal regards I am,

Very truly yours,

FRED FORNI,
Chief, Saugus Police Department.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, CITY OF
MEQUON, WIS.,
Mequon, Wis., February 23, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee, Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My purpose in corresponding with you is to commend you for your * * * personnel. Recent decisions involving Miranda and Escobedo have certainly tipped the scales of justice directly in favor of the criminal element.

Another impending decision, namely U.S. versus Lewis could effectively decision law enforcement out of existence, should the U.S. Supreme Court reverse the lower court decisions.

Although our agency has complied with the requirements of the Fifth Amendment for many years, we have found that this is not sufficient for it is incumbent upon the prosecution to prove not only that the suspect was properly advised of his rights, but further that he thoroughly understood them. You might be interested in knowing that our agency lost a court decision in Circuit Court that involved the arrest and subsequent prosecution of an intoxicated driver of a motor vehicle involved in a fatal auto accident wherein an innocent person was killed. The court held that although the arresting officers had twice advised the suspect of his Constitutional Rights, it felt that because the subject was so intoxicated, he was unable to properly understand them. The burden placed upon law enforcement today is truly difficult to contend with.

It is my opinion that the U.S. Supreme Court has read this "advising" requirement into the Fifth Amendment, for exhaustive research on my part fails to delineate any directives requiring that police officers must so do.

Yours truly,

ROBERT L. MILKE,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF NORTH OLMSTED,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
North Olmstead, Ohio, February 24, 1967.
Re bill, S. 674.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: It is very gratifying to see legislation being introduced on the above Bill.

If it takes an unanimous decision of the jury to find a defendant guilty of a felony, I feel that there should be a greater majority than five to four in handing down decisions which become the law of the land.

I had the occasion to attend a seminar in Ann Arbor, Michigan on August 1, 1966. There were mostly Defense Attorneys present and the common thought among them was that "they at last had the law enforcement officer where they wanted him." A few examples were mentioned concerning "police brutality," but none were recent occasions. They were all at least forty to fifty years ago.

I wholeheartedly agree with rights for the individual, but all I have been noticing in recent decisions is "rights for the criminal." When is the law abiding citizen going to have representation?

Any person who has any law enforcement experience knows that confession alone does not make a case. There should be some coordinating evidence to build a case. At the same time, one of the most important points of investigation is interrogation. Many times during an interrogation the smartest suspect may unconsciously drop a remark which presents a lead to the crime. Even this is ruled out now. For example; a woman's scream is heard from a house at 3:00 A.M. A male runs from behind the house. The law officer stops suspect and asks the following questions.

1. Who are you?
2. Where do you live?
3. Where have you been?
4. Where are you going?

If the officer did not advise the suspect of his rights before he asked questions three and four, the officer has violated the suspects rights.

My honest feeling is that we are going overboard to protect the criminal in recent decisions and it is about time to protect the honest and law abiding citizen. It is about time the cases were tried on the merits of the cases instead of technicalities.

As I said before, it is highly appreciated that a person of your status and importance as taken an interest in our problems. I sincerely hope you will receive the response and support for the Bill S. 674.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY W. HIRD,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF CUDAHY, WIS.
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
February 25, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As Chief of Police in the City of Cudahy, I heartily endorse any legislation that will lift some of the burdensome restrictions brought about by the Miranda Decision.

The full impact of this decision cannot be adequately assessed by merely comparing the number of confessions obtained before and after the decision was rendered. A more realistic picture is presented when one considers the following:

Witnesses and other people with pertinent information are now reluctant to cooperate with investigators, especially after the required warnings are recited.

Physical evidence at crime scenes is overlooked, or its value to the prosecution deteriorates, because investigators are prohibited from making the necessary inquiries that would lay proper foundation for introduction in court.

Many prosecutors have become so sensitive to the rules set down by Miranda that they often talk the defendant out of cooperating by long, detailed and repetitious warnings with regard to the defendant's rights. There also seems to be a good deal of confusion among prosecutors and some members of the judiciary as to the application of these rules.

It is now impossible to find two officers of the court who will give similar answers to questions on such matters as Tacit Admissions, Res Gestae Declarations, etc.

Probably the most damaging result of these decisions has been its effect on the public's attitude toward police. Many people feel that the laws and ordinances can be violated with impunity. Matters that were once treated as routine incidents now require extensive investigation and sometimes lengthy court proceedings.

This is having an adverse effect on the efficiency and morale of the police.

I honestly feel that unless some of the restrictions on questioning suspects prior to arrest are removed, crime figures will soar and conviction rates will drop.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY M. WISE,
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Muskegon Heights, Mich.,
February 24, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am very pleased, and in accord with your dismay in regard to the U.S. Supreme Court decisions of late. That this affects the ability of local law enforcement is certainly very disturbing. In the relatively short time that these decisions have been in effect, they have had adverse effects on even the very smallest police agency. I believe that this is a very important and the most significant fact concerning this matter.

Every law abiding citizen in the land is deprived of common sense law enforcement. I am sure that we are, or at least should be, cognizant of the fact that our society was founded and has been built on voluntary obedience to the law. Without this voluntary obedience by the great majority of the populace there would be utter chaos. This I am sure is evident to everyone. However, the recent Miranda decision is a great step against being part of the law abiding community. In a small department such as ours, we regard crime prevention as our number one job. The education of our youth is of prime concern, for in their hands will rest the reins of government in the future. This is most difficult when confirmed criminals are set free because of some small technicality of the law. It seems that there are factions in our society that would make it appear that voluntary obedience to the law is not what our forefathers meant in drafting the Constitution. Many of our laws refer to "reasonable and prudent person", but it certainly appears that some of the most recent decisions of the Supreme Court have disregarded reason.

We as law enforcement officers have a definite responsibility—to ourselves for choosing this profession, and to the people we serve, for their faith and confidence in us to maintain a peaceful society. I am sure they realize we cannot do the job alone, and it is most gratifying that you have shown your position by the introduction of S. 674. As a small community police department, the examples and statistics I could give you would be minute compared to the larger cities, but I can tell you this—it has affected our arrests, and most important to us, it has affected police performance. It has made police recruiting ten fold more difficult.

I sincerely thank you for the opportunity to make this brief expression and wish you all the success in your endeavors. You are an extremely popular Senator in the eyes of law enforcement and I hope all law abiding citizens. Your immediate constituents can be very proud of their man in the Senate.

Respectfully,

JAMES J. FARKAS,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF STREATOR, ILL.,

Streator, Ill., February 24, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

YOUR HONOR: Law enforcement in our time is very difficult and trying operation. Breaking and entering, Larceny and Burglary is taken for granted by many persons to be their legal right.

In Chicago during their heavy snow, breaking into business establishments, carrying and hauling away merchandise was a huge operation and when officers attempted to make arrest, resistance occurred and they were accused of brutality as they were when the so called peaceful demonstrations were held.

After arrests are made, proof beyond doubt is demanded by attorneys for their clients.

Under present conditions a person is not safe in his own home. Forced entries are made, occupants are threatened, tortured, raped, tied up, valuables stolen and some are murdered and the offender is not easily apprehended. If and when apprehension is made, proof must be established of guilt.

We know we must inform those who are placed under arrest as to what their Constitutional rights are.

Release on Bond, especially on offenses in Chapter 38 of the Criminal Code of the IRS., is a simple matter. Once out on bond, many commit other crimes and some fail to appear in court on date set for them.

Long delays in bringing cases to trial. Changes of location for trial to be held takes additional time. All such actions pile up a backlog and bring on discouragement.

I do not believe that the Founding Fathers of our Constitution intended for the criminals to be protected as they are today. I believe that this protection be given to the Law Abiding Citizens.

In recent years, Attorneys for the Defense have used and are using every technicality to sway Jurors and Judges to point out and define a Statute in a manner that their Client is innocent of the offense committed. Even Attorneys do not agree on definitions many times of the Statutes.

The Supreme Court of the United States has laid down Rules that we as Officers must follow. We have been Handcuffed. Crime can be reduced. We as officers have the knowledge, ability and are willing to enforce the State laws and City Ordinances and assist each other of any department and the F.B.I. We are and there is no doubt every department has and is. The Handcuffs Must Be Removed from us.

The pendulum has swung too far in favor of the criminals. It must swing back to ours and swiftly. When it does, there will be a reduction.

Allocating of monies to fight crime is necessary. Just as necessary are Amendments or Enactments of laws which will permit officers to protect Law abiding citizens and our free way of life.

Respectfully yours,

ANDREW KOLESAR,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF MERIDIAN,
Meridian, Miss., February 24, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of a memorandum dated February 21st, 1967 from the International Association of Chiefs of Police of which I am a member and it is my understanding in this letter that you have introduced Bill No. S. 674, which is to amend Title 18, U.S. Code with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

Senator, as a career man in law enforcement and Chief of Police for the past thirty-four years, I am whole heartedly in favor of your bill to try to give the police officers part of the rights back that rightfully belong to them. We are operating under conditions now where the criminal is the most respected person and the law enforcement officer is the out-cast. Unless the law enforcement men of this country get some relief from some of the Supreme Court decisions rendered, then I feel that in a matter of a few years true law enforcement will become a thing of the past and the criminal element will take charge. I am sure you are aware of what this will mean to society and our way of life.

I would like to relate a case we recently had in our County: There was a sailor at the McCain Air Force Base who beat his two year old son to death and threw his body into a nearby lake. The Navy personnel handled this case. He was indicted at the last term of the Grand Jury and the District Attorney, Mr. George Warner felt under the "Miranda" decision that he had no alternative but to noll-process this case and send it to file.

This case was an unusual one and when this happened the public became highly indignant. Nevertheless, the man was set free.

It is time for true Americans who love their country more than anything else stand up and be counted and you can put me down as one of these. It is my prayer and my earnest hope that you will meet with unanimous approval and favorable consideration in the passage of your bill which will enable us to start back on the long road of forcing the criminals of our country to respect and fear the laws of the land.

Sincerely, your friend,

C. L. GUNN,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am convinced that recent United States Supreme Court decisions have put a burden on police in the nation and have affected every law abiding citizen of this country.

These decisions, in effect, have not caused less respect for law and order by criminals and hoodlums because they have none to begin with. It has caused a lack of respect for the police, being unable to enforce the law, and a lessening of fear for the consequences, if caught.

The police can adjust to the interpretations of the Court but the law abiding citizen will never be able to understand why we cannot protect his rights from the criminal and hoodlum.

It is my opinion that Mr. Average Citizen does not appreciate nor understand the release of admitted murderers, sex criminals, etc., merely because the accused had not conferred with an attorney before the admission.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. SHAVER,
Chief of Police.

WAUSAU POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Wausau, Wis., February 27, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Law and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to take this opportunity to express my views and objections to the problems fostered on the police by the Supreme Court Decisions in the Escobedo and Miranda decisions.

We have experienced a great deal of difficulty in clearing cases involving criminals with previous records. These persons, when apprehended, are hiding behind their so called rights and refuse to answer questions, consequently only cases with physical evidence and witnesses are being cleared. We are not having any problems with the first offenders. These persons willingly waive their rights and confess to their crimes.

The retroactive order of the Miranda Decision suppressed evidence secured by a statement in a vicious sex murder case in Wausau in July 1966. The statement was suppressed in its entirety due to the ruling. Included in the statement was an account of happenings leading to the crime which were not witnessed by anyone except the victim and the murderer. As a result the Murderer pleaded insanity and was found insane which would not have been possible had the statement been allowed as evidence.

Other points that I wish to make and feel are important are: the many man hours needed to secure evidence enough for conviction of the criminal and the great lack of available laboratory facilities to examine the evidence secured.

Then also the image of Law Enforcement has been harmed. The feeling of the man on the street is that the police have "goofed" and had to be put in their place by the Court. There has been relatively no feeling exhibited for the victims of crime.

These are only a few of the views and as time goes by the real damage will be noted. As a policeman for the past thirty years I wish God's speed in correcting a bad situation.

Sincerely,

EVERETT GLEASON,
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Manteca, Calif., February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I would like to add my support to your bill (S. 674). It is my opinion, related on my personal experience, that the Supreme Court has gone past a reasonable man's interpretation of the Constitution. I think it is time the rights of the victims of crimes be considered and society's right to be protected against violence and crime be brought to the forefront.

Guilt or innocence no longer seems to be a factor in our courts. The contest now is to see if the defense can find any minute detail that may have been overlooked by the police to free a guilty person and return him to prey on society.

Very truly yours,

DAVID WALSH,
Chief of Police.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
Baton Rouge, February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I have just received a memorandum from Mr. Quinn Tamm, Executive Director, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., regarding hearings by the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures scheduled March 7, 8, and 9, 1967.

Law enforcement agencies join you and the other Senators and Representatives in your concern with regard to recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions which are adversely affecting the ability of those agencies to fulfill their responsibilities.

This will advise you that the under-signed strongly favors legislation such as S. 674, which I understand is a bill to amend Title

18, U.S. Code with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions. Such legislation, I believe will do much to relieve the almost impossible situation law enforcement agencies have been faced with since the Miranda decision.

With best wishes for success in this matter, I am

Yours very truly,

THOMAS D. BURBANK,
Director.

LANE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE,
Eugene, Oreg., February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I was requested by Quinn Tamm, Executive Director, of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., of which I am a member, to contact you regarding the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures. I would like to express my opinion as follows:

The lack of statements from accused criminals has forced the police to pursue a more painstaking and expensive type of investigation than was formerly necessary prior to the Supreme Court Decisions which re-defined the rights of the accused.

Formerly the police interrogated a subject and in most cases there was no reluctance on the part of the suspect to give a statement. This eliminated the painstaking technical search of each and every crime scene for physical evidence necessary to connect the suspect with the crime.

This time consuming police work coupled with the expensive laboratory work necessary to process evidence obtained has posed the problem of obtaining more personnel, more laboratory space and equipment. Personnel, time, laboratory expense, all run into vast amount of money which is absolutely uncalled for in this writer's opinion. The accused was never mistreated by any enlightened enforcement officer and in most cases was always willing to admit a crime in which he was involved. The scientific crime scene search and laboratory evaluation has merely replaced scientific interrogation with no advantage to the criminal, but adding a great burden on the taxpayer.

We in law enforcement certainly feel that the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions are adversely affecting the ability of local law enforcement agencies to fulfill our responsibilities.

Very truly yours,

HARRY H. MARLOWE,
Sheriff, Director of Public Safety.

CITY OF COLUMBIA, S.C.,
February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of a memorandum from Mr. Quinn Tamm, Executive Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, relative to Bill S. 674, which is a Bill to amend Title 18, U.S. Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

Senator, I have looked at several major cases which were committed recently in our city. Frankly, I could cite many, many cases of this nature. We've found that the Supreme Court rulings have caused us considerable hardship in preparing cases for Court. They have not only tied our hands in readying a case for Court, but burdened us in that three or four days are now required to prepare a case. In many instances, the suspects have gone free, when we knew they were guilty.

It is my personal feeling as a veteran law officer with 37 years' service, 26 as Chief of Police, that the Supreme Court rulings have

hindered law enforcement far more than anything that I can recall during my long career. The demonstrations by the youth on the Civil Rights issues were the beginning of crime increase in our nation. In addition to this, the Supreme Court rulings have added a "stumbling block" to the enforcement of law and order in our present day society.

Very truly yours,

L. J. CAMPBELL,
Chief of Police.

Attachment.

RECENT U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS AFFECTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

It is our opinion that the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the "Miranda Case" have hindered law enforcement. The Supreme Court should give thought to the rights of law-abiding citizens as well as the undesirables. Under presently-existing conditions, the law-abiding citizens, who are victims of rape, murder, and other type crimes, have no rights. The Supreme Court has leaned over so far that they have fallen off the cliff in favor of the criminals, in guaranteeing them of their personal rights.

CASE ILLUSTRATION NO. 1

A subject was apprehended running from a resident yard at 2:00 a.m. The residence had been burglarized. This subject was warned of his rights, that anything he said could be used against him in Court, that he had the right to engage an attorney before answering questions, and, if he could not financially afford one, the Court would appoint one, without cost. This *hardened criminal* was allowed to go free as he refused to answer any questions. The owner of this residence was unable to identify subject.

CASE ILLUSTRATION NO. 2

The Crystal Linen Service, 803 Main Street, this City, was entered on Christmas Day, 1966. The owner came by his business at which time two burglars ran out the back door. The owner could only describe them as two white males. The police apprehended two men, one fleeing approximately two blocks from the business, who was later identified as one Kenneth Chapman. He refused to answer any questions, giving only the name of Bill Splvey, which was false. During his incarceration (bond was set, but he was unable to make it), a report of his fingerprints was received, indicating that he was an escaped prisoner from the State of Georgia, where he was serving twelve years for bank robbery.

Subject #2 in this case, one Walter Turner, refused to make any statement and demanded an attorney. After getting his prints off to the Bureau in Washington and a report therefrom, he had been released on bond, and it was learned that he was wanted for parole violation. As of this date, the subject is still at large. His car was found less than a block from the Crystal Linen Service with a complete set of burglary tools in it. The car was properly registered to Walter Turner of Georgia. He was indicted in this city for possession of burglary tools. These two subjects had entered this business establishment, moved the safe to the rear of the building where they were performing a "peel" job, and was surprised by the owner. They did not enter the safe.

This case was marked "cleared" by the arrest of Chapman. His attorney advised him that, through the Police Department returning him to Georgia with no prosecution on this end, we were able to clear this case. Through advice of his attorney, he re-nacted the crime for us, so there is no doubt concerning this crime.

CASE ILLUSTRATION NO. 3

A man died and an autopsy was performed to ascertain the cause of death. Findings revealed poisoning. During the investiga-

tion, it was revealed that his wife had taken out a \$5,000 life insurance policy on subject several months prior to death. The wife was brought to headquarters for questioning, but prior to leaving home she called her attorney who met her at headquarters. On the very first question, in the presence of her attorney, she was asked, "can you tell us about your husband having been poisoned;" and this concluded the interrogation. The case is still unsolved.

I could, without any difficulty, cite many other cases where the "Miranda Case" has hindered law enforcement. Since this decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, cases that usually took one day to investigate, now take three to four days.

DRAPER POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Draper, N.C., February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: As one who has been in law enforcement work for seventeen years, I wish to protest the U.S. Supreme Court Decisions affecting local law enforcement.

The Miranda decision has practically paralyzed the Police Departments' efforts to make an honest investigation and is an insult to American intelligence.

Anything that can be done to relieve this situation and allow the Police Departments to help make our Country a safer place for honest God-fearing citizens, will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,
WILLIE H. ADKINS,
Chief of Police, Town of Draper, Draper,
N.C.

MONMOUTH COUNTY POLICE CHIEFS
ASSOCIATION, INC., OF NEW JERSEY,
February 27, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Our Association wishes to advise that we are entirely in accord with your expressions and actions relative to the hearings to be held by the United States Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, March 7, 8 and 9, 1967 regarding U.S. Supreme Court decisions affecting local law enforcement.

We forward this communication to you for use at said hearings as we would like our position noted on the record. We greatly respect all laws of our country but feel that recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions have adversely affected the ability of local law enforcement agencies to fulfill their responsibilities, to the greatest degree possible.

We respect and protect the rights of all citizens but do not feel that the public's welfare should be jeopardized by unreasonable legislation or judicial interpretation that unreasonably hampers law enforcement activities.

We feel that the degree of limitation as to the obtaining of confessions should be specifically delineated in legislation so that investigative procedures by law enforcement agencies would grant unto such agencies the ability to interrogate suspects in such latitude to protect everyone's interest and to still have justice preserved.

The broad spectrum of recent court decisions, including the Miranda case goes, we feel, beyond reasonable limitations and does in many instances create situations which are adverse to the public's best interests.

We trust that our experience and our views based thereon, will be of aid concerning this vital issue.

Respectfully yours,
MONMOUTH COUNTY POLICE CHIEFS
ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY,
FRANCIS M. SCALLY, President.

CXIII—349—Part 4

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,

Grand Forks, N. Dak., February 18, 1967.
HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, in law enforcement, are sincerely interested in the recent Supreme Court decisions affecting law enforcement over the nation. Most people fail to realize that law enforcement is the first line of defense of our nation and unless we are able to do the task assigned, then, certainly we all must fail.

Today's youngsters are losing their respect for law enforcement and the courts because of the conditions imposed upon law enforcement and on the ability to handle juveniles with dispatch and clarity.

In the past few days we have arrested one-eighteen year old and two-sixteen year old boys involved in approximately fifteen burglaries. The eighteen year old was treated as an adult and placed in jail. The two-sixteen year olds had to be turned loose to go on their way and supposedly in charge of their parents. Equal treatment is not for all this day and age.

Changes must be made to protect the citizen for he is the forgotten person in the United States today.

Yours for equal law enforcement with justice,

S. D. KNUTSON, N.A.,
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
BUREAU OF POLICE, CITY OF
MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
March 1, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.
Re U.S. Senate hearing regarding U.S.
Supreme Court decisions.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I wish to congratulate you for the fine speech that you delivered before the Senate recently. As a member of the IACP and as a professional police officer since 1932, I too have expressed dismay with regard to recent United States Supreme Court Decisions which are adversely affecting the ability of local police officers to fulfill their responsibilities in combatting the ever mounting acceleration of crime.

The Court seems to prey on the victims of crime instead of safeguarding society against the vicious confirmed criminals. The Court is not even certain of its own findings in giving 5 to 4 decisions and is committed to the illogical pursuit of tenuous technicalities which it recklessly invokes to nullify the convictions of confirmed criminals. These decisions affect every city, village and hamlet.

As Inspector of Police of Mount Vernon, New York Police Department in 1953, I investigated the apprehension and conviction for murder of one Chester Lee. Thirteen years later, in 1966, as a result of the Miranda decision, a retrial disputing the statement taken by a District Attorney, resulted in the release of the defendant. I enclose a newspaper article from the New York Daily News which illustrates the case in point.

I exhort your Senate colleagues to vote favorably on your Bill S. 674 to amend Title 18, U.S. Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

I also recommend the national legal use of wiretapping and eavesdropping to curb the accelerating rise of the sale of narcotics, the violation of gambling laws, the vicious felonies that terrorize our residents and homeowners and the destruction of crime syndicates.

It is time that the people support and the Legislators enact laws that favor police investigation and police action to deter the rise of crime.

Rest assured of our cooperation in all matters of mutual concern.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE F. KUMMERLE,
Commissioner of Public Safety,
City of Mount Vernon, N.Y.

CITY OF BINGHAMTON, N.Y.,
February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: This is in response to the memorandum forwarded to members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., by Mr. Quinn Tamm, Executive Director regarding Supreme Court decisions concerning the function.

I will restrict myself to one consideration only which to my knowledge I have never heard come under discussion. This is the necessity for police officers to give, what has come to be called "The Miranda Warning" to suspects.

Specifically, that this places an unfair burden on a policeman in that he is required to "educate" citizens as to their constitutional contents. Were the suspect an alien I could understand and appreciate this warning but I feel that all citizens should know the U.S. Constitution forward and backwards.

But, my main thought on this matter is that this requirement places another opportunity for corruption in an enforcement officer's hands in that he could effect the release of a defendant by falling or stating he failed to comply with this requirement.

If for no other reason I oppose this requirement.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN V. GILLEN,
Chief of Police.

ST. CLOUD, MINN.,
March 2, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Criminal
Law and Procedure, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: We have recently received a letter from the Executive Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, which indicates that your committee will hold hearings on proposed changes in the laws of admissibility of confessions in criminal procedures. In the letter, it was indicated that you requested correspondence from members of the IACP regarding Supreme Court decisions, with emphasis on the recent Miranda decision. I would presume that you have received replies from Police Administrators throughout the country, and that some of them will be heard before your committee. As a police officer I am vitally interested in the outcome of the hearings, and more important, the possibility of remedial legislation.

We in the police profession have been plagued in recent years with adverse decisions which have allowed criminals to go free, even though guilty, and in many cases being set free before any criminal prosecution is started, simply because of a narrow Supreme Court decision. I think it is important to point out that Police officers generally agree that the rights of the accused are important, but they do not agree with the methods of the court in setting up guidelines in how these rights should be protected.

The reason for my writing to you is that I sincerely hope that not all of your witnesses are Police Chiefs or Police Commissioners of large cities. I would hope that you would talk to the Police Officer who is out doing the work. The detective or Police patrolman is much nearer the problem in many instances, than the Police administrator. The administrator will bring out statistics on the number of cases that have been lost

because of the court decision, but the Police officer will be able to testify to the actual difficulties involved in attempting to remain within the law in clearing a case.

St. Cloud is not a large city, population is about 40,000, but our problems in this area are the same as those in Chicago, New York City & Los Angeles. Our crime rate is probably not as high, but when we come in contact with a suspected criminal, our procedure is the same as that in any other part of the country. You have requested specific examples of cases involving the Miranda decision. In the past week our department recovered a stolen car under circumstances that if the Miranda decision had not been made, a charge of unauthorized use of a motor vehicle would certainly have been made. Due to a recent snow our officers tracked an individual to his home. He was a known car thief, but was not contacted on the night in question. The following day he was picked up on a warrant on another charge and lodged in the County Jail. When one of our Detectives attempted to question him regarding the car theft he first advised him of his rights and the person in custody refused to talk to him. An auto theft may not seem too important in an isolated instance of this nature, but multiplied nationally it becomes a very grave problem.

A case I was involved in may, or may not be affected by the Miranda decision, even though the Miranda warning was given. I was assigned to investigate a possible violation of the National Firearms Act at a local manufacturing plant. The case involved the possession of a sawed off shotgun by one of the employees. I entered the office of the personnel manager and he, his assistant and another man were present. The personnel manager was examining the gun in question and stated that the foreman had informed him that one of the employees had the gun in the plant. Since this was a violation of the company rules, the manager explained that he had gone to the work area in question and had confiscated the gun. I questioned him for several minutes and then turned to the third man in the room, presuming him to be the foreman and asked him about the situation. It turned out that this individual was the owner of the gun and he stated that it was his and that he had modified it himself. He stated that he had brought it to the plant with the intention of showing it to another employee with the possibility of selling it to him. It was at this point that I informed him of his rights based on the Miranda decision. There is the possibility that the Government may not prosecute this individual under the National Firearms Act, but merely content themselves with collecting the tax due on the weapon. However, if the Federal District Attorney should decide to prosecute on the charge, I suppose that the possibility exists that the admissibility of the man's statements might be successfully argued by a defense attorney. This of course involves a great deal of speculation, and I am quite sure that you would be able to secure much better cases to illustrate the effects of the Miranda decision, but I did want to point out that all Police officers are bound by the same rules.

In closing I would like to make one more plea to have at least some of the working force of Police departments testify before your committee. Only by talking to the men directly involved, and hearing from them the number of times that they have had to abandon a sure case merely because they have not been able to question a suspect, will your committee have an opportunity to assess the real impact of these decisions.

I would like to add that the Supreme Court has had one good effect on the Police Profession. Because of the increasing demands on law enforcement, it has become incumbent on police administrators to attempt to attract highly qualified people to

the careers in the Police service. Our department has become aware of the need of careful selection of qualified persons for the department. We have had a difficult time in the last few years to fill vacancies, but our Chief would rather run a man or two short, rather than hire an unqualified person for the mere sake of being at full strength.

I would like to thank you for the interest you and your committee have shown in the problems of the Police Profession. I sincerely hope that some remedial legislation will be forthcoming as a result of recommendations of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

Sgt. JAMES J. MOLINE,
Saint Cloud Police Department.

CITY OF CASPER, WYO.,
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Casper, Wyo., March 1, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am in receipt of a letter from the International Association of Chiefs of Police in regard to your work on the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures.

I wish to commend you in your efforts to restore some logic in the handling of statements taken from defendants and evidence obtained during investigation through interrogation. A typical case of injustice through the recent supreme court decision was in the City of Douglas, Wyoming, in 1965.

On December 27, 1965, Lynette Powell, age 16, disappeared from a home where she was babysitting. The following morning her body was found in the river and she had been stabbed twice in the chest. A short time later Richard Rogers was arrested, advised of his rights, and confessed to the murder. He showed the law enforcement officers where he had hidden the knife he had used in the stabbing of the girl and told them where he had thrown the body in the river. This case was not taken to trial because the judge ruled under the supreme court decision that no evidence could be allowed through interrogation. Richard Rogers was turned loose and never tried for the crime.

I hope through your efforts that at least common sense can be used in the handling of prisoners, and again, I want to commend you for all the work you have done to help the law enforcement profession.

Respectfully,

PAUL V. DANIGAN,
Chief, Casper Police Department.

CITY OF KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
February 28, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As Chief of Police of Knoxville, Tennessee, I should like to express our sincere appreciation for your introduction of Senate Bill 674, and to assure you of our support of any legislation designed to free Law Enforcement from the shackles of recent Supreme Court decisions.

Every person with any knowledge of Law Enforcement realizes that interrogation is a necessary part of Police investigative procedure and that, in many cases, it is the only key to the solution of the crime. If we apprehend a known criminal in the vicinity of a burglary, with the loot therefrom in his possession, must we have his attorney present before we ask him how he came by that stolen property? If, because of the overwhelming circumstantial evidence against him, he confesses his guilt to the Officers bringing him to Police Headquarters, shall the court rule out his subsequent confession because his attorney was not present when he made his original admission of guilt?

We make no attempt to justify the isolated instances of abuse of Police powers in the past. In common with Law Enforcement Agencies everywhere, we guard zealously against even the appearance of such abuse. We have no "third degree"; officers interrogating suspects are very careful to offer neither threats nor promises. For many years, our State Courts have provided counsel if the defendant in a criminal trial is unable to afford an attorney.

With these policies, we are in whole-hearted agreement. However, to arrest a criminal under suspicious circumstances and to be unable to even question him regarding his guilt; or to be unable to use as evidence his voluntary statement regarding that guilt is an illogical overemphasis on the constantly-increasing rights of the criminal, while totally ignoring the declining rights of his victims—the right of society as a whole to protection under the law. It is emasculation of Law Enforcement, to the point where Police and the Courts are well-nigh impotent in the performance of our sacred trust as guardians of the public safety.

We offer you the whole-hearted cooperation of this Office and of this Department, in your commendable efforts to remedy this situation.

Sincerely yours,

H. C. HUSKISSON,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF MENASHA, WIS.,
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
March 1, 1967.

Re Senate Hearings, bill S. 674.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: As a representative of law enforcement, I strongly support a change in the law regarding the admissibility of confessions. The quagmire produced by recent court decisions is effecting police operations because of the lack of operational guidelines.

In many circumstances, a confession is readily available from a suspect when he is confronted with facts relating to the case. The restrictions set forth in the Miranda rulings and the various interpretations given in the news media confuse everyone involved.

I am certain that no one who lives in this country wants to lose any of his rights granted under the Constitution. By the same token, a truly professional enforcement officer does not want to violate those rights.

The rights of law enforcement should also be considered and liberalized, and such legislation is long overdue.

Very truly yours,

LESTER D. CLARK,
Chief.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Danbury, Conn., February 23, 1967.
Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal
Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: First, let me tell you how happy I am that you are the Chairman of this very important Committee, also that you are such an outstanding member of the Democratic party.

It is with a deep feeling of respect and admiration for you that I ask that you do everything within your power to have S. 674, which will amend Title #18, U. S. Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

All police departments are having a very difficult time in recruiting men to the departments and it is all due to the decisions which have been handed down by the Supreme Court.

With all due respect to this fine group of men, it is a general feeling that an age limit should be set for the members of this august body.

With every best wish and trust the good lord will bless you with continued health so that you can serve your country for some period of time.

Sincerely,

J. HOWARD MCGOLDRICK,
Chief of Police.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,

Kirkwood, Mo., February 23, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCLELLAN: I wish to thank you very much for introducing Senate Bill 674 which would amend Title 18 of the U.S. Code.

In the face of the many recent Supreme Court decisions that directly affect the ability of the police to serve the public, it occurs to me that we need new rules such as the one that you propose. I think too that it might be nice if it could be legislated into being that our courts recognize a certain amount of error or mis-judgment on the part of police when cases are presented for adjudication. In any event, the bill that you have proposed would certainly go a long way to assist us in law enforcement.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

KIRKWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT,
MAX A. DURBIN, Chief of Police.

CITY OF RALEIGH, N.C.,

February 22, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am sure that I only speak the sentiment of all law enforcement officers that we appreciate your and Senator Ervin's efforts to assist law enforcement officers to do their job. Recent Supreme Court decisions have handicapped us to some extent and the situation certainly needs clarifying. I believe that our people should have enough confidence in the great majority of their law enforcement agencies to trust them with the tools needed to do an acceptable job in protecting the lives, rights and property of those same people.

Best wishes to you and if either I or this department may serve you in any way, I assure you it shall be done to the best of our ability.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chief of Police.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Phillipsburg, N.J., February 23, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I welcome your concern of recent Supreme Court decisions. It is hard to conceive just how the Miranda Supreme Court decision has shackled the efficiency and performance of police work.

While pursuing our obligation to preserve life and property, we are in turn very concerned with the rights of every citizen, being ourselves citizens and a member of the same society.

Our concern over the known criminal element walking free in our cities and towns has caused great dismay to every policeman dedicated to his career and his obligations to the people he serves.

It is with great hope that you, Senator, will be one of the first pioneers to make this Miranda decision more flexible in the name of every American citizen who cries out for

the pursuit of happiness and the absence of fear in walking the streets of our nation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BUDD,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF ORLANDO,

Orlando, Fla., February 23, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have a very timely memorandum from our Executive Director, Mr. Quinn Tamm concerning the very immature decisions made by the Supreme Court, adversely affecting Law Enforcement. These, of course, being the Mapps, Mallory, Jencks, Miranda, Escobedo and the more recent extension of the Escobedo Decision.

As a member of the Law Enforcement profession, with almost forty years experience in this field, I am truly amazed by the decisions in the above cases, along with others that have handcuffed the Police throughout our nation.

We, here in our city, have an organization of five people who have been speaking to church groups and other organizations for the past year, trying to enlighten them with the bare facts and not nebulous intangibles. It is believed that we have made some progress in this direction and we will continue to make our presentations and appearances as long as we feel that the desired and ultimate goal can be reached.

It is absolutely nauseating to see the direct result of these decisions, public apathy; complacency; and failure of our parents to assume their God Given Responsibilities. We have too many houses and not enough homes in our nation today.

Then, of course, we shouldn't overlook these so-called do-gooders who are slobbering over these "so-called unfortunate individuals" in a vain effort to find excuses for their senseless transgressions.

It is my firm belief that unless the decent law-abiding Americans, which comprise approximately ninety percent of our population, stand up and be counted as tried and true Americans, the other ten percent, which give us ninety percent of our trouble, will be dictating policies and procedures for our guidance in the future.

Maybe, Sir, my words may be a little strong, but they describe my convictions most thoroughly.

If there is anything we can do here to assist you in your wonderful undertakings, please advise.

Kindest personal regards and very best wishes.

Sincerely,

CARLISLE JOHNSTONE,
Chief of Police.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,

CITY OF NEW BOSTON, OHIO,
February 23, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Miranda decision is a great deterrent to effective law enforcement. I feel that the law-abiding citizens of our great country should be able to expect and receive better protection from those who commit crimes than the Miranda decision permits.

Respectfully yours,

RUSSELL IMES,
Chief of Police, New Boston, Ohio.

NEW JERSEY ARMORED CAR SERVICE, INC.,
Pleasantville, N.J., February 24, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I regard with dismay recent and not so recent U.S. Supreme

Court decisions which prevent law enforcement agencies from protecting us from the murderer, rapist, robber and knife wielder.

The recent release in Brooklyn, N.Y. of a confessed murderer who destroyed his wife and 5 children and walked away a free man is a case in joint. How can this be possible? Daily our newspapers carry items of criminals being set free to continue their depredations of plunder and ravage.

Please, do your best to nullify these bad U.S. Supreme Court decisions and as a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police I can vouch that we are 100% behind you.

Respectfully yours,

ERNEST O. SCHEYDER.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, December 1966]

"PLAYING GOD": 5 TO 4—THE SUPREME COURT AND THE POLICE

(NOTE.—With this number of the Journal a practice is inaugurated of publishing editorial comments upon controversial subjects in the field of criminal law, criminology, police science, and police administration.

(Upon some occasions one of the editors, or an editorial consultant, will present an issue and express his own views upon it; at other times the initiative may come from writers not associated with the Journal. In either event an opportunity will always be afforded for responsible response. The response, however, must fall within the space confines of editorial comment.

(Following is an expression of a viewpoint by the Journal's Editor-in-Chief that will unquestionably draw opposing comment—very likely from one or more of the Journal's own editorial consultants.)

Over the past several years, wherever the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision that imposed a new restriction upon the police, many persons were heard to say: "If only the police, prosecuting attorneys, the organized bar, the state courts, or the legislatures had taken the initiative and done something about the situation there would have been no need for the Court to step in." To some of us this always seemed to be a naïve explanation of the motivation of a majority of the Justices.

Recent developments have established, to my satisfaction, the fact that the Court's majority has been determined all along to do its own policing of the police regardless of what any other group or any other branch of government might do by way of attempting to solve the law enforcement problems about which the Court has been so concerned. The Court's one man majority was going to continue to "play God". And "play God" it did in its June, 1966 decision in *Miranda v. Arizona* (384 U.S. 436).

For the past several years an American Law Institute committee, composed of lawyers, law teachers, and judges, with divergent viewpoints upon the subject, has devoted a tremendous amount of time and effort toward the formulation of a proposed tentative legislative code prescribing interrogation procedures for the police to follow. These endeavors of the American Law Institute began a year before the Court's 5 to 4 decision of June, 1964 in *Escobedo v. Illinois* (378 U.S. 478), and the tentative draft of the Committee's proposed code had been printed and disseminated at least three months before the *Miranda* decision.

As the Institute's committee was working on its project, so was a comparably composed American Bar Association Committee on Minimum Standards of Criminal Justice. One of its sub-committees had been assigned to deal specifically with the police interrogation problem and to make recommendations, and it was working closely with the Institute's committee toward that end. Its existence and activities were also known to the Court long before the *Miranda* decision.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Criminal Justice was also deeply engaged in a study of many aspects of criminal investigation that inevitably would have produced facts and figures helpful to a full consideration of the interrogation-confession problem. And other studies were under way, such as those by the District of Columbia Crime Commission and the Georgetown Law Center. Also, the Ford Foundation had recently awarded a grant of \$1,000,000, in part, for a study of arrests and confessions in New York.

Here, then, was action—in truly democratic fashion—seeking to find a proximate solution to some very difficult problems.

All of these efforts would have resulted in a full airing of the interrogation-confession problem, based upon practical as well as legal considerations. But a one man majority of the Court in *Miranda* "pulled the rug" from underneath all of these studies and research groups, and effectively foreclosed a final evaluation of their ultimate findings and recommendations. It did so by branding as unconstitutional a substantial segment of the very practices and procedures that were under consideration by these various groups. As Justice Harlan said in his dissenting opinion in *Miranda*, "the legislative reforms" that may have emanated from such group efforts "would have had the vast advantage of empirical data and comprehensive study" and "they would allow experimentation and use of solutions not open to the courts". Also in Justice Harlan's opinion, "they would restore the initiative in criminal law reform to those forums where it truly belongs."

With its *Miranda* limitations upon the validity of a suspect's waiver of the Court's newly conceived "rights" about which he must be informed, there will be many instances where police investigators are deprived of an essential means for the solution of a substantial percentage of the serious crimes that now plague this country. Only by a deliberate evasion of the *Miranda* rules might the police prevent this consequence; and this they should not do! Legally, as well as morally, the police have no alternative but full and good Latin compliance. Whatever deleterious effects their compliance may bring with respect to the safety and security of law abiding citizens do not constitute a responsibility with which they should concern themselves. To use the words of one of the Supreme Court Justices in another context, "There are others who must shoulder much of that responsibility".

Considering the complexity of the interrogation-confession problem, a summary 5 to 4 nullification of much of the aforementioned group efforts directed toward the preparation of legislative guidelines is awesomely inconsistent with fundamental democratic concepts.

It's more like "Playing God: 5 to 4".

FRED E. INBAU,
Editor-in-Chief.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his excellent, thought-provoking speech on the problem which confronts the people of the United States more than any other except that of Vietnam. This matter demands some remedy against the abuses that are being practiced by the many individuals who defy law and order.

I think it must be said that encouragement has been given to them because of the breakdown of our legal processes resulting primarily from the decisions of

the Supreme Court, so excellently discussed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my distinguished colleague.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to join the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Arkansas in calling this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I hope that at an early date this Congress will enact some remedial legislation which will protect the innocent as well as give protection to the accused.

The members of the Supreme Court, who were so zealous in trying to protect the constitutional rights of these criminals, should also be reminded that each of these criminals has destroyed the constitutional rights of a law-abiding American citizen.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To be safe in his home, in the streets, and in his place of business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a constitutional right that certainly is equal to all the so-called civil rights of any individual. He should have equal consideration.

In conclusion, I should like to remind Senators that the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin a series of hearings tomorrow, and we earnestly invite each Member to give thought and consideration to the problem that is confronting us, and we solicit from them every counsel and any contribution they feel they can possibly make toward a solution of this problem.

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE TIGHTENS ON KANSAS WHEATGROWERS AND CATTLEMEN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Kansas wheatgrowers and cattlemen have been experiencing an ever-tightening cost-price squeeze which has been of several months' duration.

In a period when the Government encourages production, when our food-stuffs are needed to still starvation in many parts of the world, the genius of America's farm production experiences price declines while cost increases. Labor, machinery, and land costs are all up.

It has been written that bankers in some farm communities are reporting a strong demand still for credit to buy machinery and land, and even to provide for the cost of living.

In the drought conditions which affect the wheatgrowers of Kansas—indeed, it is said that only the eastern part of Kansas now shows the green of the winter wheat which was planted late last fall—reports of farmers plowing under wheat acreage to bring supply-demand more in line may be premature. For the truth of the matter is, Mr. President, that the Kansas wheat producers do not revolt nor do the Kansas cattlemen go on strike as the press so often characterizes their concern. Yet the situation today approaches the point of a farm economy crisis.

Mr. Ray Frisbee, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau Federation, recently stated:

The economic scale is terrifyingly out of balance . . . farmers have got to have more for their produce or there is going to be a deterioration of agriculture which could affect this nation's economy.

I am advised that the following is the wheat situation in Kansas: last year at harvesttime, wheat was \$1.86 a bushel, and in the anticipation that it would rise to \$2 a bushel, many producers and growers sought to hold out until the market went up. The situation, instead, was that the market went down; and as the producers waited, the price dropped further, and last week the price had fallen to \$1.47 a bushel. Perhaps this discipline on the part of the farmer is having some effect, because last week, for the first time in 8 months, the price of wheat in Kansas markets went up after the low of 2 weeks ago.

Under these circumstances, it is a matter of great concern that the Secretary of Agriculture, who previously seemed so confident of his plans and farm policies, can now only be quoted as saying that the Government is "exploring every possible avenue" to halt the price slide.

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

Mr. PEARSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PEARSON. I would suggest that one of the avenues that the Secretary should explore to the fullest possible extent and as soon as possible is that of how to correct the image which has developed over the past 12 to 18 months that the administration is committed to a policy of keeping the lid on farm prices and, in fact, is quite willing to pursue those actions which will depress farm prices.

On February 23 I wrote to Secretary Freeman, asking for his explanation of the drastic drop in wheat prices over the past 8 months. His reply, in a letter of March 3, stated:

The decline from wheat prices quoted last summer has been attributed to a reduction in speculative activity, and the prospect of an increased world production of wheat.

Mr. President, I have quoted only part of the letter. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 3, 1967.

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of February 23 concerning a drop in wheat prices in Kansas and suggesting advance distribution of the 1967 wheat certificate payments. I, too, am concerned with farm prices weakening, costs rising, and agriculture in general still a long way from parity of income.

Commodity prices are determined by many factors. The marketing factors bringing about the decline from the wheat prices quoted late last summer have been attributed to a reduction in speculative activity.

ity, and the prospect of an increased world production of wheat. Last week the wheat market showed a considerable strengthening in cash prices and futures. We now have a free market in action. Reduction of stocks has created a greater flexibility in market prices and wider price fluctuations are being experienced more than during the years of burdensome stocks when market prices closely paralleled loan rates. The market is now more independent of government pricing than at any time in more than 30 years.

We have not made advance payments under the wheat program because the time between signup and final payment has been relatively short. Funds have not been included in the current fiscal year budget. We are studying the possibility of making our payments somewhat earlier than last year, including some payment before June 30, but we cannot be sure we will be able to do it.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would suggest that the price rise last summer occurred partly because the Department of Agriculture had considerably underestimated world wheat production. The decline in what prices then began after the Department's report in late fall that world production would be at an alltime record high, and shortly after the Department had called for an additional increase in domestic wheat acreage of 15 percent. Furthermore, about this time reports began to circulate that wheat shipments under the Public Law 480 program were to be cut by at least 25 percent.

Mr. President, I do not suggest that the earlier miscalculations about the size of the world wheat crop were deliberate on the part of the Department of Agriculture. However, the fact remains that the Johnson administration during the first part of 1966 had taken a whole series of actions designed to freeze or roll back farm prices. These earlier actions, combined with the call for an increase in wheat acreage of 32 percent, plus the curtailment of wheat exports, have had the effect of creating the distinct impression that the administration would not allow open market farm prices to achieve a level that provides fair and honest return to the American family farmer.

The current farm price situation is unjustified and intolerable. One cannot help continuing to wonder at the paradox of abundance in America and starvation abroad while the genius of American farm technology is being rewarded only by a decreasing compensation.

REVISION OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, over the weekend President Johnson released the report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service. It is an event of high significance.

For the report is an insistent call to Congress for action. It spotlights the inequities plaguing our present system of Selective Service, and then makes sound recommendations for their elimination. We in the Congress cannot tolerate the continuance of these inequities in a system charged with heavy responsibility of choosing some few who

will bear the risk of bearing arms from among the many who will not. The report calls for action, and act we must: the induction authority under the Universal Military Training and Service Act expires this June 30.

When we do act, we must construct a system as just, as fair, and as equitable as possible. Our system must be flexible, to meet changing manpower needs of the military. And it must be predictable, to allow our young men to plan their lives free from draft-eligible years of uncertainty.

The Commission's recommendations go far toward meeting these goals. They give us a sound framework within which our work can proceed. The Chairman of the Commission, former Attorney General Burke Marshall, deserves the thanks of every one of us in this Chamber for the Report he guided to completion.

Our newspapers, reflecting the intense concern generated by the prospect of draft reform, have given the report thorough coverage. They have as well made many constructive analyses of the problems the draft reform proposals face. I ask unanimous consent that several of these articles and editorials be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 5, 1967]

DRAFT REPORT URGES: END STUDENT DEFERMENTS

(By Martin Nolan)

WASHINGTON.—A presidential advisory commission has called for the abolition of all student draft deferments as part of its plan for revamping the Selective Service System.

The 21-member commission, which has examined the draft since July, released its findings Saturday in a 218-page report called "In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve?"

President Johnson is expected to incorporate many of the commission's findings in his message to Congress next week. The draft law expires July 1 and presumably a new law will take effect this Summer.

The commission was headed by former Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall, now general counsel of I.B.M. Six college teachers or administrators were members of the group, along with businessmen, labor leaders, and four former Pentagon officials.

Besides calling for an end to "further student or occupational deferments," the commission urged the reversal of drafting oldest men first to a policy of drafting youngest men first, beginning at age 19.

It also proposed a lottery, which it defined as "an order of call which has been impartially and randomly determined," as well as procedural changes within the Selective Service System itself to reduce the autonomy of local draft boards and to make standards for induction more uniform.

The commission also urged the armed services to make more use of women volunteers and to tighten standards for enlistment in the National Guard and Reserves.

Most of the reforms had been urged by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy in speeches a year ago, as well as by Pentagon studies and other reports on the nation's draft system.

But the far-reaching changes involving students are the most controversial aspects of the report. These recommendations may ignite a debate on the draft as widespread as that accompanying the reintroduction of peacetime conscription 20 years ago.

The commission report admitted that the abolition of student deferments had caused the deepest division within the commission during its seven months of work.

"No issue received such prolonged and thorough deliberation," the report said. "Only on this issue did the commission contain a substantial division of opinion."

Both sides agreed on one thing concerning deferments, that they "should never be allowed to become, in effect, exemptions".

"All members agreed that one of the gravest inequities in the present system is that what starts out as a temporary deferment for college enrollment is easily extended into a de facto exemption—by graduate school, by occupation, by fatherhood, and ultimately by the passage of time and advance of age."

The report cited statistics showing that of men between 27 and 34, only 27 per cent of those who went to graduate school have seen any military service. Of those whose education stopped at high school, 74 per cent wore uniforms.

In this age bracket, 70 percent of those who finished college have served, the same percentage as high-school dropouts.

College dropouts in this age category had a rate of 68 per cent in uniform. At the other end of the educational spectrum, 41 per cent of those with eight grade or lower educational level have served.

MAJORITY VIEWPOINT

The majority viewpoint noted the effects of the new GI Bill, which rewards veterans with a chance for college, and said that "the educational processes would not be harmed, and indeed may well be strengthened, by the abolishment of student deferments."

The minority argument was the same as that advanced by Sen. Kennedy last week, that deferments "be continued through the baccalaureate degree," i.e., at least four years.

Yale President Kingman Brewster Jr., a member of the commission, was one of the first to call attention to the inequity of college students and the military when he referred last year to the ability of collegians "to hide in the endless catacombs of formal education."

In a New York speech Friday, Brewster also spoke with favor of a "break" between high school and college to aid young men's maturity.

All commission members agreed that the "endless catacombs" of graduate school would be sealed up.

OFFICER SHORTAGE?

One of the minority's objections, that absence of deferments would create an officer shortage, was answered in one of the four exceptions to the no-deferment policy: "Men who undertake officer training programs in college should be deferred, provided they commit to serve in the Armed Forces as enlisted men if they do not complete their officer programs."

Another exception covered "hardship deferments, which defy rigid classification, but which must be judged realistically on individual merits." Local boards would do the judging.

Also, college students whose number came up in the lottery "would be permitted to finish their sophomore year before induction."

The fourth exemption provided for a phase-out of the present system, allowing those in school or in apprentice training "to complete the degrees or programs for which they are candidates. Upon termination of those deferments, they will be entered into the random selection pool with that year's 18-year-olds."

The majority based its stand on total abolition of deferments on the war in Vietnam. "A chance to postpone service right now might mean the difference between the obligation to serve in a shooting war and the possibility of serving later when the war might have come to an end."

SPOTLIGHTED BY WAR

The report's introduction said that the draft was "floodlighted today by the war in Vietnam. The echo of American battle fire impels, as it always should, the hard probe for better solutions.

The war was also cited in rejecting the "National service" concept proposed by Defense Secretary McNamara last May. "No fair way exists to equate voluntary service programs with military service," the report said.

The report also rejected an all-volunteer army as an inflexible means of obtaining military manpower in an emergency. It added that "some members of the commission see unfortunate social consequences in an all-volunteer military force sustained only by financial incentive... a mercenary force unrepresentative of the nation."

The commission's advocacy of a lottery involved no specifics, saying only that "the computer and the fishbowl are two that have been suggested." It did recommend that the "order of call could be done once a year, or at more frequent intervals if found practicable."

"Men would be called for induction in the order determined. Every man in the eligible pool would know where he stood on the list."

IMPARTIAL METHOD

The commission based its arguments for a lottery on population figures showing two million men reaching 18 every year, of whom the draft requires between 100,000 and 800,000. The random-selection process, it said, is "as impartial a manner as can be devised." The system would require a full year of "maximum vulnerability" to the draft. Of the expected 1.5 million men in the pool (after immediate physical examinations had rejected some 500,000), beefed-up and more glamorous recruitment programs would lure some 450,000 men, the commission said. This would leave 150,000 men who "could be sure of being drafted at some point during the year."

But because many of the 150,000 chosen would enlist in other services, "many men immediately below the first 150,000 would also expect to be drafted."

Those at the bottom of the order that year would be safe while those in the middle of the 1.5 million pool "might have some uncertainty about their situation for the duration of the year."

After the year, however, all "would retain a diminishing vulnerability to the draft until they reached 26," barring a larger war.

The commission devoted much of its report to internal reforms with the 27-year-old Selective Service System, taking away much of the power of the 4000 local boards and saying that it urged "the rule of law to replace the rule of discretion."

Although calling for pay raises for the clerks of the local boards, it urged new faces on the boards themselves. Noting that the average age of board members was 58, it also pointed out that 12 members are over 90, 400 over 80 and that one-fifth of all local board members are over 70 years old.

The commission reproduced questionnaires showing that some boards consider college students more important than fathers and vice versa, showing a haphazard pattern of equity.

NEW BOARDS

It called for changes in appointing new boards including a maximum retirement age, a maximum of five years' service, the eligibility of women to serve on the boards and changing "their composition to represent all elements of the public they serve."

Most board members, even in Negro areas, are white and most are professional men or white-collar workers even in areas where most of the registrants are from lower-income classes.

The commission concluded that the doctors' and dentists' drafts would have to con-

tinue despite the "double jeopardy" such men who had already served at age 19 might face. The new draft system would compensate for this, the commission said, by placing veterans at the bottom of the induction list when drafting doctors and dentists.

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 5, 1967]

STUDENTS PREFER LOTTERY

(By Jeremiah V. Murphy)

Greater Boston college students viewed with mixed reactions Saturday the changes proposed by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

A survey at Harvard, Boston College and Boston University revealed one point of agreement—the need for changes in the existing draft laws.

Most students felt that a lottery system would be fairer, would not discriminate against young men with neither the financial nor intellectual ability to attend college and thus be deferred from military service.

Several others said the lottery leaves "too much to chance."

One Harvard student said, "I don't like the idea of my life being used up, perhaps by a name being pulled out of a hat."

Following are student reactions:

Andrew Efron, 18, of Poughkeepsie, N.Y., a Harvard freshman—"I think they should abolish student deferments altogether. The lottery should start the year a student gets out of high school. The way things are now, the draft is keyed on a social class level. Some fellows can't afford college or don't have the educational background. Today they're drafted. It is not fair."

Philip Boswell, 17, of Washington, Harvard freshman—"A lottery would be more moral, but student deferments are more practical. The lottery is much fairer to everyone. Generally, I would favor the new proposals."

Robert Mintz, 18, of Burbank, Calif., Harvard freshman—"Improvements in the draft law are necessary, but I don't like the lottery idea—too much hit or miss. I do not like the idea of my life being used up, perhaps, by a name being pulled out of a hat. We need a more rational system, but it is difficult to decide who should be killed and who should live. The existing system is unfair to those who can't go to college."

Mrs. Pamela Salvatore, 23, of Milbrae, Calif., Harvard graduate student—"It is an improvement over our present system, but I don't think it is the total answer."

Stephen Ryack, 24, Brookline, University of Chicago student at Harvard—"The plan is unfair, because the country needs to maintain its leadership. I think the whole proposal is misdirected. Would be better if we used all our resources to eliminate reasons for the need for a draft."

Robert Wood Jr., 19, Harvard sophomore—"I don't think a lottery would be fair... too much left to chance, random."

Edward Jakush, 21, of Chicago, M.I.T. senior—"A lottery system would be cruel. You'd never know who is going to get drafted. You'd take people for military service who have no particular qualifications. It would be square pegs in round holes."

Michael Pabts, 21, of Milwaukee, Boston College senior—"The new plan is short sighted. I'm willing to serve but I think I would be more valuable after I finish school when I am a biochemist. The plan would be a waste of talent for idealistic reasons."

William Brobowski, 21, of Norwich, Ct., Boston College senior—"I wouldn't want to see student deferments abolished, but a lottery would be more democratic."

William Schoenfeld, 21, of Bradford, Boston College senior—"I am in favor of military training for everyone. With a lottery, some people—with luck—wouldn't serve."

Julian Podbereski, 19, of Toronto, Boston University sophomore "I am a pacifist, so I am opposed to the draft in any form, but I think a lottery would be fairer. It would

not discriminate against those not in college."

Emily Hassen, 20, of New York, Boston University junior—"It would be a better system, because everyone would have an equal opportunity to serve. Student deferments are unfair to those who can't afford to go to college."

Warren Cohen, 23, of Newton, Boston University graduate student—"The new plan is a good idea. Gets them when they are young, easier to train."

[From the Boston Globe, March 5, 1967]

THE REACTION: "EXCELLENT JOB" . . .
"OVERDUE"

(By Richard J. Connolly)

Proposals by President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service stirred a wave of reaction among educators, government officials and civil rights activists Saturday night.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy hailed the commission's study as "an excellent job, pointing up the inequities" of the draft system.

"There can be little question that the present system is uncertain, unfair and unjust because of its crazy-quilt pattern of deferments, its geographical disparities and its inherent lack of predictability," he said.

He had called for the basic reforms in a Senate resolution last week.

John C. Carr, state selective service director, said, "I wouldn't be at all unhappy if no changes are made at all."

"It's impossible to eliminate inequalities entirely. I think the present system has smoothed out many of the possible inequities."

He said a proposal to grant deferments only to college students in technical fields would appear to discriminate against students with a liberal arts talent.

He added, however, that any of the programs proposed by the commission would be easy to administer if they become law.

The commission's recommendations regarding student deferments prompted Station Curtis, dean of students at Boston University, to point out that students have had an almost blanket deferment.

"I would certainly favor revision of the draft which would eliminate this inequity because I think the college student, under the present system, has enjoyed a kind of preferential treatment which is thereby an inequity," Curtis said.

If there is a proposal for revision of the draft system, which would tend to eliminate or minimize this inequity, I'd be in favor of it. College students themselves are quite aware of this inequity."

Dr. Asa S. Knowles, president of Northeastern University, said there are many inequities in the draft and a revision is long overdue.

"I'll be happy to see the report of the commission, this should bring greater equity. It's a complicated question and should be carefully studied."

He added that all inequities could not be removed until everyone is drafted.

Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, president of Boston College, said that perhaps the draft has been unfair in allowing total de facto exemptions.

"But I think it would be unwise not to defer students. There is a broader need in this country than defense. We still need scientists, engineers and medical personnel."

Even in World War II and the Korean War, he pointed out, students in particular fields were deferred.

Dean Harold L. Hazen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Graduate School said education up to the top level is the only way for the country to develop foundations for leadership.

"The question is whether our society can afford, statistically speaking, to dispense with a significant fraction of such people," he added.

He said the subject dealt with a basic philosophy involving the wise use of manpower, the contributions of leadership by specially qualified in the fields of medicine, science and engineering.

Bob Eubanks, co-chairman of Afro-Americans Against the War in Vietnam, said, "It comes as no surprise that they would admit that an inequity against Blacks exists, but it will take a complete change and overhaul of the draft system to change it."

His group sponsored a "funeral march" Saturday through Roxbury to "mourn the deaths of 2,500 black men in Vietnam."

"More blacks are always going to be drafted than whites under the present system," he said, "because of their lower education and lack of the kind of jobs that would give them a deferment."

"The main thing is not that more blacks are being drafted than whites, but that blacks have nothing to fight for in Vietnam in the first place."

LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS WOULD BE DROPPED

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—The nation's 4,100 local draft boards—survivors of a century-old concept of having men chosen by their own neighbors for military service—would go out of business under proposals by President Johnson's Selective Service Advisory Commission.

The boards would be replaced by 300 to 500 "area offices," operated by hired personnel who would register and classify youths for induction under "clear and binding" national standards. The local boards are run by volunteers operating under standards which vary from place to place.

There still would be volunteer "local boards"—but only 300 to 500 of them, working in conjunction with the area offices and limited to hearing appeals from inductees. They would be the first court of appeal.

Instead of the 50 state offices which now exist, there would be 8 regional offices, where regional appeal boards as well as administrative functions would be housed, and the national headquarters, with its presidential appeal board would remain as presently constituted.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1967]

PRESIDENTIAL UNIT ASKS DRAFT BY LOT OF 19-YEAR-OLDS—PANEL URGES YOUNGEST OF ALL ELIGIBLES BE CALLED FIRST, WITH FEW EXEMPTIONS—NO STUDENT DEFERMENT—MORE UNIFORMITY PROPOSED—NEGRO "INEQUITIES" NOTED—WHITE HOUSE PLEAS

(By Max Frankel)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., March 4.—A radical reorganization of the military draft, altering the methods and standards of selection, has been proposed to President Johnson by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

The panel, which was appointed by the President, calls for a virtual lottery among eligible 19-year-olds, which would work impartially throughout the country and determine a young man's fate at an early stage of his career. It would also replace the nation's 4,100 neighborhood draft boards with no more than 500 area centers applying uniform policies of classification and appeal.

The Texas White House published today the commission's plan, which was also released in Washington, with evident enthusiasm but without formal comment. The President is expected to endorse most of the recommendations in a special message on Monday, inviting Congress to help arrange their gradual adoption.

After an exhaustive seven-month study, the select commission concluded that the youngest of all qualified men should be drafted first, starting at age 19, and that they should be summoned in a random and impartial order, in effect, by lot.

EXEMPTION CHANCES IMPROVE

However, fewer than half of these men would be needed by the armed services, even in a sizable war such as that in Vietnam. The rest, having escaped call-up in their period of "maximum vulnerability," would therefore become virtually exempt, more certainly so with each passing year as ever larger groups of younger men were enrolled.

The commission also called special attention to what it called the Negro's "inequitable" status, partly reflecting social and economic injustice, and perhaps, it hinted, more direct discrimination in the selection of fewer Negroes as officer and technical trainees.

A majority of the commission urged the abolition of almost all student and occupational deferments so as to subject nearly all physically and mentally fit 19-year-olds to one simultaneous risk of induction.

But a substantial minority, seven or eight of the 20 commission members, favored continued deferments for undergraduate study, provided that the beneficiaries were required, upon graduation, to expose themselves to random selection with the next group of 19-year-olds.

The majority, officials indicated, was led in this argument by the commission chairman, Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, who is now vice president and general counsel of the International Business Machines Corporation.

REEDY HEADS MINORITY

The minority forces are said to have been led by George E. Reedy Jr., President Johnson's former press secretary, who is now President of the Struthers Research and Development Corporation.

The panel differed from a civilian advisory group on the draft appointed by Congress. This committee, whose recommendations to the House Armed Services Committee were released this morning, called for severe measures against draft evaders and draft card burners, and found the Selective Service Law basically fair.

All the members of the Presidential commission agreed that too many students had parlayed deferments into exemptions, and they urged strict safeguards against "one of the gravest inequities in the present system." They advised against deferments for most graduate students.

The unanimous recommendations also included the following:

That men eligible for the draft should not gain immunity by direct enlistment in the Reserves or National Guard.

That possible shortages in the Reserves or Guard be filled by the draft, with the same random selection system.

That the need for draftees be reduced by creating more military jobs for the surplus of women volunteers and by developing programs to train men who volunteer but do not meet induction standards.

That policies toward aliens be modified to exempt tourists and other temporary visitors and give immigrants time to adjust.

That study begin at once on the feasibility of an "ideal" peacetime system that would let all drafted men decide when, between the ages of 19 and 23, they wish to serve.

Some of the commission's most far-reaching proposals, including random selection, the drafting of younger men first and the abolition of most deferments, could be decreed by Executive order of the President without new legislation.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS SUGGESTED

The Selective Service Act, which expires in June, would be renewed under the commission's plan for four years, with the same flexibility for the President. It would be altered, however, to "consolidate" the system under more centralized administration, to make new regional appeal boards more rep-

resentative of different population groups and to provide equitable appeal procedures.

The commission met for more than 100 hours and read hundreds of reports on the views of all major organizations and manpower experts, students and Cabinet officials, all 50 Governors and many Mayors. It studied the need for the draft and all proposed variants and known consequences thereof.

It began with these central facts—that about two million men will reach draft age in the coming years, three-fourths of whom will qualify under current standards; that of that 1.5 million, only 600,000 to one million will be needed; and of these, only between 100,000 and 300,000 may have to be drafted. Then it asked how they should be chosen.

Raising standards or expanding deferments, the commission decided, will only promote "harmful and undesirable" injustices. It decided that the drafting of older men first, as at present, would leave all men in uncertainty for many years and impose unequal risks of selection.

Accordingly, it suggested a complete reversal of concept. It proposed the universal testing of all young men, for social as well as draft purposes, soon after they registered at the age of 18. Soon thereafter, those found physically and mentally eligible for the draft pool would be ranked at random in an order of call, a list from which the Defense Department would draw the needed number when they turned 19.

Whether the random ranking should be done by computer or by the drawing of numbers from a fishbowl, according to registration numbers, birth dates or otherwise, must be determined by special studies, the report said.

In addition, the report asked for a total overhaul of the Selective Service administration. Though restrained in its language, the panel was highly critical of the existing structure, which it portrayed as diffuse, inefficient, often arbitrary and indifferent to the rights and needs of the registrants and society.

Top officials in the system are "heavily oriented toward the military," the commission said. Local board members, it found, are all male, mostly veterans and white-collar workers and almost exclusively white—96.3 per cent, with only 1.3 per cent Negro members. The average age is 58, with 20 per cent over 70.

The commission would create a centralized system built around eight regional centers directing the work of 300 to 500 area centers. It would install modern data handling equipment and synchronize all policies.

Attached to each center, but independent of it, would be appeal boards of volunteer citizens representing all elements of the public, serving five-year terms on Presidential appointment, allowing a month for appeal, recording decisions in writing and assisting the appellant in every way.

The percentage of Negroes qualified for service is considerably smaller than that of whites, the report said. Yet 30.2 per cent of the qualified Negroes are drafted, against only 18.8 per cent of the qualified whites.

Fewer Negroes get into Reserve and officer training programs, it was found. Fewer Negroes in the Army get jobs requiring technical skills, thus leaving the path to an infantry division as "the only one entirely open."

FEWER NEGROES CHOSEN

Though the over-all proportion of all Negro enlisted men in Vietnam is only 11 per cent, the report said, their percentage in Army units there is 14.5 per cent, their representation in combat units is appreciably higher still and they account for 22.4 per cent of all Army troops killed in action.

Nonetheless, the commission rejected the idea of using the compulsory draft for the

"worthwhile objectives" of rehabilitating the millions of men who are being rejected for educational or health deficiencies—700,000 in the fiscal year 1966 and five million men between those now aged 18½ and 34.

This, the report said, is a "national shame" and "threat to the national security," the report said, but a system of universal training to promote fitness, training, discipline and patriotism, it added, cannot be justified on the grounds of military need and should therefore be attacked by other means.

The commission also rejected the elimination of the draft and the total reliance on volunteers, above all because this would rob the nation of a flexible system capable of rapid mobilization in crisis.

Also rejected were the many proposals for compulsory national service of some kind, such as in the Peace Corps abroad or in Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) at home, or for voluntary service as an alternative to military duty. These pose difficult policy and constitutional issues, the commission said.

Moreover, it could find no fair way of equating civilian with military service. It questioned the quality of volunteer programs that became draft alternatives and recommended the rigid separation of programs on military as opposed to educational and social needs.

After a side study, the commission voted to stand by the existing rules for conscientious objectors, recognized only if they are morally opposed to war in all forms, not just a particular war.

One or two commission members supported the idea of permitting a so-called "selective pacifism," but the majority thought this was essentially a political rather than a moral expression that ought to be channeled through the recognized political processes.

By far the most prolonged and thorough debate inside the commission dealt with student deferments.

The majority concluded that the inequity of giving students a special privilege had been compounded by the administrative inequities invited by a system of discretionary student deferment. The system was said to have bred cynicism about military service and education.

ALTERNATE SYSTEMS SEEN

The dominant view held that educational processes would not be harmed by an end of deferments. It expressed confidence that the armed forces, which draw about 80 per cent of their new officers from the colleges, could develop alternate recruiting systems.

The majority would not cancel the deferments of students who were already enrolled for degrees when the system change occurred. But thereafter, it would defer only to the end of the sophomore year those students already at college whose order of call was randomly determined at age 18. Full student deferments would be offered only to men in officer programs bound by contract to serve as officers, or as enlisted men in case of default.

The minority, concerned about the military need for officers and by the general need for physicians and dentists, favored deferments for students in a "serious" college undertaking and for medical students in professional school provided they accepted an irrevocable commitment for eventual military service.

The Johnson Administration's enthusiasm for the report and admiration for the manner in which it was compiled were evident from comments by staff members and the care with which it was released.

Also, the unusual release of the report just two days before the President's own statement on the subject suggested that he was willing to give the report's release precedence and welcome a comparison of his proposals with those of the commission.

The concept of drafting younger men first has won almost universal favor. It has long been pressed by the Defense Department and was endorsed by the special study commissioned by the House Armed Services Committee, conducted by Gen. Mark Clark, retired. But that study favored most college deferments, except for "noncritical" graduate students, and rejected random selection.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara is on record favoring a lottery of some kind and Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, anticipated this and most of the other major recommendations of the National Advisory Commission in a resolution he submitted to the Senate. Mr. Marshall, the commission chairman, is a close friend of the Kennedy family.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1967]
CALL-UP TIME IS NEAR FOR DRAFT REVISION
(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—"It seems to me," a 24-year-old soldier wrote Senator Edward M. Kennedy from Thailand, "that society demands the young men of our era to somehow accomplish three objectives between his 18th and 25th birthdays.

"He is supposed to attain a position of security in life; he is supposed to defend his country; and he is supposed to get married."

The soldier then went on to enumerate in detail the conflicts and confusion that a young man encounters in trying to achieve all three. He ended with a plea for the Government to help by straightening out the military draft.

What to do about the draft is causing almost as much perplexity for the Government as the young man encounters in trying to accommodate to a system that is now widely acknowledged to be outdated, frequently unfair and an inefficient use of manpower.

RELUCTANT CONGRESS

Congress has been reluctant to come to grips with these problems, even though they have been accumulating over a period of years. The present draft law was renewed for four years in 1963 without study or debate.

But now both Congress and the Administration have been driven by political necessities to initiate reforms. Several factors have intensified the crisis.

The present law expires July 1. The draft is biting deeply to provide manpower for Vietnam, a war that in itself is bitterly controversial. Youths, parents and educators are bringing pressures for change.

The trouble is that there are deep-seated disagreements on how the procedures should be changed. This was apparent in the commission that President Johnson appointed last summer to make a study and recommendations on the draft.

DIVIDED ON DEFERMENTS

This commission, which was chosen to represent a cross-section of society, was deeply divided over the question of student deferments. In its report released today by the White House, the commission recommended, among other things, that student deferments be ended with these exceptions; that those now in school be permitted to complete the degrees for which they are candidates; and that thereafter those in college when selected be permitted to finish their sophomore year before induction.

Earlier in the week, the House Armed Services Committee released a report of its own study conducted by a commission headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark (U.S. Army retired).

The study had been ordered last fall to give Congress an independent basis for action. One of its chief recommendations was that student deferments be continued except for graduate students in noncritical fields.

This disagreement between the two study commissions points up the fact that there is yet no consensus even within the Government on many important aspects.

There does, however, seem to be a consensus on some points. Both commissions and many other concerned with the draft agree that the younger men should be drafted first—a reversal of the present practice of taking the oldest first from the pool of men between the ages of 18 and 26.

Further, there is general agreement that the system should be more uniform from state to state and district to district. As Senator Edward Kennedy pointed out in a recent speech, some cities draft 19-year-olds while others draft 22-year-olds, and married men are called up in one state while many thousands of single men remain untouched in another.

But the areas of agreement soon run out and disagreements emerge. The Administration and Senator Kennedy are promoting a random selection system for picking those to be inducted from the pool of those declared to be most eligible. But the Clark commission rejected outright use of any lottery.

The outcome depends to a large degree on President Johnson. Many of the changes—taking the youngest first, for example—can be accomplished by Executive order without any change in the law.

But the President must look to Congress to give him the kind of law that will permit him to put the reforms he desires into effect. And Congress, responding to political pressure, is taking the initiative in seeking reforms.

NEW HEARINGS SCHEDULED

The House Armed Services Committee will renew hearings on the draft in April. A Senate subcommittee on employment, manpower and poverty, with Senator Kennedy presiding, will begin hearings on March 14.

The Kennedy subcommittee does not have jurisdiction. That belongs to the Armed Services Committee headed by Richard B. Russell of Georgia. But after the young Massachusetts Democrat took the initiative in draft reforms, Senator Russell announced he would be glad to let him conduct the hearings with the understanding, of course, that the Russell committee would decide what kind of bill is reported out.

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1967]
PANEL WOULD DRAFT 19-YEAR-OLDS FIRST,
ABOLISH STUDENT AND JOB DEFERMENTS—
JOHNSON COMMISSION URGES LOTTERY-TYPE
SELECTION OF INDUCTEES

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., March 4.—A basic reorganization of the Selective Service System with the ending of student and occupational deferments and the calling of the youngest men first was proposed to President Johnson today by a presidential advisory commission.

It recommended that a "random" selection system using a fishbowl or computer be devised to pick those men to be drafted. The word "lottery" was not used, but it was implied. If approved, the system proposed would mean that in the future 19-year-olds would be drafted first instead of the "oldest first." Those not drafted when 19—barring a greater national emergency—probably would never be called.

President Johnson has been studying the report, published today, for about a month, officials said, and plans to make his recommendations on it to Congress on Monday.

The President appointed the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service last July. Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General and now vice president and general counsel of International Business Machines Corp., was chairman of the 20-man Commission.

SUPPORT INDICATED

Officials declined to say whether the President's recommendations to Congress would follow the Commission's recommendations.

The college deferment issue is among the most controversial in the Commission's far-ranging report.

Deferred students now in school would be permitted to complete the degrees for which they are candidates, but upon termination of the deferments they would be entered into the random selection pool with that year's 18-year-olds.

In the future, those already in college when called would be permitted to finish their sophomore year before induction.

All young men on reaching 18 would be examined and those qualified for service would be classified 1-A. When they are 19 they would be included in a pool from which that year's inductions would be made.

For the year they are 19, they would "undergo their maximum vulnerability to the draft," the report said.

When the period of maximum vulnerability elapsed an order of call would be determined for a new group of 19-year-olds and those who were not inducted would be called only if military circumstances required.

In the year ending June 30, 1966, some 340,000 men were drafted. Draft calls in the latter half of 1966 ran about 50,000 a month. This year the calls are between 11,000 and 15,000 a month.

No new student or occupational deferments would be granted, but hardship deferments "judged realistically" would be granted.

With nearly 2-million men reaching draft age each year—more than the armed services require—some kind of "random" selection is the fairest possible way of choosing those to be inducted, the Commission said.

At present, the Armed Forces need only from a half to a third of the 2 million men annually reaching draft age.

The Commission rejected proposals to eliminate the draft, to adopt a system of universal training (proposed by former President Eisenhower), or to establish a compulsory national service or a volunteer service as an alternative to military service. All these, it said, were objectionable for one reason or another.

The Commission proposed what one official called a "total" reorganization of the Selective Service system, but its continuance. The law expires June 30.

The boards should represent all elements of the population they serve, the Commission said, and women should be eligible to serve on them. It proposed that board members serve a maximum of five years and that a maximum retirement age be established.

"The application of universal rules will remove the need for most of the routine decision-making which now is the chief function of local boards," the Commission said. "Elimination of most deferments and the policy of selecting youngest men first for induction will make classification far more an impartial and standardization procedure than it presently is."

THIRTY DAYS FOR APPEALS

The Commission said that registrants could make appeals to local boards regarding their classifications and should be given 30 days to do so instead of 10 days as at present.

The Commission refused to recommend a major change in the rules regarding conscientious objectors. A minority in the Commission wanted to recognize an objector's opposition to a particular war, but the majority said the present rule requiring objection to all wars was fair.

It cited the Supreme Court's 1965 *U.S. vs. Seeger* decision, which broadened the definition of religious beliefs that conscientious objectors may cite. The Court said "a sincere and meaningful belief which occupies in the life of its possessor a place parallel to that filled by the God of those admittedly qualifying for the exemption comes within

the statutory definition." The Court did not take up other, even broader arguments of objectors in this decision.

The Commission called for "an adequate number of special panels" to hear conscientious objector appeals. At present, the Justice Department conducts such hearings, as well as prosecuting those who refuse to serve.

The report said that its study impressed on it that there are "serious defects in our national life" since one-fourth to one-third of registrants are found ineligible for service because of educational or health deficiencies.

MORE NEGROES REJECTED

It said it found that Negroes were insufficiently represented on draft boards. But it said that the number of Negroes in the Armed Services is not out of proportion to their number in the population.

A far greater percentage of Negroes than whites are rejected for service. Enlistment rates are about equal for qualified white and Negro men.

"However, Negroes already in the service re-enlist at a substantially higher rate than do white servicemen—their first-term re-enlistment rates have been more than double that of whites in recent years," the report said.

The over-all proportion of Negroes in relation to all enlisted personnel in Vietnam is only 11 per cent, the report said. As of late 1965, however, it added, 22.8 per cent of the enlisted men in combat units in Vietnam were Negro. And during the first 11 months of 1966, Negro soldiers comprised 22.4 per cent of all Army troops killed in action.

The Commission was unanimous on most issues, but it was divided on the question of college deferments. The majority, however, argued against all future deferments.

"There is no evidence, in the opinion of most members of the Commission, that the abolishment of student deferments would deter young men selected for service from going to college, or returning to college, when their service was completed," the report said.

MORE WOMEN URGED

"This being so, the actual effect of student deferments as these members see it is unrelated to the national interest. Quite to the contrary, they believe, student deferments have become only a convenient device to shrink the ever-increasing pool of available manpower."

The Commission urged that more women be permitted to serve in noncombat roles, and officials reported that the Defense Department was undertaking plans to increase the number of women in uniform from about 32,000 to more than 37,000.

The Board said that men who undertake officer training programs in college should be deferred, but only if they commit themselves to serve as enlisted men if they do not complete their officer programs.

The Commission urged a study to determine whether a plan could be worked out which would permit those selected at 18 for induction to decide when, between the ages of 19 and 23, they wish to serve.

Most of the recommendations for reorganization of the system would require legislation; most of the proposals affecting deferments and drafting 19-year-olds first could be put into effect by presidential order.

SYSTEM OUTGROWN

"The United States has outgrown its Selective Service System," the report said, adding that 4000 local boards can no longer be called "neighborhood" committees.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) said last night he was opposed to any kind of a draft lottery system. Jackson, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said men with certain skills should be deferred.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), a long-time critic of the current draft system, said Mr. Johnson's Commission had "done an excellent job in pointing up the inequities

of the draft system and recommending solutions for them."

Sen. Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.), chairman of the Armed Services Committee, declined to comment. He said his committee probably would begin considering the Commission's proposals by mid-April.

THE FACTS ARE THESE

Some 2 million men will be reaching draft age each year. Nearly three-fourths of them will be qualified for service under current Department of Defense standards. Of that 1.5 million, only 600,000 to 1 million—varying with the circumstances—will be required to serve. And of these, between 100,000 and 300,000 may have to be inducted. The problem is: How shall those men be selected?

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1967]
ONE OF REPORT'S CONCLUSIONS: QUALIFIED NEGRO IS FOUND TO RECEIVE INEQUITABLE TREATMENT UNDER DRAFT

(By William Chapman)

Under the current military service system the qualified Negro is more apt to be drafted, to be placed in a combat unit, and to meet death in Vietnam than the white man.

These are conclusions drawn from the report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service which found the Negro's participation in the draft to be "in several ways inequitable."

The report issued yesterday did not label the draft itself inequitable, but said that the Negro's long-standing social and economic handicaps have led to his unfair status in the military.

By extensively documenting these inequities, the report confirmed the charges of many civil rights leaders and other analysts that the draft burden falls more heavily on Negroes than on whites.

It expressed hope that the Commission's recommendations for draft revision, which include a random selection system and an end to most student deferments, will correct the inequities.

The report also recommended that new local draft boards represent all elements, "including ethnic" elements, of the population. At present, the Commission found, only about 1.3 per cent of the 16,632 local board members are Negroes.

The report found that the number of Negroes called to service is not out of proportion to their total population. However, many more Negroes than whites are rejected by the draft, primarily because they fail written tests.

From the remaining pool of service-qualified men, the report found, a much higher percentage of Negroes than whites is finally drafted. In one test year, the Commission found that 30.2 per cent of the qualified Negro group was drafted, as against only 18.8 per cent of the qualified whites.

The major reason for this, it said, is the inability of Negroes to get into reserve programs or into officers' programs. The Commission also pointed out that in low-income slum areas of a sample-study state were found the fewest student deferments.

EFFECTS OF HANDICAPS

The same educational and social handicaps that bring proportionately more Negroes than whites into service also channel Negroes into combat units. Fewer of them are qualified for technical training, and they may therefore look on infantry service as the only open path to advancement.

"Approximately 20 per cent of all personnel assigned to combat occupations throughout the Army are Negro," the report added.

The racial composition of combat units is even more striking in Vietnam. The report found that in late 1965, 22.8 per cent of enlisted personnel in combat units were Negroes; yet Negroes made up only 11 per cent of the total enlisted personnel serving in Vietnam.

"The casualty figures reflect this," the Commission said. "During the first 11 months of 1966, Negro soldiers comprised 22.4 per cent of all Army troops killed in action."

DRAFT BOARD MEMBERSHIP

In an extensive questionnaire survey of local draft boards, the Commission found 23 states in which no Negroes serve as members. None serve in Mississippi, for example, although 42 per cent of the State's population is Negro.

Forty per cent of the District of Columbia's board members are Negro, it found. But only 2.7 per cent of Maryland's and 2.2 per cent of Virginia's are Negroes.

Three members of the presidential Commission were Negroes and one of them, Vernon E. Jordan Jr. is of draft age. Jordan is director of the Southern Regional Council's voter education project.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1967]

CENTRALIZATION OF DRAFT POWER IS URGED

(By George C. Wilson)

"The United States has outgrown its Selective Service System," a presidential advisory commission said yesterday in recommending that local draft boards be stripped of their authority to classify young men.

The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service recommended that the power to draft should be vested instead in a centralized system.

A central office in Washington would lay down the rules and then let area offices in each state implement them.

Instead of some 4000 draft boards across the Nation deciding the fate of young men in their areas, computers as impartial as traffic lights would do much of the selecting.

President Johnson must decide how much of the Commission's report to adopt. His message outlining proposed draft changes will go to Congress on Monday.

The Commission noted that the local draft board concept dates back to right after the Civil War, when a report recommended putting the power to draft in the hands of "civilian neighbors."

While the local boards are still portrayed as giving personalized service, the Commission said America has urbanized so much in the last century that few people know the draft board members in their community.

The Commission drew this picture of the 16,632 local draft board members—the first such national portrait:

All are male and almost all of them white. Only 1.3 per cent are Negro, 0.8 per cent Puerto Rican, 0.7 per cent Spanish American.

Average age is 58, with one-fifth over 70—including 400 members over 80 and 12 between 90 and 99.

Almost half have served more than 10 years; 1335 members have served more than 20 years.

About 67 per cent are veterans.

They are above average in education—with one-third of them college graduates, as compared with 10 per cent in the general population of that age group.

Seventy per cent are in white-collar jobs, with 20 per cent of that portion in the professions. This means that craftsmen and laborers are not represented proportionally on the boards.

More distressing, said the Commission, is the fact that the 4000 draft board in acting as independent units often have conflicting rules for deciding who goes to war. Student deferment policies were cited as an example.

The members themselves usually can give little time to the day-to-day work of the draft boards, the Commission found, and thus entrust much authority to the clerks, often underpaid.

The appeal boards, where men can protest the draft status given them by their local board, also are in a jumbled state, the Com-

mission found. Their work loads and rules vary widely.

"To the Commission," the report said, "all of these factors together strongly describe a critical need for policy uniformity through the application of clear regulations consistently applied. Many local board members themselves agree."

This is how the Commission would reorganize the Selective Service System to substitute "the rule of law" for the "rule of discretion:"

Keep the national headquarters, which now exists in Washington.

Establish a regional office in each of the eight regions of the Office of Emergency Planning. The eight cities where emergency planning regional headquarters are situated: Harvard, Mass.; Olney, Md.; Thomasville, Ga.; Battle Creek, Mich.; Denton, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Santa Rosa, Calif. and Everett, Wash.

Create 300 to 500 area offices—at least one in each state—near population centers.

"Clear and binding policy regarding classifications, exemptions and deferments would be established at the national level," the report said. The rules would go to the regional offices and then to the area offices.

Young men would register at the area offices near their home. Clerks from the existing local boards might be hired for these area offices. Computers would do much of the paperwork at the headquarters level.

While the present local boards would have no authority to classify young men at the outset under this proposed system, the format of these boards would be kept for the 300 to 500 appeal boards that would be established, one for each of the area offices.

There would also be appeal boards for each of the eight regional offices and also a National Appeal Board. A young man could appeal within 30 days after being classified, instead of the present 10-day limit.

The Commission recommended that these appeal boards at the area offices be more typical of the community around them. This would mean primarily, more Negro members. A term of five years would be set as well as a maximum age. Women now barred would be allowed as members. Finally the President would not be limited to Governors selections in naming appeal board members.

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1967]

VOTE TO ABOLISH APPARENTLY WAS CLOSE—STUDENT DEFERMENTS SPLIT BOARD

(By William Chapman)

Eliminating student deferments from the Selective Service System was the most divisive issue confronting the presidential commission on the draft.

It apparently was by a narrow margin that the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service voted to abolish, with few exceptions, the policy of deferring college students.

GROWING CONTROVERSY

The close division indicates the ticklish nature of President Johnson's problem in deciding whether to recommend abolition of student deferments. He is expected to make his position known early this week.

College deferrals have been a center of controversy in recent years. Critics contend they lead to a permanent exemption of upper and middleclass young men who remain in college on the graduate level simply to evade the draft. Draft boards have been accused of favoritism in granting or withholding deferrals and universities are entangled in arguments over whether grade records should be made available to selective service authorities.

In its key finding, the Commission majority held that college deferrals do not, as originally intended, serve the national interest. They had been granted on the as-

sumption that a steady flow of college-trained manpower is necessary for the economy and other national purposes.

"There is no evidence, in the opinion of most members of the Commission, that the abolishment of student deferments would deter young men selected for service from going to college, or returning to college, when their service was completed," the report said.

DETRIMENTAL EFFECT

"This being so, the actual effect of student deferments, as these members see it, is unrelated to the national interest. Quite to the contrary, they believe, student deferments have become only a convenient device to shrink the ever-increasing pool of available manpower."

Even if administration were improved to prevent deferments from becoming virtually permanent, a privileged group—the college students—would be permitted to decide when it would start military service, the commission said.

The group, for example, could choose deferment now when a shooting war is under way in Vietnam and hope the fighting ended before its turn came, the majority pointed out.

The majority contended that few students deemed necessary for national interest pursuits would be diverted from studies by a two-year interruption for military service. "Indeed, it was felt that many young men might gain in educational ambition, motivation, maturity and capacity for achievement as a result of such a detour," it declared.

OFFICER RECRUITMENT

The minority warned that abolishing college deferments would seriously impede the military's procurement of officers, since almost 80 per cent of new officers come from the campus.

The majority replied that officer-recruitment problems could be overcome and cited a Defense Department statement which said these problems are "not insuperable." The report suggested that Defense augment its ROTC programs, granting deferments to those students accepting binding contracts to serve as officers or enter the draft.

The minority contended that criticism of the deferments is based not on the principle but on administrative abuses. If the abuses are corrected, making it impossible for deferrals to be stretched into permanent exemptions, the system would work satisfactorily, the minority said.

The majority found that deferrals had fostered "a degree of cynicism about both military service and education." It cited reports of both students and educators that young men increasingly looked upon college as a haven from the draft.

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1967]

GUARD AND RESERVE HIT AS EVADERS' HAVEN

(By John Maffre)

Two high-level commissions urged the President this week to rule out the National Guard and the Reserve as a draft evaders' haven.

But to some extent, Pentagon action has already begun to overtake suggestions of the President's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and of the House Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Requirement.

Both groups focused attention on "REP," the inactive man in, or trying to enter the Reserve Enlistment Program that calls for six months active duty training and 5½ years of hometown drills.

The Presidential Commission, headed by Burke Marshall, would rule out draft immunity for new reservists with no prior service, except those who enlist before being classified 1-A. It would also use the proposed lottery induction system to fill reserve ranks if voluntary enlistment fell short.

The House panel headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark, proposed that REPs be liable for more active duty if for any reason they failed to complete their reserve obligation, as long as they still had up to 15 months of unserved active duty. But the panel rejected the lottery system for either filling reserve ranks or drafting men outright.

In mid-February when both these reports were at the printer's, the Pentagon said it would soon begin to call some 31,000 REPs with little or no active duty and who belong to no unit. The Army alone has more than 55,000 men with no unit affiliation.

This is the first exercise of authority granted—but not sought—by Congress for the President to call individual reservists without declaring a national emergency.

The chief problem facing would-be reservists is that virtually every Guard and Reserve unit in the nation has a full complement, and a waiting list as long as its roll call. In Maryland, for example, the Guard has for more than a year been up to its 8300-man ceiling and has only one under strength unit—a Special Forces company that imposes stiff requirements.

Some reservists of long experience said that unless draft calls became much higher, both the Marshall and the Clark proposals would have relatively little effect, and that their chief value would be in the public relations sense.

One officer said he was puzzled and disturbed by the suggestion that a "mix" of voluntary enlistment and induction be used to keep inactive unit ranks filled.

"That's bad—the reserve outfits have always done pretty well on the volunteer system," he said. "I'm always unhappy when somebody talks about a draft for the reserves."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star Mar. 5, 1967]

DRAFT THE 19-YEAR-OLDS FIRST, CUT DEFERMENTS, PANEL URGES—LOTTERY-TYPE PLAN GIVEN TO JOHNSON

(By Garnett D. Horner)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—A lottery-like system of selecting draftees, starting at age 19, and a general ban on future student and occupational deferments were recommended to President Johnson last night.

Centralizing the Selective Service System to apply draft rules uniformly across the nation—doing away with local boards as now known—also was urged by the President's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

The commission's recommendations were contained in a 218-page report formally submitted to the President last week and made public at the Texas White House last night.

One practical effect of the commission's proposals would be to reverse the present policy of drafting the oldest first and limit the draft to 19-year-olds unless there should be a sharp increase in military manpower needs. If a youth were not drafted at 19, his chances of being called up would grow less and less each year until he reached 26.

Adoption of the recommendations also probably would mean that more youths would put off their higher education until they completed military service and then go to college with GI bill benefits.

AIM FOR EQUAL TREATMENT

Major aims of the commission, headed by former Asst. Atty. Gen. Burke Marshall were to assure the most equitable treatment possible and to make it easier for each youth to predict when he would be called up if he was going to be.

The President, who received a draft copy of the report three or four weeks ago before getting a printed copy last week, is expected to reveal his own ideas about revision of the draft system in a special message to Congress early this week.

The fact that the White House made pub-

lic the commission's report shortly before the President's message was due seemed to indicate that he generally approves its recommendations, but he could approve some and reject others or delay action on some of the more controversial proposals.

Officials said the bulk of the most controversial of the commission proposals—including random selection of draftees from a nationwide pool of qualified youths and abolition of most deferments—could be put into effect by executive order or Selective Service rule changes without legislation.

Congressional action is necessary, however, to extend any draft law at all beyond its expiration date of June 30. Legislation also would be needed to centralize administration of the Selective Service System as recommended.

Under the commission proposals, youths would register at 18 through one of 300 to 500 "area offices" taking the place of local boards. Soon thereafter they would be tested to determine whether they qualified for military service under Defense Department physical, mental and moral standards.

Those qualified would go into a nationwide pool. The order for calling them into military service at age 19 would be determined through "a system of impartial random selection."

Avoiding use of the word "lottery," which it considered might be misleading, the commission said "random selection" could work in one of several ways such as "fishbowl" drawing, a computer system or simply in order of birthdays.

Men in the pool would have "maximum vulnerability" to the draft for a year or less. Then another pool of 19-year-olds would come along. Those left over from the previous pool would not be called up later unless military needs required calling up first all those in the new group—and so on to age 26.

TRANSITION PERIOD

While further student or occupational deferments would be generally banned, students in school and men in recognized apprentice training when the proposed plan went into effect would be permitted to complete the degrees or program for which they were candidates. Then they would go into the "random selection pool" with that year's 18-year-olds.

After this transition period, men already in college when randomly selected for service would be permitted to finish their sophomore year before induction.

Men who join the ROTC or other officer training programs in college could be deferred only if they committed themselves to serve in the armed forces as enlisted men if they did not complete their officer programs.

Hardship deferments would continue to be granted.

The commission decided that determining the order of callup from among eligible 19-year-olds eliminates any need, under present circumstances at least, for occupational deferments or deferments for volunteers in the Peace Corps or Vista. It suggested, however, that any deferred Peace Corps volunteers overseas when the proposed plan goes into effect be permitted to complete their contracts before entry into the random selection pool.

MOST CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE

The student deferment issue was the most controversial studied by the commission. A "substantial" minority, said by an official to amount to a little more than one third of the 20 members of the commission, favored continuing student deferments.

The minority group argued that elimination of student deferments would seriously interrupt the output of college-trained men to meet essential needs of the civilian economy.

The majority argued that in any truly random selection system college students and

potential students would be drafted in the same proportion as other elements of the population. For example, they contended that in any year in which one-fourth of the eligible 19-year-olds were drafted, three-fourths of the draft-eligible student group would be free to continue their studies.

Most members of the commission also felt, they reported, that few of those drafted would be permanently diverted from college by waiting two years. They contended that many youths might gain in educational ambition, motivation, maturity and capacity for achievement as a result of a detour in military service.

PRaised BY KENNEDY

Another major argument by the minority favoring continued student deferment was that ending such deferments would hamper procurement of officers by the military forces through the ROTC and other college sources. The majority concluded that this problem could be solved by the Defense Department.

In Washington, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., who has advocated basic changes to assure fairness in the draft system, praised the commission's proposals particularly in connection with student deferments.

"The problem of student deferments is a very difficult one," he said. "I am not certain that the commission's suggestion that service begin after completion of the sophomore year is the best we can devise. But it is extremely significant that the commission has dealt with the problem of deferments. That is a part of the draft system which produces considerable unfairness."

Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., said he was opposed to any kind of a draft lottery system because in his view men with certain skills should be deferred.

Sen. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, D-Ga., chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said his committee probably would begin considering the commission's proposals by mid-April.

NATIONAL POLICIES URGED

Under its centralization proposals, the commission said National Selective Service headquarters should issue "clear and binding policies" concerning classifications, exemptions and deferments "to be applied uniformly throughout the country."

It proposed setting up eight regional offices, with some 300 to 500 "area offices" located according to population, with at least one in each state.

The area offices would handle the registering of youths for the draft and classifying them. This is now done by some 4,100 local boards of volunteers.

"New local boards" would be set up only in connection with the area offices and would enter the draft picture only as the registrants' first court of appeal.

The registration and classification at area offices would be handled by civil service employees instead of by volunteers as under the present local board system.

LOCAL BOARD CHANGES

The commission proposed that "all elements of the public they serve" should be represented on the new local boards acting as appeal agencies. It also urged that members' terms be limited to 5 years; a maximum retirement age should be fixed; the president's power to appoint members should not be limited to those nominated by state governors, and women should be eligible.

The commission found many things wrong with local boards as now set up. It reported all board members now are male; only 1.3 percent are Negro; one-fifth are over 70, and 400 of these are over 80.

The commission recalled that when the system was established in 1940, the local board concept was thought to be fair because it meant having a man chosen for the draft by his neighbors.

But only in rural areas does this "personalized concept" appear to be true today, the report said. It explained that urban board members usually work in anonymity, and rarely know the men they classify.

In fact, the commission found that "the United States has outgrown its Selective Service System" which under present conditions generates "needless inequities and confusion."

BACKGROUND DIFFERENCES

It noted a "substantial degree of difference" in chances of men with differing educational and economic backgrounds being drafted.

While low-income slum areas have the greatest number of men rejected because they fail to meet Defense Department standards, high income areas usually have a high proportion of student deferments.

Men with less than an eighth-grade education and Negro high school dropouts are less likely to enter service because they fail the written examinations, while graduate students are less likely to see active duty because many continue student deferments until they become, in effect, exemptions.

The commission found the Negro's position in the total military picture "in several ways inequitable."

It said the Negro does not serve in the armed forces out of proportion to his representation in the population as a whole. The proportion of Negroes in relation to all enlisted personnel in Vietnam is about 11 percent.

But the commission found that 30.2 percent of a qualified Negro group was drafted, while only 18.8 percent of the qualified whites were. Among reasons cited for this were that fewer Negroes are admitted into reserve or officer programs.

While Negroes made up only 11 percent of all enlisted personnel in Vietnam, the commission reported that as late as 1965, 22.8 percent of the enlisted men in combat units in Vietnam were Negro.

The commission said its proposals amounted to replacing the "rule of discretion" with the "rule of law."

It argued that "fairness, uniformity, and equal treatment for all can best be achieved through a system administered without regard for any geographical boundaries."

YOUNGEST FIRST ARGUMENTS

Even simple reversal of the present policy of drafting 26-year-olds first, then 25-year-olds, and so on down the line, and starting with 19-year-olds will make classification more impartial than it now is, the report contended.

Arguing for drafting men in the "youngest first" order, the commission said:

"Interruption of a man's life at that time (19) is less serious than at an older age. The uncertainty which now confuses many in their 20s as they attempt to set their careers in order would be reduced, if not eliminated.

Fewer men are married at that age. Fewer, too, have acquired skills in industry.

SERVICES PREFER

"The order is also preferable to the services, who believe that younger men are better able to respond to military training, and in general make better soldiers."

To remove present inequities in Reserve and National Guard programs, the commission recommended that "direct enlistment into Reserve and National Guard forces should not provide immunity from the draft for those with no prior service except for those who enlist before receiving their 1-A classification."

The commission also recommended a national computer file of draft-eligible doctors and dentists to help make sure their drafting would cause the least possible disruption in the medical needs of the community where they are living, and liberalization of policies

regarding drafting of aliens in the United States.

Among ideas considered but rejected by the commission were reliance on an all-volunteer army instead of the draft, universal training, compulsory national service, and volunteer national service as an alternative to military service.

A substantial majority also refused to recommend recognizing as conscientious objectors those who might oppose the Vietnam war, or any particular war, rather than war in any form.

"The majority believes," the report said, "that the status of conscientious objection can properly be applied only to those who are opposed to all killing of human beings under any circumstances.

"Legal recognition of selective pacifism could open the doors to a general theory of selective disobedience to law, which could quickly tear down the fabric of government."

The commission—which included three Negroes—was named by President Johnson last July 2. In its study, the commission invited opinions from more than 120 organizations—veterans, religious and civil rights, among others; some 250 editors of college student newspapers; each of the 4,100 local draft boards and 97 appeal boards; every state governor; many mayors, and others.

TWO MANPOWER POOLS FEATURE REVISED DRAFT SYSTEM PLAN

Here, step by step, is the way the draft system proposed to President Johnson by an advisory commission would work:

1. At age 18, as now, all men would register. As soon as possible, they would be given the standard physical, education and moral tests.

2. Those classified 1A after the testing procedure would be included in a pool of men subject to first call for military service if they would reach age 19 before a designated date. Those reaching 19 after that date would be placed in a second pool.

3. Through a random, lottery-type process, those in the first pool would be arranged in the order in which they would be subject to induction, if needed. These men would be most vulnerable to the draft for a period of one year, possibly less.

4. After the period of maximum vulnerability had elapsed, names of all men in the next-in-line pool would be ranged by a lottery-type procedure and the process would begin all over again with that group. Meanwhile, men in first pool who were not inducted would not be called unless military circumstances first required the call-up of all men in the second pool.

[From the National Observer, Mar. 6, 1967]

THE DRAFT BLOWS UP A STORM AS EXPERTS REPORT—VOLUNTEER ARMY, LOTTERY, UNIVERSAL TRAINING WIN VOCAL FOES AND FRIENDS

"The whole system is honked up," grouses a 29-year-old San Diego father of one daughter. Asks George Feldman, a round-faced psychology major at Yale University, of the proposals of an all-volunteer army: "No matter what they pay you, who would volunteer to get shot at?" Students can easily win draft deferments until they are out of school, says the editor of Georgia Tech's student newspaper. "Then if you're smart," counsels this Atlantian, John Gill, "you go get married and manufacture another deferment."

All across the nation last week the topic on target was the military draft and what Congress should do about it. In Washington, D.C., the President's special National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, after an eight-month study, recommended far-reaching reforms in the nation's 27-year-old Selective Service System.

The report's conclusion: "The United States has outgrown its Selective Service

System." The committee's recommendations, prepared under the direction of former assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall, would reduce the power of the nation's 4,061 local draft boards and eliminate inconsistencies in their administration, curtail student and occupational deferments, and reverse the present "oldest-first" order of call so the youngest men, beginning at age 19, would be taken first.

A National Observer survey of dozens of draftees, college students, draft-board officials, wives of soldiers in Vietnam, and community leaders in 13 States from Connecticut to California tapped the growing uneasiness over the draft system. Uneasiness over the draft, has, of course, been a continuing matter since before World War II. But certainly there is a new flurry of it.

Not everyone favors changes now. "The hysteria to change the draft law has come because of our involvement in war in Vietnam," reflects the Rev. Derian Yallian, pastor of the United Presbyterian Church of Solana Beach, Calif. Had the present "hysteria" prevailed during World War I or II, says the minister, "I don't think any of us would have to worry about the draft—we would be conscripted by a dictator and have no choice in the matter."

Saying he's a hawk and defending the present law, which "uses everyone's potential where he fits best," the Rev. Mr. Yallian protests: "Let's not cripple ourselves so we can't defend ourselves. I get awfully tired of people who say let's divorce ourselves from the past. Let's do something brand new. To think this way is national suicide."

Yet Congress must act. The present Selective Service law, which was adopted in 1940, expires June 30. Before then, Congress must decide whether to continue the present system, overhaul it, or replace it with an entirely new procedure for filling the nation's military manpower needs.

SPECIAL COMMISSION REPORTS

Several alternatives and dozens of alterations are being debated. Among them are a volunteer army, a national lottery, universal military training, and optional national service in groups such as the Peace Corps. Spokesmen for each of these plans will express their views at public hearings of the House Armed Services Committee, probably sometime in April. A special House commission headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark (U.S. Army, Ret.) last week presented a study of its own; this study will become the focal point for the April hearings.

General Clark's panel recommended that the youngest men, rather than the oldest, be drafted first. It also called for the restricting of graduate-school deferments to those fields judged to be "critical to the national security." Yet unlike the Presidential commission, the House committee rejected the use of a random-selection system.

President Johnson's proposals on the draft were being prepared over the weekend. With ferment in the air, Congress seems destined to overhaul the Selective Service for the first time since just after World War II.

"You shouldn't ask me about this, because I'm bitter," warns Dick Floberg, the 29-year-old San Diego father of one daughter, a former professional baseball pitcher, and now a golf professional.

I WAITED FOR 18 MONTHS

"I wanted to go when I got out of high school, get in my six months, and get out," he explains. "But Selective Service rejected me. Said I had a bad leg and bad back from baseball. Then I got married—and they called me! I took the exam and I liquidated everything. I even quit my job. I waited for 18 months. Nothing happened. So I wrote my congressman.

"Six months went by and I got a 1-Y classification, whatever that is. I never did go. If you want my opinion, the draft

should be for both men and women—get them off mama's apron strings. Then we wouldn't have so many Berkeleys. If they all went in at say 16 and came out at about 18, they would be better men and women."

John Wilson, a 21-year-old Northwestern University advertising major from Wilmington, Del., agrees. "I would much rather have served at 18," he says. "Now I'm anxious to start a career, but I'm faced with the prospect of two years of service." If he were killed in Vietnam, he complains, "it would be a net loss of \$20,000 spent on my education."

Gaylord Fagerhand, a Moorhead, Minn., Air Force veteran and a church-choir director, would like to see some of the college loopholes tightened up. He winces: "There are too many ways of getting out of the draft. You go to school and get a deferment and then keep going from one deferment to another. I think when you complete one deferment you should be drafted."

EXPELLED, THEN DRAFTED

Even students have trouble justifying such deferments. Britt Kolar, a beefy junior from Texas who plays linebacker on Yale's football team, recalls a classmate who was expelled for a fight and subsequently drafted. "He made a slip his freshman year, and now he's in Vietnam," moans Mr. Kolar. "Those guys over there fighting are just like us—maybe not quite so smart—but that shouldn't make them less qualified to be living when the war's over."

Says Keith Marshall, 20, a Yale student from New Orleans: "I'd have more trouble justifying draft-dodging than I would justifying fighting in Vietnam if I were drafted." He doesn't weigh the war philosophically. "I've made it very simple. It's my country, right or wrong."

Others are unhappy that some people escape the draft. "If you have money and connections, you're OK," notes a draftee standing in line at the Whitehall Street induction center in New York City. "Look how Cassius Clay and George Hamilton have avoided the draft."

George Hamilton, the film star who occasionally courts the President's daughter, Lynda Bird, received a "hardship" deferment because his socialite mother depends on his \$250,000 annual income; she lives in a 39-room Beverly Hills mansion. Cassius Clay, the heavyweight boxing champ, has been trying to avoid induction by arguing that his Black Muslim religion entitles him to deferment as a conscientious objector or as a minister.

A HOUSEWIFE'S VIEW

A slender, brunet San Diego housewife, Mrs. Betty Daun, a mother of three little girls, steps from her 1967 Volkswagen camper, protesting: "Why shouldn't George Hamilton go? I don't see any reason why he shouldn't. They say he is sole support of his mother. Why can't she get up and get a job? If we're going to fight wars, I think the rich and poor should go just the same."

Shaking his head in disagreement is James A. Nelson, 22, a University of Nevada senior who is single. "There are many complaints about Clay and Hamilton, but they've just been made scapegoats by the public," he believes. "The guy who would criticize Clay's not being drafted is probably trying to keep his own kid out of the service."

When it comes to alternatives to the present system, few have any well-thought-out ideas. One exception is Francis N. Connolly, editor and publisher of the *Tempe* (Ariz.) Daily News. He favors a form of universal military training for all Americans for a minimum of one year. "There's something everybody can do—even those in a wheel chair," he argues.

J. W. Mitchell, a Negro veteran from Atlanta, rejects the voluntary-army idea. He asks, "How would you volunteer for something you didn't want in the first place?"

THE BOTTOM OF THE BARREL

"I guess the lottery would be fair," comments the Rev. George Hagen, associate minister at the First Congregational Church in Branford, Conn., on a proposal for selecting draftees at random from a general pool. "But I'm sure our government can come up with something with a little more meat to it. A lottery would be scraping the bottom of the barrel."

Says Gerald Bankers, a chemistry major at North Dakota State University in Fargo: "This lottery idea stinks. First of all, those guys who aren't doing anything might just as well go into the service. And second, I don't think a guy should be jerked out of school. I don't want to be in the middle of a quarter and get jerked out."

The Rev. Mr. Hagen sees an expanded choice as an answer to the "traitor-patriot" division some say is created by the present Selective Service procedure. "There are very interesting possibilities in VISTA-like national service corps," he says. He suggests this option to the draft would be better administered through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Office of Economic Opportunity than through the Defense Department.

"There is something wrong with a system which casts you either as a patriot if you're willing to bear arms in Vietnam or a non-patriot if you object to fighting in this war," he laments.

A 21-year-old El Centro, Calif., professional photographer, Bert Hope, senses the immense difficulty of the task ahead for Congress. "Sure, the law is full of loopholes," he says. "And the law should be tightened. But then you can't build a bureaucracy big enough to screen every case. There are too many people in this country."

KEY POINTS IN DRAFT REPORT

The President's special National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, after an eight-month study, recommended far-reaching reform of the nation's Selective Service System. In all, the commission made 13 major recommendations and dozens of minor ones. Here are the main points in the report:

The system's administration would undergo a major reorganization. The commission would phase out the system's current decentralization in 4,061 local draft boards and replace it with a more centralized administration characterized by a strong national headquarters. The goal would be to eliminate inconsistencies in local administration. The new structure would include 8 regional offices and 300 to 500 area offices. Local boards, composed of volunteer citizens, would serve as the registrants' court of first appeal on complaints.

The present "oldest-first" order of call would be reversed so that the youngest men, beginning at age 19, would be taken first.

No further student or occupational deferments would be granted, with minor exceptions. Gone would be widespread deferment for undergraduate and graduate study. Present deferments would be allowed to continue. But thereafter, men who are already in college when they are randomly selected for service would be permitted to finish only their sophomore year before induction.

Draft-eligible men would be inducted into service as needed according to an order of call that would be impartially and randomly determined. Eliminated would be some local-board procedures that encourage consideration of special circumstances, such as performance in school and family environment.

Direct enlistment into Reserve and National Guard forces would not continue to provide immunity from the draft for those with no prior service except for those who

enlist before receiving their 1-A classifications.

If Reserve and National Guard units were not able to maintain their force level with volunteers, they would be filled by inductions. Inductions would be determined by the order of call for active-duty service.

The commission proposes further study to determine the feasibility of a plan that would permit all men who are selected for induction at 18 to decide themselves when, between 19 and 23, to fulfill their military obligation.

The commission rejected several widely discussed alternatives to the Selective Service System. Among them were reliance on an all-volunteer military force, a system of universal training for all young Americans, and a system of optional service in groups such as the Peace Corps.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1967]

A FAIRER MILITARY DRAFT

President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service has made generally admirable proposals for eliminating the inequities of the present military draft.

Obviously, no formula that puts on 19-year-olds—men too young to vote—the primary responsibility for fighting the Vietnam war is going to evoke cheers in the streets. But the commission has effectively documented its conclusion that the present system discriminates grossly against the poor, particularly the Negroes, and that most alternatives would aggravate, not cure, the existing unfairness.

Its own proposals are geared to the special needs of the war in Vietnam, a conflict that imposes a substantial drain on the nation's treasure of young men without approaching the dimensions of total war. The worldwide commitments the United States has undertaken are too great to be met through reliance on a volunteer military force unless the inducements for enlistment are made so alluring that the country would risk creating an army of mercenaries.

Yet these commitments are not so demanding that the nation requires an elaborate selection system to guard against the danger of crippling gaps in its homefront reservoir of scientific and industrial specialists to fill essential jobs.

Student deferments under the present system have in too many cases turned into outright exemptions, thus accentuating the burden on those who are already the most deprived of America's citizens. Indeed, deferment standards are becoming increasingly quixotic under pressure of the movement on many campuses to withhold data on class standings from the draft authorities.

Beguiling as is the notion of offering youngsters the option of national service in areas remote from the battlefield and valuable as such service can be, the commission is right in believing that no fair way exists for equating it with military duty in a shooting war.

In assessing the post-Vietnam outlook, the commission envisages a situation in which those chosen by lot from among each group of 19-year-olds will have maximum latitude in deciding whether to serve at once or at any time up to their 24th birthday. It is not at all clear why some such latitude cannot be introduced even now, especially if new incentives are established to encourage early service.

Congress will undoubtedly insist on exploring more closely this possibility. It will also encounter political resistance to the proposed abolition of local draft boards, which served with distinction in World War II and the Korean war. But we believe the special requirements of the current conflict make advisable changes along the lines of the commission's report. The cause of equity in national defense will be advanced by approval of its recommendations.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1967]
OUTGROWN SYSTEM

No one who takes time to read the report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service is likely to question the need for a change. The system by which men are now drafted for military service is virtually the same as it was when the legislation was passed in 1940 on the eve of World War II. But the needs are very different. The Commission concluded that "the United States has outgrown its Selective Service System."

The original concept was that men would be drafted by a local board made up of their neighbors. Except in a few rural communities, this concept has been lost in the complexities of our urban society. Members of the local draft board are rarely known to the men whom they classify. Much of their work is routine, and the impression prevails that they do little more than rubberstamp the decisions of their clerks.

The current dissatisfaction with the work of the boards stems largely from the wide variations in the standards they apply. The Commission found that some boards never reclassify men with deferments in effect and others shift men into the A-1 category before their deferments expire. Confusion and inequity often result from the fact that instructions go out to local boards from state directors as well as from national headquarters. Some states allow a student to be deferred if he carries 12 semester hours; others require 15. Some local boards take into account a student's self-support in college; others disregard it.

During the first five months of 1966, 90 per cent of the local boards in the States of Washington and Alabama had to induct married men to fill their quotas. But none of the boards in Connecticut drafted married men. The Commission also noted a strong tendency for local boards to draft men who have moved out of their community, and appeal boards more sympathetic to the individual in his new location reverse many of these decisions.

Although the Commission found that the Negro does not serve in the armed forces out of proportion to his representation in the population as a whole, he encounters inequities at several points in the system. This is one of many factors pointing to the need for uniform standards and greater consistency in their application. The President's message to Congress today will indicate the extent to which the Commission's recommendations are to have Administration support, but it is quite apparent that the reorientation of the Selective Service will need to be drastic.

THE CIA AND STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the recent furor over CIA funding of student organizations' activities abroad has caused many observers to condemn both giver and recipient. It has caused others to question why such secret methods of finance were used. Indeed, it has caused a great deal of discussion and given writers many a story. I think, however, that the most rational statement concerning the CIA link to American student organizations is a column published in the Washington Star yesterday. It is in defense of the CIA.

I ask unanimous consent that the column, authored by Howard K. Smith, be printed in the RECORD.

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

IN DEFENSE OF USING CIA FUNDS FOR STUDENTS

(By Howard K. Smith)

The most constant feature of real life is its inconsistency. It is a distressingly untidy process which confounds every effort to make a system of ideas fit or explain it.

Prof. Arnold Toynbee, who tried to schematize the record of life more elaborately than anybody since Marx and failed—for life simply bulged right out of the complex corset of system he designed for it—was once tempted to think that only one theory would fit it: The "it's-just-one-damned-thing-after-another" theory of history.

Life does not even accommodate high principle very well. The recent trouble over the CIA is an example. There is no doubt whatever that in principle it is wrong for a secret spy agency to finance, and therefore compromise the purposes of, a free organization of American students. Yet, there is also no doubt that this method of financing the students worked when no other way would have.

Consider the circumstances in which the method was begun. It was in the early fifties. The Communists had tried to take Greece and failed; they had tried to strangle Berlin by blockade and failed. So the violent phase of the Cold War in Europe was ending and the contest was turning into a competition of ideas and images between America and Russia.

International student conferences were proving good arenas for this competition to impress students from the underdeveloped lands of Africa, Asia and Latin America, future sources of trouble.

American students arrived at the conferences in limited delegations and possessing only the money acquired from dues, which barely paid their keep. The Communists arrived with abundant financing, bushels of expensive literature and squads of agents to keep them informed as to which delegates from the new countries were most susceptible of influence.

The richly endowed Communist delegations danced rings around the impoverished Americans. In the eyes of the neutral delegations, precisely, the images designed by Moscow were created: The Americans were sluggish representatives of a way of life clearly on the way out. The Communists were dynamic examples of a way of life sure to be the future's wave.

It became obvious that the American students were suffering from lack of what their nation had most of: money. Two general sources of funds were scouted. First, private sources were tried but found ungenerous. Then the thought of asking Congress for open appropriations of funds was considered. But that appeared equally unpromising, for two reasons:

To begin with, paying students to go to yacking sessions was just the kind of vague do-goodism that Congress was, and is, stingy about; so it would have appropriated too little. And, then, it would have demanded student conformism as compensation for its handout.

As an example of the latter problem, everyone remembered the art exhibit the USIA put on in Berlin in order to compete with the Communists. To prove new art forms were being sought, some pretty farout American paintings were exhibited. Some junketing Congressmen saw the avant-garde pieces and blew up at this misuse of the taxpayers' money. So the art had to be replaced with some non-controversial photographs of American life.

Had Congress appropriated some inadequate "smallest"—the opposite of largesse—its members would have become apoplectic at the first student delegation who dissented from an American policy in public. Since dissent comes as naturally to students as speechifying does to congressmen,

there would have been an embarrassing brouhaha and a cutting off of funds.

It is one of life's little perversities that only a secret spy agency could permit freedom to dissent at government expense. And that vision—of American students free to dissent confronting Communists harnessed to a strict party line—was exactly the right one to display to the students from the new nations. So, that is what was done.

That Cold War emergency is over and we have come out of it just fine. So the procedure of CIA financing of students could be—or should have been some time back—stopped. It is a pity it was ever necessary. But that is the way life is.

ACCELERATED CONSTRUCTION OF BONNEVILLE AND OTHER UNITS OF CENTRAL UTAH PROJECTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Utah State Legislature, now in session, has adopted a resolution, in which the Governor of Utah concurs, requesting the acceleration of construction of the Bonneville unit and other units of the central Utah project.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we who have been in Congress since 1956, when the upper Colorado River storage project became a reality, have been fighting almost annually for enough construction money to keep this great project on the track.

Some years have been good, and some have been lean. We are now in a lean time in the history of this project; however, it is my hope that after 2 extremely lean years we have made the turn and are heading toward added emphasis of one of the major participating projects, the central Utah project.

So that the Senate and the country can be made aware of the importance of this project to Utah's future, I join in the request of my colleague from Utah [Mr. Moss] to have printed in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Utah State Legislature requesting Congress, the President, and the Department of the Interior to accelerate the construction of the Bonneville unit and the planning and construction of the other units—Upalco, Jensen, Uintah, and Ute Indian—of the central Utah project.

The resolution was one of the first items of business to be passed by the Utah State Legislature, and I agree with it wholeheartedly.

It asks support for the \$11.1 million which provided in the fiscal year 1968 construction program for the Bonneville unit.

It also asks for \$25 million for fiscal year 1969, and for the acceleration of many of the related projects, as well.

I think that the resolution represents a fair and accurate cross section of the thinking of the people in my State and I hope that Congress, the President and the Department of the Interior will see fit to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senators from Utah?

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

S. CON. RES. 1

(By Wallace H. Gardner, Ernest H. Dean, and W. Hughes Brockbank)

A concurrent resolution of the senate and house of representatives of the thirty-seventh Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, requesting the Congress, the President, and the Department of the Interior of the United States to accelerate the construction of the Bonneville unit and the planning and construction of the other units (Upalco, Jensen, Uintah, and Ute Indian) of the Central Utah Project

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein:

Whereas the record is replete with evidence that water development projects constructed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation contribute materially to the national welfare, and, in addition, reimbursable costs of such projects are repaid to the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas the continued economic growth of the state of Utah is directly dependent upon the development and utilization of Utah's legal entitlement of Colorado River water, as set forth in the Colorado River Compact of 1922 and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact of 1948 in order to provide water to meet increasing municipal, industrial, and agricultural requirements of the state; and

Whereas units of the Central Utah Participating Project of the Colorado River Storage Project are under construction and in various stages of planning by the United States Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas funds appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1966 for the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project were diverted to other uses and of the \$7.5 million appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1967, with direction from the Congress that these funds be spent exclusively on the Bonneville Unit, only \$4.6 million has been programmed by the United States Bureau of Reclamation for the current fiscal year; and

Whereas the President of the United States included in his Budget Request an \$11.145 million program for fiscal year 1968 for continuing construction of the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Thirty-seventh Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, does hereby unanimously support the President's budget request of \$11.145 million to continue construction of the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project.

Be it further resolved, that the Congress of the United States is urged to appropriate the necessary funds to accomplish the President's program, and, that the Department of the Interior proceed with construction of works to utilize these funds during fiscal year 1968.

Be it further resolved, that to meet the future water requirements of Utah all of the Units of the Central Utah Project will be required at the earliest practicable date, and it is therefore urged that the Congress of the United States, the President, and the Department of the Interior continue to accelerate the construction of the Central Utah Project by authorizing the necessary works, appropriating the necessary funds, and issuing pertinent directives to the Bureau of Reclamation to accomplish the following:

(1) A progressive and economic construction program on the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project amounting to at least \$25 million for fiscal year 1969; and

(2) The completion of advance planning reports and initiation of construction on the Congressionally-authorized Upalco and Jensen units of the Central Utah Project prior to 1969; and

(3) The completion of feasibility reports prior to 1972 on the Uintah and Ute Indian units of the Central Utah Project.

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Utah be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Upper Colorado River Commission and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in Congress.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, almost two decades ago—in 1948—an act of Congress established the Selective Service System. Men who were infants that year are today being drafted under that system for military duty. Moreover, the basic system itself, which was in effect reactivated by the 1948 legislation, was created in 1940. Men who were born that year—the same year the System was born which has had such a dominating influence on the lives of an entire generation—are today too old for the draft. Those who have received deferments are technically still vulnerable, but even so the draft rarely touches men above the age of 26.

The Selective Service System has endured all these years, substantially without modification, because it was, to an extent, effective and responsive to the country's needs.

It was also considered a fair system when it was established. It was built on the assumption that men who were called through the draft to serve their country would be chosen equitably.

It might well have remained that same way had the world—and the Nation with it—remained unchanged.

But change has come—change so vast that our vital statistics sound like those of a different Nation from that which existed a quarter of a century ago. Some of those changes, particularly those in our population growth, have brought with them conditions out of which inequities arise when young men are selected to serve.

Today more men are available for the draft than the Armed Forces need. The basic condition is as simple as that. But the steps the Selective Service System has taken to accommodate that condition have not been simple at all. They have involved an extremely complicated program of deferments of various kinds which have in practical effect exempted large numbers of men from the draft, placing the burden of involuntary service increasingly on one group.

The President's message to Congress offers a way and is open to suggestions to bring back to the Selective Service System the principle of equity which Congress always intended for it.

It would subject all eligible men equally and fairly to the process of selection. None would be favored. All would be treated as complete equals.

So long as we must continue to have a draft—and it is obvious that a draft will be necessary for at least the years ahead that we can now foresee—we must have the fairest draft system that a democratic nation can devise.

I believe the program the President has submitted is a proposal worth our most serious consideration. The Senate will scrutinize his recommendations care-

fully and scrupulously and will consider changes which will treat all as equitably as possible and endeavor to do away with inequities wherever they may exist.

NATIONAL CARIH ASTHMA WEEK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] for the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 4, authorizing the President to proclaim "National CARIH Asthma Week."

It gives me much pleasure to be a cosponsor of this joint resolution, and I do so with deep regard for the devotion of those Americans who have taken up the challenge of transforming intractable asthmatic children into healthy, vigorous youngsters.

Mr. President, this remarkable institution continues to provide for the needs of severely asthmatic children of every race, color, and creed from every State in this Nation. We owe a great debt of gratitude not only to the CARIH institution itself, but also to the dedicated efforts of the 140 CARIH auxiliaries throughout the country who, through private effort, provide the funds for this nonprofit institution.

Mr. President, I urge the speedy adoption of this joint resolution.

JACK W. HALL—LEADER OF LABOR MOVEMENT IN HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, in the relatively brief history of the labor movement in Hawaii, one name stands alone in terms of leadership, aggressiveness, and a determination to secure a fair share of the fruits of our society for workers. That name belongs to Jack W. Hall, regional director of the International Longshoremen & Warehousemen's Union.

In a recent speech, Mr. Hall outlined the philosophic approach of the ILWU in Hawaii to social problems and economic change. Because of the union's success in helping to resolve human problems created by industrial change, I know that Mr. Hall's remarks will be of interest to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Hall's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

HUMAN COSTS OF PROGRESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In a recent speech, Jack W. Hall, regional director, set forth the philosophic approach which he said has motivated his union, the I.L.W.U., in its approach to social problems and technological change.

(Because the I.L.W.U. has been a major force in re-shaping post-World War II Hawaii, the text is reprinted in full.)

(By Jack W. Hall, ILWU Regional Director)

Let me start off by stating how trade unions as they function today in the United States see their primary responsibility. A union's first responsibility is to the members it represents. It must be able to safeguard the jobs and conditions of the members in its ranks, not those it has represented in the past, or those it may organize in the future.

From this point of view we in the I.L.W.U. have been in the forefront in seeking new answers to the technologically-created problems of our members. In a moment I will describe some of the answers we found—new approaches which were first developed in Hawaii.

Before I do, I want to say that the narrow view of labor's responsibilities which I have given you does not meet the larger social problems. This narrow view is generated by the system within which we operate. It reflects the correspondingly narrow view which most employers take of their responsibility under a free enterprise system. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the freedom of free enterprise has been precisely the freedom from responsibility for the social and human consequences of the enterprise.

Our traditional ideology . . . and let me say right here that I don't believe this ideology corresponds to the facts of modern life, which include giant corporations and imperfect competition . . . but the tradition, nevertheless, does hold that the employer's first responsibility is to profits and that if each employer pursues this interest energetically and efficiently, some will fail, but the best will succeed and—as Adam Smith expressed it—as if guided by an "unseen hand," all this self-centered striving will result in general economic and social progress which will benefit us all. (Here in Hawaii we never really believed that, of course. We know we cannot permit some of our basic industrial firms to fail even if they are not the "best.")

This progress Adam Smith spoke of is evident enough, however.

Less well understood by those who should know is the terrible human cost of much of this progress . . . the cost to millions of lowly, inarticulate people whose lives have been destroyed or blighted by the shifting demands and upsetting effects of the industrial revolution which has been transforming life on our planet at an ever faster pace for more than two centuries.

The progress has always left a frightful human wreckage in its wake—from the mill-towns in 19th century England and the modern slums and mines of South Africa and South America to the black ghettos of our own country or our urban and rural slums right here in Hawaii.

It hasn't been progress at all—it has been a disaster for millions of individuals . . . for underpaid workers in unregulated industries, for middle-aged workers whose skills have become obsolete, for uneducated Negroes replaced by cotton-picking machines, for slum-reared youngsters who drop out of school and can't find a job in a society which demands more and more education.

Trade unions were born as workers sought to defend themselves against the socially irresponsible use of economic power. In many countries this effort produced socialist parties, striving to establish a political-economy in which the criterion for economic decisions would be the general welfare, rather than private profit.

In the United States, for the past 80 years, the labor movement has generally concentrated on winning recognition and defending the interests of its members within a given industry. I believe that unions have an important secondary responsibility to be activists and agitators for solutions to broader social problems which cannot be met by collective bargaining. Only once in my lifetime has the American labor movement undertaken anything like structural reforms in our society, however. That was when the C.I.O., led by John L. Lewis, backed Roosevelt's New Deal and initiated our present system of social security and public welfare measures.

These measures, along with the Keynesian concept that government fiscal policy could be used to stabilize the economy, recognized the fact that economic change and progress create human problems which cannot be prevented or resolved by private decisionmak-

ing, and that society as a whole has a responsibility to its members who are the victims of change. A high-water mark of this thinking was the Full Employment Act of 1946. That Act in its declaration of policy says:

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

The cold war prevented us from building further on these foundations, until very recent years.

Finally, shocked by revelations of widespread poverty, persistent unemployment, human deterioration and waste, in the midst of general affluence, we started to take some relatively small-scale public steps under the slogans "A War on Poverty" and a "Great Society." Unfortunately, these beginnings are starving in the cradle because of our disastrous involvement in Vietnam, with its overwhelming cost of more than \$2 billion a month.

I say all this to indicate how narrow our own achievement has been, and to indicate that we are aware of this. We have simply concentrated on those solutions which were possible for us within the context in which we worked.

There are some unique features of Hawaii's industry which favored our efforts to make employers accept responsibility for helping to resolve the human problems created by industrial change. These include:

1—Insularity which makes problems like unemployment more critical. They have to be solved by us here. There is no frontier or neighboring state, to take the pressure off.

Also, insularity makes it easier to trace the effects of economic decisions back to their causes.

2—Concentration of ownership. The Big Five were the decision-makers and everyone here knew it.

3—Importation of the Labor Force by the Big Five. Workers were brought in from many countries, but by one group, for one purpose. They may have worked for several companies, or for several industries, but still they worked for the same general group of employers and thought of themselves as having had their fate determined by the Big Five.

4—The union to be successful was compelled to forge an inter-racial solidarity, which is unique in America.

On the mainland, the late-comer immigrant group has always been the shock absorber of industrial change. As each group was assimilated, it escaped from the problems and left them to the group which took its place. The Negro is the last of these, with no replacements in sight. This is one reason for a general lack of social solidarity and responsibility in American life. It also helps us understand the Negro crisis.

In Hawaii only an inter-racial, statewide union could cope with the Big Five. To hold the union together we had to represent the interest of every racial group.

5—Changes came faster in Hawaii. Within 15 years after the war, the workforce in sugar and pineapple was cut in half.

With this background, how did the Union seek to discharge its responsibilities to its members and the community?

In the sugar industry more than 15 years

ago, the union made the basic decision not to waste its strength in a losing fight against mechanization and job eliminations. Instead it demanded that the workers be given a share in the benefits of the machine and be protected against victimization. This required workers as well as employers to act in a responsible way.

In the sugar industry, for example, instead of permitting layoffs of younger, low seniority workers, who would have to join the ranks of the unemployed and who then and for several years after would become public welfare burdens, we initiated two programs—designed to shrink the work-force from the top—both at the expense of larger wage increases:

1—Incentives—in the form of separation pay and repatriation allowances—were provided to encourage the older worker to voluntarily leave the workforce. Older workers were permitted to substitute for younger workers who would otherwise have been laid off. Repatriation incentives encouraged older workers, particularly Philippine nationals, to return permanently to their homeland before normal retirement age, with sizeable sums of American dollars, which vastly expanded in purchasing power in the Philippines. These repatriates on reaching normal retirement age were all eligible for social security and collective bargaining pensions.

2—We took money that would otherwise have gone to active employees to buy pensions for older workers so they could afford to leave the workforce and we negotiated for them and their spouses the best medical plan in the nation for retired workers.

A similar program was followed in pineapple.

Together with the above efforts to get older workers out of the workforce, the union encouraged the employers, with some degree of success, to retrain workers displaced by technological change for more skilled jobs. Rate protection was assured for extended periods depending on length of service.

In the longshore industry, the displacement problem has been relatively much greater and has come in a much shorter period of time.

Containerization and bulk shipment of practically all Matson cargo to Hawaii has had a tremendous impact on jobs and work opportunity here in Hawaii. Hawaii is the destination point of all Matson cargo flowing out of the Pacific Northwest, the San Francisco Bay Area and Southern California.

In less than 10 years, Hawaii's longshore workforce has been cut in half, and work opportunity for the individual has gone down by a third. The outer-islands have been hit hardest.

How did we go about easing the impact of these changes? We did it by:

1—Providing jobs for men who wanted to transfer to the Pacific Coast ports where work was plentiful and giving them travel allowances of \$850 for family men (\$325 for single employees).

2—Permitting employees to repatriate to home lands with lump-sum settlements of pension equities. Some left with as much as \$20,000.

3—Offering generous severance allowances to older workers. Employees leaving or retiring at age 60 under the old agreement, in addition to all other pension and severance arrangements received a supplemental severance bonus of \$6,000.

Today the statewide longshore work force is down to what seems to be minimum needs for the next several years. The problem now is the distribution of work opportunity between ports. Out-ports, especially Kauai and Hilo, have the minimum number of men required to handle a conventional ship but bargaining of containers has cut work opportunity to less than subsistence level.

We are meeting this problem in current negotiations by establishing a statewide

labor pool with hours equalized on a statewide basis. Workers will be moved from port to port by air to accomplish this equalization and if work opportunity falls below an average of 38 hours weekly, over a four-week period, wage supplementation will be paid from Mechanization Funds to bring earnings to that average.

We are now engaged in energetic efforts to promote and to organize Hawaii's newest industry—tourism—with the hope that this expanding industry will be the source of decent jobs at union wages and conditions for those displaced by future economic change and for our young people entering the labor market for the first time.

We are supporting and encouraging training programs, government and private, so these displaced and new workers will have the skills to fill these new jobs.

I am confident that through the process of collective bargaining we will be able to handle the problems of our present members as economic change continues. But this is only a small part of the overall State and national problems. The big job will have to be done by government, labor and business working together. Only in this way can the larger social problems be mitigated, let alone solved.

NEW YORKERS ARE BEING SOLD OUT TO IOU'S

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the New York press is providing excellent coverage of the big, but generally unreported stories of our times. I refer to the overcharge exacted by the investor-owned utilities, the failure of State regulatory bodies to regulate and the arrogant efforts of the IOU's to attain complete monopoly on their essential electricity by excluding city-owned and customer-owned power systems from essential wholesale power supply.

The situation is worse in some other States than it is in New York. But it is bad there, and I compliment newspapers such as the New York Times, the New York World Journal Tribune, and the Watertown Daily Times for their coverage and editorials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials entitled "Selling Out on Power," published in the March 2 and March 3 issues of the Watertown, N.Y., Daily Times, and the March 4 editorial, entitled "Assessing the PSC" published in the New York Times.

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

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Mar. 2, 1967]

SELLING OUT ON POWER

The proposal for an \$8,000,000,000 atomic power program in New York state is a sellout to the private power companies. No other conclusion can be reached because the New York state power authority will be forbidden to construct atomic power plants in the future and will at the same time be confined to hydroelectric considerations as an operator of Niagara and Massena and a coordinator in other hydroelectric matters. This proposal must receive legislative enactment. May the legislature insist that the authority be given as many rights to the construction of nuclear plants as the private utilities.

The statement is made by Gov. Rockefeller that the New York utilities must double their annual electricity production in the next ten years, from 17,000,000 kilowatts to 35,000,000 kilowatts. This sounds big, but it is absolutely the same program that the

utilities have set for themselves ever since World War II, namely an increase of ten per cent a year. So suddenly a deal is made that will enable them to keep up what they have been doing in the past, in return for which the power authority, which was conceived as an agency to represent the citizens' interests in power making and power distribution, will be shoved over into the corner and given a job of keeping the old power plants swept out.

Incidentally, the power authority today is producing approximately a little more than one-fifth of the state's annual power production. By 1977, if the scheme is accepted by the legislature, the authority will produce a little more than one-twelfth of the annual production. Many people fought the better part of 40 years to assure the state of an adequate share of the power production. Suddenly in the prospect of an \$8,000,000,000 expansion, the state's role is downgraded so that the private needs for capital can be advanced, with the lenders being assured that they will not have any increase in the amount of competition from the power authority. The statement is made in news stories that there will be no competition insofar as the atomic power production is concerned; continue to limit the state power authority to hydroelectric operations to avoid competition with the utilities in the field of nuclear energy.

There is language in the announcement about a role for the power authority. It is supposed to make power available to municipalities and public power districts in greater amounts through a withdrawal of power from private utilities. They in turn would get their increased electricity requirements from the nuclear plants. This seems to be saying that public power will go to publicly owned installations primarily, and privately built nuclear power will go toward the industrial needs of consumers.

We cannot believe that the farsighted programs in this state, originally conceived by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, enhanced and enlarged by the late Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, brought to culmination by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, should now by a simple legislative enactment be placed in a deep freeze.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Mar. 3, 1967]

SELLING OUT ON POWER—II

Continuing the comments against the Albany power plan that would deny the New York State Power authority the right to construct nuclear plants, we call attention to the efforts during the past seven years to broaden the state power franchise. The suddenness of the announcement Wednesday that the private utilities would be given free rein in the field of nuclear electricity production might lead some citizens to think that a major need had only recently been discovered, and the cost of meeting that need was particularly high, \$8,000,000,000, over the next ten years, and finally there was an immediacy about accomplishing the objective.

In 1960 the New York State Power authority publicly called attention to the role that the authority should be given in meeting the needs of the electricity consumers during the years to the 1980's. In 1960 the authority sought permission of the legislature to build and operate nuclear power plants. At the time two temporary committees on power resources had recommended against the authority's request for nuclear privileges, although the authority was the one state agency that was supposed to be responsible for publicly owned electric power production. The authority itself had made studies and the then chairman, Robert Moses, had sought with his persuasiveness the opportunity at legislation. Again in 1961, he and the authority asked for atomic privileges.

The Power Authority Act was confined to hydroelectric developments, nuclear power not being in the picture when the early laws

were passed. Never, however, did the authority seek to restrict the private utilities from the nuclear field. The thinking has been that both the privately owned and the publicly owned utilities had an important role in meeting consumer needs.

In 1965 the authority went at it again, proving conclusively that in behalf of the public it should have a nuclear opportunity. The 1965 effort, however, was made behind the scenes, although the justification and the statistics amply supported authority recommendation. Although the proposal never saw the light of day, suggested amendments to the Power Authority Act were couched in terms that the public interest requires "that the state as well as the private utility companies should participate in the development of electric power from nuclear fields and other forms of atomic energy."

There was apparent rejection of this in Albany, although the public never had a chance to express itself.

In 1966 the authority came at it again, unfortunately in an informal manner, and got nowhere. This is the kind of issue that should have been in the forefront of the campaign, but for reasons that aren't understood never a mention was made. Late in 1966, once again the authority prepared documentation as to why it should be given the right to build nuclear power plants.

As soon as word of its efforts got out, there was a gang-up against it so that within a period of a little more than a month the authority recommendations were rejected as though they never existed, and the governor, together with the speaker of the assembly, Mr. Travia, are proposing to introduce legislation that is 100 percent against the interests of the state power authority, the traditional power agency of the state. It has been said that the power authority will be given permission to develop electricity on some settling pools, but this isn't the big power producer of the future. Nuclear power will be the big producer. Yet Albany says that it is going to limit the state power authority to hydroelectric operations to avoid competition with the utilities in the field of nuclear energy.

Is there anyone in the state who is ready to rise up and head off the legislative embargo against the authority's entering the nuclear power development? Who will stand up and assist the agency in carrying out the public power policy of this state which dates back for 40 years. Certainly there has been no mandate for reversal, but that seems to be what is happening.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 4, 1967]

ASSESSING THE PSC

The city's request for greater control over utilities comes too late in this legislative session for comprehensive consideration. But it will be unfortunate if it does not become the basis for a thorough study of the state's regulatory laws and of the operation of the Public Service Commission.

Mayor Lindsay's proposal that the PSC be required to hold public hearings before authorizing rate increases follows his unsuccessful protests in November when the commission granted a \$32.4-million rate boost to Consolidated Edison first and ordered hearings afterward. These hearings, now in adjournment, are to be resumed March 14. Meanwhile, New Yorkers are paying bigger electric bills.

The Mayor's bill and alternative proposals should be considered by a Joint Legislative Committee, which could hold hearings over the summer. Its job would be to evaluate the commission's work, and to revise and update the state's laws in this field. The Transportation Corporations Law, for example, unchanged since 1840, is more attuned to conditions in primitive rural communities than to the aggravating problem of urban life, yet this law sets many of the standards for utility regulation today. Such

a committee also could consider qualifications for PSC membership and staff. Politics often seems to have been the primary requisite in past appointments.

A real assessment of the commission and a dispassionate look at its decisions are doubly important in the light of the program just announced by Governor Rockefeller and the state's public utilities for an \$8-billion expansion program in the next decade. New York's need for much more power is clear, but the public is entitled to assurance that it has an effective watchdog in deciding how that power is produced and what it costs.

THE QUIET PAIR OF PHILANTHROPISTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it has been more than a month since the small airplane carrying Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Currier vanished over the Caribbean. It must now be presumed that they are lost.

These were remarkable individuals. Born to great wealth, they made a pact to invest their inheritances in solving social problems in the United States, rather than investing in their own pleasure. They preferred to remain anonymous; and made more efforts to escape publicity than most people make to get it.

Mrs. Currier was the daughter of our Ambassador to Great Britain, the Honorable David Bruce, and granddaughter of Andrew Mellon. In 1955, while a student at Radcliffe, she married Stephen Currier, son of the late painter Richard Currier.

In 1958 the couple set up the Taconic Foundation. Through this outlet, they poured funds into the struggle to obtain equal opportunities for Negroes, although it was not then fashionable to do so.

More recently, the attention of the Curriers turned to the growing urban problem. Last year, Mr. Currier formed Urban America, Inc., which is studying such problems as bad housing and inadequate urban planning. The couple had also been working on plans for beautifying the Washington area.

Stephen Currier was not a philanthropist from afar. He spent time in the slums he sought to improve. He saw his role as that of catalyst in problem-solving; typically, when the Federal Government authorized funds for mental health research, the Taconic Foundation departed from the field.

Characteristic of the couple is the fund known as the Harvard Gamble, which provides means for worthy students wishing to go to Harvard, but are below the scholarship level and are without funds.

Mr. President, many eloquent tributes have been made to the Curriers in this Chamber. Many others have appeared in the press and have been broadcast on radio and television. One of the best was delivered by Edward P. Morgan over the American Broadcasting network on February 3. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Morgan's fine remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS,
FEBRUARY 3, 1967

Almost everybody wants to make more money but too many people who strike it rich

leave a trail of trampled bodies and ideals behind. And then, sour grapes or not, a lot who don't make it automatically equate wealth with evil, sin, reckless living and the exploitation of society.

History brims with the depredations of cruel, selfish captains of industry, the ruthless rascality of the robber barons and their ilk. But perhaps the greatest mistake Karl Marx ever made was to overlook the fact that there is a little avarice in almost all of us. The appetite for tangible gain is a human one; keeping up with the Joneses—or, preferably, passing them on the curves—can have as much motive power as an ideology. There is another truth which Marx missed and a lot of the rest of us are inclined to forget. It is that many men—and women—of wealth have been powerful influences for good. Maybe some are activated by a feeling of guilt over "ill-gotten gains." But there is another breed consisting of people who use money joyously as a tool to build, so to speak, a social structure that lends a little more grace to the landscape of civilization than existed before they came along. Very likely they would have drawn the same plans without a bankroll but it is marvelous how money can help translate a blueprint into an edifice.

Seventeen days ago Mr. and Mrs. Stephen R. Currier were lost on a chartered flight from Puerto Rico to the Virgin Islands. They were virtually unknown to most Americans. But their generosity, commitment and deep, energetic concern for the human race warmed and lit up the lives of countless people so that while the loss of this young couple is a cruel tragedy it is counterbalanced by the glowing fact that they did such an incredible amount of good in such a breathlessly short time.

Inevitably, most of the news stories about the missing Curriers zeroed in on their wealth. Audrey Currier, 33, was the daughter of David K. E. Bruce, now U.S. ambassador to Britain, and granddaughter of Andrew Mellon, Pittsburgh banker and multimillionaire who was Secretary of the Treasury under Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover. Steve Currier, 36, stepson of Edward M. W. Warburg, himself a prominent philanthropist and patron of the arts, was a Harvard dropout who enhanced his own fortune, small by comparison to his wife's, with wise investment.

But the real story involves what the Curriers, who leave three small children, did with themselves and their money. They did it so quietly that their immediate families are only now beginning to discover the extent of their activities. They created a private foundation, Taconic, and no tax dodge, it. The young man who never finished Harvard and the girl who finished Radcliffe with honors, used it to help through college students who just missed qualifying for other scholarships. The number of "Taconics," as they are called, on the Harvard campus today would be hard to count. Before Birmingham Police Chief Bull Connor made civil rights a national issue with his dogs and firehoses, Currier was unobtrusively immersing himself in the cause. Through Potomac Institute, financed by the Taconic Foundation, he contributed money to hire expert help in the drafting of civil rights legislation in the mid-60s, so inadequate were Congressional staffs dealing with it. He substantially supported the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the Southern Regional Council. He went to Harlem, not to "slum" but to try to find answers to social problems. He was instrumental in organizing Urban America, Incorporated, to fight poverty and prejudice in conjunction with governmental efforts. He became enormously and expertly interested in conservation, gave an important private boost to Lady Bird Johnson's beautification program.

Currier designed himself the fabulous home they built in the Virginia hunt country and Audrey Currier did her own interior

design and decoration. The magnificent estate, after their children's use of it, will be left to the U.S. government hopefully as a sort of American Chequers where presidents can take important guests for quiet weekends as British prime ministers have done in that famous country place in England.

The Curriers were not of the jet set and they shunned publicity. Indeed protecting their near-anonymity was one of the assignments of Currier's public relations men, though they were far from recluses and once organized with the other Warburg children a huge and hilariously happy weekend party as a wedding anniversary presents for Steve's mother and step-father.

Eddie Warburg once encountered a moving passage in a collection of quotations which, he remembers, struck Steve as a creed worth living. It runs like this: "I shall pass through this world but once. Any good thing therefore that I can do, any kindness that I can show to any human being, let me do it now. Let me not defer it nor neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

It would hardly have mattered if Stephen and Audrey Currier had never heard that creed for they lived it anyway.

FARM BUREAU SUPPORTS MARKETING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the current issue of Nation's Agriculture, monthly publication of the American Farm Bureau, discusses the Agricultural Producers Marketing Act. The bill is designed to stop unfair practices affecting producers of farm products and their marketing associations.

It is my belief that any sound farm policy should support the farmer's independence and at the same time encourage and protect his right to take collective action as a means of improving the price received. That is why the bill, supported by the Farm Bureau, makes good sense: it gives the farmer protection when exercising his right to bargain.

As this article points out:

The market system provides an opportunity for what, in reality, is an economic contest between buyer and seller. . . . Farmers have little or no negotiating strength and . . . the handlers are winning the contest—buying at the lowest possible cost.

I am pleased to have added my name to that of Senators AIKEN, YOUNG of North Dakota, and LAUSCHE as a sponsor of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Farm Bureau United Behind Marketing Rights Bill" be printed in the RECORD.

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

FARM BUREAU UNITES BEHIND MARKETING RIGHTS BILL

Marketing rights for farmers and their marketing and bargaining associations will be a major issue in the 90th Congress.

The Agricultural Producers Marketing Act—a bill which received widespread support at hearings last year—has been re-introduced by Senators George D. Aiken (R.) of Vermont, Frank Lausche (D.) of Ohio and Milton Young (R.) of North Dakota.

The bill—designed to stop unfair practices affecting producers of farm products and their marketing associations—is strongly supported by Farm Bureau.

The Aiken-Lausche-Young bill will be known as S. 109, the same number assigned to it during the past Congress. Similar bills are being introduced by prominent members of the House of Representatives.

The marketing rights bill would forbid handlers to:

Deny any producer his right to join and belong to an association of producers.

Discriminate—or threaten to discriminate—against a producer because of his membership in or contract with an association of producers.

Coerce or intimidate a producer into withdrawing from his association.

Offer any inducement or reward to a producer for refusing to join or ceasing to belong to an association of producers.

The need for such legislation was made very clear at hearings on S. 109 held last year by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Chuck B. Shuman, President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, pointed out to the Senators that since the early 1920's public policy has encouraged farmers to form marketing associations which could negotiate contracts for farm products.

"These laws," Shuman said, "in effect granted farmers the right to market cooperatively through their own marketing associations. Unfortunately, farmers have been discouraged from exercising their right to act cooperatively because of reprisals and fears of reprisals from some processors."

The Senators heard testimony from several farmers who had participated in cooperative marketing activities and who had—as a consequence—experienced acreage cuts and unusual treatment by processors. There can be no doubt that farmers' marketing rights have been denied and thwarted by some processors.

Today, processors deny that they practice the unfair acts set out in S. 109. Even if that is true, processors know they can use the unfair practices without suffering legal penalties, and farmers know it, too. A poor market is better than no market at all; so many farmers do not join cooperative marketing efforts for fear of reprisals such as loss of acreage or termination of a contract.

Those who recognize the need for better marketing also recognize the desirability of protecting farmers' rights to cooperatively market their products. Legislation which will establish "rules of fair play" on the part of processors and others in their business relationships with farmers should eliminate these threats of discrimination against farmers for having joined a marketing association.

President Shuman has said, "This is moderate legislation that is truly in the best long-time interests of producers and processors who are really interested in responsible marketing practices."

One would think, from an ordinary knowledge of agricultural marketing, that S. 109 is a fairly straight-forward idea that will quickly become law. Such is not necessarily the case.

The market system provides an opportunity for what, in reality, is an economic contest between buyer and seller—one trying to buy at the lowest possible cost and the other trying to sell under the most favorable terms. However, there is little opportunity for millions of farmers, acting individually, to be very effective in the contest when the buying, processing and distribution of agricultural products is concentrated in the hands of a relatively few large processors.

The processors know that, under the present rules of the game, the cards are stacked on their side of the table, that farmers have little or no negotiating strength, and that the handlers are winning the contest—buying at the lowest possible cost.

Opponents to S. 109 are opposing a fair game. And there is danger that they may win in the legislative halls just as they have won in the fields of crops and pens of livestock. One way farmers may do better at the market place is to support "rules of fair play" to govern conduct there.

Consequently, Farm Bureau is strongly urging the enactment of legislation, such as

S. 109, which will prohibit unfair practices designed to discourage voluntary farmer participation in marketing associations. Farmers should not be denied the right to market their products because of voluntary membership in their associations.

THE SEARCH FOR ALTERNATIVES TO GAULLISM IN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President—

Some new sounds are being heard in Europe and they aren't *The Star-Spangled Banner*.

This is the opening sentence in a most provocative editorial entitled "Seeking Alternatives to De Gaulle," published in the February 10 issue of *Life* magazine.

The "new sounds" to which the editorial refers are Harold Wilson's "playing it a little anti-American" in order to gain admission to the Common Market and Chancellor Kiesinger's renewal of close French-German collaboration.

The editorial observes:

They're all talking De Gaulle's language these days.

Life then goes on to outline an alternative to De Gaulle's policy, an alternative based on four propositions:

Britain's admittance to Europe, Europe technologically independent of us, Bridge-building to the East and a Germany free to be itself.

Life concludes that "our job is to refine these ingredients of Atlantic policy so that we are able to pose to Europeans a clear alternative—as we do not at present—to all that is narrow and inadequate in De Gaulle's policy."

I commend the *Life* editorial to the attention of Senators. The editorial carries a step further some of the thoughts I included in an article I wrote in the October 1966 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. I concluded that article by saying:

For our fundamental national interests can easily accommodate the changing mood of Europe. We need sacrifice nothing to keep our policies relevant. But only by so doing can we preserve our influence in the Europe of today—and tomorrow.

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

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

SEEKING ALTERNATIVES TO DE GAULLE

Some new sounds are being heard in Europe and they aren't *The Star-Spangled Banner*. Harold Wilson urges Britain's acceptance into the Common Market "so that we can speak from strength to our Atlantic partners." He added, "Let no one here doubt Britain's loyalty to NATO and the Atlantic Alliance. But loyalty must never mean subservience." As Germany's Willy Brandt said, Wilson had to play it "a little anti-American" if he expects Britain to be admitted. West Germany's new Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger is out to make friends with Communist East Europe and has already won diplomatic recognition from Romania. He pursues this new "great policy" in collaboration with France. They're all talking De Gaulle's language these days.

It's possible to dismiss such European developments as being beyond our concern. As Europe grows more prosperous and more independent of us, we even like to think that we planned it that way. In a sense, we did. We knew that our relative ascend-

ency in the Western alliance would gradually diminish and generously looked forward to the economic rivalry of a strong and independent Europe—though in the context of what Jack Kennedy called "a mutually beneficial partnership."

It isn't quite working out that way. There are other trends to note in Europe: NATO humiliatingly evacuating its headquarters, with a gaping hole in its defenses; De Gaulle feting Kosygin and denouncing the U.S.; Britain wondering whether it can any longer play a world role; West Germany outgrowing its policy of close dependence on the U.S.

What has gone wrong is not the health of Western Europe, in which we can rejoice, but the health of the alliance. "Treaties are like young girls and roses," Charles de Gaulle has said. "They last while they last." He expects the West to take his Westernness for granted while he seeks an accommodation with the East. He believes, as the foreign editor of *Le Monde* puts it, that "it is unnecessary for Western Europe to pay anything for American protection against the Soviets since it clearly is in the American interest to provide it." From this De Gaulle proceeds to his next conclusion: "I am not displeased to have the U.S.S.R. as a counterweight to American hegemony—and I am no more displeased to have the United States as a counterweight to Soviet hegemony." Here is the core of Gaullism.

We are often assured that *of course* and *at heart* De Gaulle is a Westerner, a believer in the Atlantic Alliance. This would be true of him if the West were faced with a threat of imminent Soviet attack. But the kind of Europe, and world, that De Gaulle seeks in his own maneuvering has some important differences from our goals, including his desire to use Russia and us as counterbalances. In this sense, he is not on our "side" at all. He wants the cold war ended—fine; but he also believes it is the U.S.—and not Soviet Russia—that threatens the peace and jeopardizes the détente. In his New Year's message he proclaimed that France, having "regained her independence," seeks "continental rapprochement" and a "European Europe." "While Europe thus takes the road to peace," the U.S. wages its "unjust war" in Vietnam, a "detestable war, since it leads a great nation to ravage a small one." From these attitudes it can be seen that De Gaulle, if an ally, is an ally on Judgment Day only.

He has regained his "independence." We accordingly have a right to ours.

It would be merely annoying, and dismissable as "typically French," if De Gaulle's thesis was confined to him alone. But his thinking appeals to an increasing segment of European opinion. Nationalism is back in style in Europe, reinforced by the economic advantages of a larger community. De Gaulle also speaks to some basic European instinct about itself; that it should not be allowed to harden any longer into a divided continent, with the division running dangerously down the center of Germany. His vision of opening relations with Eastern Europe was earlier than ours. But, alas, this initiative, and all the good it might bring to Europe, is also perverted by the narrow French ambitions it serves.

We could more easily accept the loss of our Atlantic Partnership dreams if we thought De Gaulle's own conception of Europe would work. But his is a vision hauntingly dated by 19th Century notions of maintaining France's key role, which is too small for the modern necessities of Europe. If De Gaulle's formula fails, as it very well may, we must have an acceptable alternative at hand. This alternative may have no success while De Gaulle's veto is in force, but it needs to exist to be ready when he is gone. Here are some of the ingredients of such an alternative:

Britain's admittance to Europe. A Britain wholeheartedly in Europe's councils will cer-

tainly not speak captively with America's voice, as De Gaulle fears. But with its worldwide experience and traditions parallel to ours, it will help to break up some of that claustrophobic Franco-German atmosphere.

Europe technologically independent of us. Harold Wilson warns against the dangers of "industrial helotry" if Europe is too dependent on "American business for the sophisticated apparatus which will call the tune in the '70s and '80s." This European concern is legitimate, and the ground rules need to be worked out.

Bridge-building to the East. The U.S. should join this effort to draw back into Europe those Communist nations which are no longer satellites. President Johnson has already so urged us, but the Vietnamese war inhibits both East European countries and U.S. congressmen.

A Germany free to be itself. Now that it is no longer a "client" of ours and is taking its own initiatives, we are freed from having to think of MLF or other intricate nuclear roles for Germany and, in doing so, stirring up bad memories. The Germans will have to weigh their own sacrifices in the pursuit of a unified nation, and this is healthier all around. "We seek neither national control nor national ownership of atomic weapons," Kiesinger has promised. Territorial pledges to the East will come next.

The danger is that these new German sacrifices will not produce reunification either. If in the future there emerges a frustrated and nationalistic Germany, this will be chargeable to De Gaulle.

At this point, if not much sooner, the Atlantic connection and what is left of NATO will be plainly relevant. For Russia, which recognizes only real power, shows little readiness to make any hard concessions to De Gaulle. The help of the U.S. will be required to bring unity to divided Germany. The pullback of Russian forces can be purchased only by a reciprocal pullback by the U.S. So long as our intentions are made clear to our allies in advance, it is not too soon for the U.S. to consider bringing home one or two of its five German-based divisions now. Our Atlantic and NATO commitment will still be there. Even many of the French, after De Gaulle, will come to see that with the superpower of Russia as a neighbor, there is no safe Europe except in an Atlantic context. Our job is to refine these ingredients of Atlantic policy so that we are able to pose to Europeans a clear alternative (as we do not at present) to all that is narrow and inadequate in De Gaulle's policy.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON CONSULAR TREATY WITH U.S.S.R.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since the Senate will soon be confronted—probably later this week—with the monumental and precedent-shattering decision on how to vote on the proposed ratification of the consular treaty with Russia and its close tie in with the administration's companion effort to increase East-West trade with Communist countries, I submit for publication in the RECORD some highly interesting editorials on these matters coming to my attention from various sections of the country.

The first editorial is one from my home State—the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., and is entitled "Consular Treaty With U.S.S.R. Should Wait on End of Red Aid to Hanoi." It tells its own persuasive story.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CONSULAR TREATY WITH U.S.S.R. SHOULD WAIT ON END OF RED AID TO HANOI

One of the many strange maneuvers in the current confused world political situation is the emphasis which the administration is putting on ratification this year of a consular treaty with Russia.

Last year the proposal did not come to the Senate for a vote. But Senator Karl Mundt, who has vigorously opposed ratification during Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, predicts that the issue will come to the floor this time as a presidential "must" measure.

Proponents of the consular treaty argue that it will help our government to assist and protect a handful of tourists in Russia and that it will open more channels of communication which might help in some fashion to build more amicable relations with the Soviet Union.

Opponents of the treaty—the American Legion is one of the most vocal—argue that it is not in the national interest to enter into an agreement of this nature with a Communist power that is providing massive military assistance to a third party with whom the United States is engaged in combat.

Regardless of the good or bad long term effects of a consular agreement, there are many reasons why this does not seem to be the correct time for Senate ratification.

No one questions the fact that the Soviet government is furnishing massive aid to the North Vietnamese—sophisticated military hardware without which the war could not be continued. Senate acceptance of any type of treaty at this time implies condonation of this conduct.

The Red Chinese have reportedly informed Hanoi that peace overtures must not be made through Russia, and the British claim that there are now 100,000 Red Chinese in North Vietnam for the prime purpose of stiffening resistance against anything unsatisfactory to Peking. Obviously any agreements with Russia at this time will serve only to stiffen Red Chinese resistance to all efforts to end the Vietnamese conflict.

Soviet leaders alternately plead an interest in peace and threaten increased military assistance to North Vietnam. All of their ideas for a settlement in Vietnam are equally as unacceptable to the U.S. as those emanating from Hanoi.

In fairness to the nearly half-million service men now on duty in Vietnam—the men whose lives are risked daily to Soviet Russian weapons—the United States Senate should either table the consular treaty, or demand the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam on terms acceptable to this country as a condition for ratification of such a treaty.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the second editorial to which I invite careful consideration comes from the Mount Washington Press, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and is entitled "Advertising Legerdemain." From it, many Senators may learn for the first time that the Russian Communists are now advertising in our metropolitan press, urging Americans to support expanded trade with Russia. Indeed, this is a most unusual and brash attempt by a foreign government to supply its economic deficiencies at the very time it is providing every sophisticated weapon the North Vietnamese need and use to prolong the war and to expand our American casualties in that war. I think Senators and others will find the last three paragraphs of the Mount Washington Press editorial especially illuminating and shocking.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Mount Washington Press,
Feb. 16, 1967]

ADVERTISING LEGERDEMAIN

This newspaper, like most, relies heavily on advertising revenue. We do reserve the right to refuse certain advertisements, as do most papers. But in general we think the businessman is entitled to tell the public of his services or products in his own language.

However, a piece of advertising legerdemain was managed last month which requires comment. We refer to that big, eye-catching two page spread which appeared in the New York Times under the banner: "Foreign Trade—Two Way Traffic." It was purchased by the USSR. The date is important: January 16, 1967, pages 56 and 57.

On page 67 of that newspaper, one finds a three-column news story headed: "Soviet Ad Seeks Wider U.S. Trade." The lead paragraph reads: "A Two-page Soviet advertisement in the New York Times today is viewed by observers as the most important positive response President Johnson has yet received in his effort to build a trade bridge to the Soviet Union."

Seven paragraphs further along we find this: "In his State of the Union message last week, President Johnson indicated that he would press again at this session of Congress for passage of the East-West trade bill. This measure would give the President authority to extend most-favored-nation treatment to Communist countries, to conclude bilateral trade and other economic agreements with them, and to extend some types of commercial credits to them . . ."

Having read this long story, we turn back to inspect that big U.S.S.R. advertisement inviting Americans to advertise their products in the U.S.S.R. The advertisement even tells us that "direct mail advertising will be an effective channel through which to inform the Soviet market of foreign products." That invitation, from a country where a letter is about as private as a bulletin board by the time the censors finish.

Knowing something about newspapers and advertising, it dawned on us that it would have been a superhuman task for this ad to have been written, laid-out, artwork done, type set, and copy submitted in a period of just six days between the President's State of the Union speech and the publication date. How then could it be a response?

We decided to find out. We did. For this special edition the New York Times rate card stipulated: "Closing Date: Tuesday, December 27, 1966. All material, copy and layouts must be in New York by this date." The price: \$6,240 per full page, for the U.S. edition.

Since the Soviets couldn't have been responding to Mr. Johnson, do you think it possible that Mr. Johnson was . . . ? I don't even want to say it.

—LYLE H. MUNSON.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the third editorial comes from the State of Oregon and was published in the Hillsboro Argus, Hillsboro, Oreg., under the title, "Wishful Thinking Seen." It makes excellent and effective use of information available to all of us from the great weekly magazine, U.S. News & World Report, to point out the futility and the bad judgment of encouraging increased exports of American supplies to Russia and of approving the consular treaty as a step toward that objective at the very time when American boys are dying every day on the Vietnam battle front, solely because of the weapons of

war the Russians are sending the Vietnamese to be used for that purpose.

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

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

[From the Hillsboro (Oreg.) Argus, Feb. 6, 1967]

WISHPFUL THINKING SEEN

The snow job that has been coming out of Washington in recent years relative to the possibility of Russia serving as an intermediary in bringing peace in Asia is, it seems to us, based on wishful thinking rather than horse sense.

High officials talk of the need to become closer to Russia because the Soviets want peace. Why shouldn't people have occasion to wonder why US seeks to make one deal after another with the Russian Communists considering their stated longstanding goal of "burying us?" Their vital role of supply to North Vietnam and the Viet Cong is prolonging the war and bringing death and wounds to more and more of America's young men every day in the effort to spread Communism further into SE Asia.

US officials back space treaties, airline pacts, establishment of more consulates in both countries and expansion of East-West trade. All the while war goes on with Russia the principal supplier of war material for the forces fighting against us.

We have long felt that it is a waste of time to think that Russia would work to bring about peace and take us off the hook in Vietnam. What could suit their long range goals any more than to lend encouragement and materiel to bleed us white in manpower and dollars as we get more and more mired down in jungle warfare? And this comes in many instances as our hands are tied behind our backs through political conduct of the war that has now put Hanoi out of bounds to US bombing.

The U.S. News & World Report, in its issue of Jan. 30, clearly points to the role of Russia in Vietnam with facts and figures that leave little room for question on our part and anyone not governed by wishful thinking.

We certainly wish there were grounds for hope that Russia was changing its attitude and sincerely wants peace. The whole history of Communist Russia's relations with the US and violation of past treaties, however, belies this.

Mr. MUNDT. Finally, Mr. President, I invite attention to a recent editorial entitled "The Russian Enemy," with the subhead, "When Will We Learn?" published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. Starting with the blunt opening sentence—

The greatest continuing miscalculation in the Vietnam war is our looking to the Russians as a hope for peace—

The editorial hammers hard at the unprecedented policies of President Johnson, whereby he urges ratification of the consular treaty with Communist Russia and expanding American exports to the Communists, when every report from the battlefield lists American casualties resulting from the arms and weapons that the Russians are giving our enemy in Vietnam in steadily expanding numbers. It is an editorial all should read.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Feb. 16, 1967]

WHEN WILL WE LEARN?—THE RUSSIAN ENEMY

The greatest continuing miscalculation in the Vietnam war is our looking to the Russians as a hope for peace.

The real enemy in Vietnam is not Red China or even the North Vietnamese. It is the Russians.

More than 80 per cent of all the war materiel used to kill American troops comes from Russia, at a cost to them of \$1,000,000,000 a year.

There would be no war today in Vietnam if it were not for the Russians.

The Red Chinese have no industrial capacity and are more than occupied with the chaotic state of their own affairs.

The North Vietnamese have few industrial or transportation facilities and are utterly incapable of mounting any offensives or even maintaining the gains which they have made, except through Russian aid.

The formidable enemy, the enemy who keeps the war alive, is Russia and Russia only.

Under these facts it makes absolutely no sense whatsoever to treat the Russians as if they have the same desire for peace that we have, or to have any hope at all that they will seek to bring peace except on the terms of American surrender.

Notwithstanding, the fatuous Prime Minister of Great Britain, Harold Wilson, pleads with Premier Kosygin to use his good influences for peace. This makes as much sense as talking to the hungry lion as he contemplates the sacrificial goat.

President Johnson speaks of "building bridges" of understanding by increased trade with Russia and the satellites. All that this trade does is release Russian industrial capabilities for supplying more war materiel to Southeast Asia.

At the same time, the President is urging the Senate to ratify the Consular Treaty with Russia which gains nothing for the United States except the rights which were granted when President Roosevelt first recognized Russia in 1933, but which have been denied then and since.

If, in one-third of a century, the Russians have not kept their promises, what reason have we to hope that they will suddenly change and keep them now?

These are the same Russians of duplicity who allied with Hitler in World War II. When Hitler characteristically turned on them, we gave them billions of dollars in aid—because at the very least we were fighting a common foe.

The Russians were never truly our allies but only co-belligerents. They never cooperated with us in the slightest meaningful way. As soon as World War II was over, they began their campaign against those who had helped them so enormously.

The result was the virtual seizure of Berlin and the Russian offensives in Greece, Turkey and the Middle East; the arming of Cuba as a base of operations against the Western Hemisphere, and continuing efforts to overthrow governments in Latin America, Africa and throughout the world.

American Presidents over the years have gone to inconceivable lengths trying to pacify and make decent world citizens of the Russians.

Roosevelt tried when he first recognized them in 1933 and when he gave them vast concessions at Tehran and Yalta to satiate their greed for power.

Truman continued the Roosevelt policy at Potsdam and after the surrender of the Japanese in the Pacific which had already been promised—although it must be said for him that he and President Eisenhower recognized the Russian evil for what it was more than other Presidents.

Eisenhower once again extended the olive

branch at Camp David and Khrushchev's answer was to subvert Cuba and establish a missile base 90 miles from our shores.

Kennedy went back to the Roosevelt policy of sweet reasonableness and almost cost us our country in the missile crisis in Cuba, and gave away our strength in Southeast Asia by virtually consigning Laos and Cambodia to the Communist camp in the vain hope that the Communists could be appeased.

Now, finally, President Johnson scarcely gets off his knees in trying to give away more and more to the Russians in the hope that they will embrace peace. The Consular Treaty, the nuclear treaty which has allowed the Russians to carry on while our nuclear capabilities stand still, the "building bridges" by trade and aid to Communists and Communist dominated states, all have failed and failed miserably.

All will continue to fail until we speak the one language the international bullies can understand—the language of strength.

Until we recognize that the real enemy is Russian and apply meaningful restraints, the USSR will continue to nibble away at us—both at our armed might and our solvency—until there is nothing left.

The old slogan, "The devil is a devil though he may come in the guise of an angel" never applied more to any country in the history of the world than to Communist Russia today.

Unless we recognize this fact and act decisively while there is still time, we will be bled dry in Asia and bankrupted at home.

The facts of history are staring President Johnson in the face. Every conceivable alternative has failed. We shall have peace only when he recognizes the Russian enemy for the enemy he is—and tries strength, not abject appeasement as a solution to our problems.

THE PRECEDENT OF PANMUNJOM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for today, March 6, contains an editorial entitled "Precedent of Panmunjom," which I believe makes much sense.

In Korea, in 1951, the United Nations forces had the Red Chinese and the North Koreans on the run. The Communists, as we now know, entered into negotiations at Panmunjom at that time hoping to take the military initiative away from our troops and gain time to regroup their own defeated forces. That is precisely what happened, and the war continued for two more long years, during which some 20,000 Americans were killed.

This country is currently engaged in a struggle in Vietnam that is surrounded by confusion and conflicting opinions. My own view on this subject is well known, but I do not care to get involved in a discussion about what course we should or should not follow at this time. I merely say that I believe it is imperative that we profit from our past experiences in dealing with the Communists, if we are to be successful in our present efforts in Vietnam.

The Wall Street Journal editorial of today clearly brings out this obvious fact, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1967]

PRECEDENT OF PANMUNJON

Senator Robert Kennedy solemnly assures the nation he is aware of the precedent of

Panmunjon, but his proposals make us wonder.

In any event, the lessons of the Korean War negotiations deserve more than the passing mention they received last week in the Senator's speech urging that the U.S. stop bombing North Vietnam to "test the sincerity" of Communist hints that negotiations might follow.

In April and May of 1951, the Eighth Army broke two Red Chinese offensives in Korea and launched a highly promising drive of its own. The Chinese were in ragged retreat; in one week during June, 10,000 of them surrendered. "In June, 1951, we had them whipped," General James A. Van Fleet said afterwards. "They were definitely gone."

On June 23, Soviet UN delegate Jacob Malik suggested negotiations. The first meeting was held on July 8. One history of the episode records that a New York Times dispatch warned against excessive optimism; "fighting for several weeks is foreseen by Washington."

The fighting lasted two more years. With the U.S. offensive called up short, the Communists proved willing to sit across the table from us, but only to hurl invective. During the talks, as the South Koreans recently reminded Ambassador Goldberg, the U.S. lost some 20,000 of the 54,000 dead it suffered in that war.

Now, the Communists have been hinting that if only the U.S. would unconditionally stop bombing North Vietnam, they would condescend to sit with us at another negotiating table. Senator Kennedy may be right that these hints are evidence of "a new and more hopeful moment of opportunity for settlement." On the other hand, as he also recognizes, they may be merely an attempt to get U.S. concessions in return for meaningless talks, or even, if you look suspiciously at what the North Vietnamese say, perhaps for no talks at all.

The Senator's "plan" to deal with the second eventually is worthy of any good high school debating team. There would be an international control commission to tell the world if the Communists used the talks to build up their military forces, notwithstanding that none of the several such commissions has ever been effective in policing anything about any Communists.

And if the other side did step up its military effort, the U.S. could simply walk out of the talks and resume bombing. We would then gain "far clearer international understanding of our motives and necessities."

In the real world, though, precisely the opposite would be more likely to happen if the U.S. ever did break up even the most pointless negotiations under the mere provocation of more Red infiltration. The cries of the hypocrites would reach an unprecedented roar, and "world opinion" would condemn not the Communists but the U.S.

The lesson of Panmunjon, then, is the old one that negotiations are not an end in themselves, but merely a means to a settlement. There is no point, and considerable risk, in making concessions to the Communists for nothing more than the dubious pleasure of their company at a negotiating table. Any concessions must be based on some assurance they are sincerely willing to see talks through to a settlement.

How do we judge if the Communists are willing not only to talk but to settle? That seems to us fairly simple. If they want negotiations without settlement they will demand U.S. concessions matched by none of their own. If they are willing to settle, they ought to be ready to express that willingness in not only words but acts; that is, they ought to match any substantive concessions the U.S. makes.

These lessons seem to elude Senator Kennedy and other stop-the-bombing advocates. Certainly we need to "test the sincerity" of the barrage of negotiation hints from the Communists. That is precisely what the Ad-

ministration is doing in demanding, so far vainly, some token of Communist good faith to match the token we would offer in calling off our planes.

Like many other Americans, we are uneasy about this war—whether it is advancing the nation's best interests. But on the specific question of the bombings the case seems clear.

Until a token of Communist willingness to settle is forthcoming, the bombings, even if contrary to common sense they had no military effect, serve an essential purpose. Our determination not to stop them without a reciprocal slowdown by the Communists is our best protection against another Panmunjon.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH COLOMBIA

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is the practice of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to inform the Senate when any proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy has been submitted to the committee pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In accordance with that practice I, as chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation, wish to inform the Senate that on February 24, 1967, a proposed amendment to this country's civil agreement for cooperation with the Republic of Colombia was submitted to the committee.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the State Department and Atomic Energy Commission and approved by the President, would extend the existing research-type agreement for another 10 years, to March 28, 1977. Among the more significant revisions in the agreement which this amendment would effect, perhaps the most noteworthy is that providing for the transfer to the International Atomic Energy Agency of the responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities transferred under the agreement for cooperation. Presently, safeguards against the diversion of these materials and facilities to military purposes are administered by the United States.

Under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act, this amendment must lie before the Joint Committee for a period of 30 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective. It is anticipated that, in accordance with the general practice of the Joint Committee, a public hearing on this matter will be held prior to expiration of this statutory waiting period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment to the agreement with Colombia together with supporting correspondence be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1967.

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Pursuant to Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

a. a proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Gov-

ernment of the Republic of Colombia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

b. a copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

c. a copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, revises and extends the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia which was signed at Washington on April 9, 1962.

Article I of the amendment incorporates in Article I of the Agreement definitions for terms listed in the present formulation of the Agreement, but currently defined only by reference to definitions of the same terms in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Article II updates the formulation of language specifying types of information which may be exchanged. It also provides that information may be exchanged on matters of health and safety related to all the areas of information specified in Article II, Paragraph A, of the Agreement, rather than just to research and materials testing reactors and reactor experiments.

Article IV of the amendment modifies Article IV of the Agreement to permit the transfer to Colombia of material enriched to more than 20% in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in fueling research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments. Article IV of the amendment further modifies the Agreement by deleting the obsolete requirement that Colombia retain title to enriched uranium until private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to such material.

Article VI reflects the "Private Ownership" legislation of 1964 by permitting arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material to be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other Party. Such arrangements would be in addition to the government-to-government transactions currently allowed and would be subject to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of Colombia and the United States.

Article VII provides that the International Atomic Energy Agency will promptly be requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the Agreement for Cooperation. This article envisages suspension of bilateral safeguards during the time when Agency safeguards are in effect.

Article VIII extends the Agreement for ten years, through March 28, 1977. The remaining articles provide editorial modifications.

The amendment will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements to bring the amendment into force.

Cordially,
GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Co-

Colombia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia which was signed at Washington on April 9, 1962, and which expires on March 28, 1967.

The proposed amendment would extend the Agreement for ten years, through March 28, 1977. In accordance with the policy of the United States, Article VII of the amendment provides that the International Atomic Energy Agency will promptly be requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the Agreement for Cooperation. This Article envisages suspension of bilateral safeguards during the time when Agency safeguards are in effect.

In addition to editorial modifications and deletion of the obsolete requirement that Colombia retain title to enriched uranium until private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to such material, the proposed amendment contains the provisions discussed below. These provisions are designed basically to reflect new policies or to extend to Colombia benefits already included in other research-type Agreements for Cooperation, as well as to improve and reformulate language to conform with current usage.

(a) In lieu of relying on cross-references to an internal law of the United States, namely the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, Article I of the amendment would incorporate definitions for terms listed in, but currently defined only by reference in the present formulation of, Article I of the Agreement.

(b) Proposed Article II updates and expands the formulation of language specifying types of information which may be exchanged on health and safety related to all the areas of information specified in Article II, Paragraph A, of the Agreement rather than just to research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments, as is presently the case.

(c) As in several recent amendments to other Agreements for Cooperation, for example those with Turkey, Austria, the Philippines, China, and Israel, Article IV would permit the transfer of uranium enriched to more than 20% in U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in fueling research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments.

(d) Article VI would reflect the "Private Ownership" legislation of 1964, by permitting arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material to be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other Party. Such arrangements would be in addition to the government-to-government transactions currently allowed and would be subject to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of Colombia and the United States.

Following your approval, determination, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia. In compliance with Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the amendment will then

be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,
GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 10, 1967.

HON. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me by letter dated February 6, 1967, a proposed Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy and has recommended that I approve the proposed Amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) approve the proposed amendment and determine that the performance of the Agreement, as amended, will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) authorize the execution of the proposed amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA CONCERNING THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on April 9, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"),

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article I of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"For the purposes of this Agreement:

"(a) 'Atomic weapon' means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

"(b) 'Byproduct material' means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

"(c) 'Commission' means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

"(d) 'Equipment and devices' and 'equipment or device' means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

"(e) 'Parties' means the Government of the United States of America, including the Commission on behalf of the Government of

the United States of America, and the Government of the Republic of Colombia. 'Party' means one of the above 'Parties'.

"(f) 'Person' means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency, or government corporation but does not include the Parties to this Agreement.

"(g) 'Research reactor' means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

"(h) 'Restricted Data' means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of Restricted Data by the appropriate authority.

"(i) 'Source material' means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Commission or the Government of the Republic of Colombia to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Commission or the Government of the Republic of Colombia may determine from time to time.

"(j) 'Special nuclear material' means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Commission or the Government of the Republic of Colombia determines to be special nuclear material; (or) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing."

ARTICLE II

Paragraph A of Article III of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. Subject to the provisions of Article II, the Parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

"(1) Design, construction, operation, and use of research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments;

"(2) The use of radioactive isotopes and source, special nuclear, and byproduct material in physical and biological research, medicine, agriculture, and industry; and

"(3) Health and safety problems related to the foregoing."

ARTICLE III

Articles IV and IX of the Agreement for Cooperation are amended by deleting the words "international organization" wherever they appear and substituting in lieu thereof the words "group of nations".

ARTICLE IV

A. Paragraph C of Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"C. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make all or a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material available as uranium enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) by weight in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed eight (8) kilograms of the isotope U-235 contained in such uranium."

B. Paragraph D of Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is deleted in its entirety and Paragraphs E, F, G, and H of said Article are relettered, respectively, as D, E, F, and G.

ARTICLE V

References to Paragraphs E, F, and G of Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation in Articles IV and VIII of the Agreement for

Cooperation are changed, respectively, to Paragraphs D, E, and F.

ARTICLE VI

Article VII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information referred to in Article III, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other for the transfer of materials, including special nuclear material, and equipment and devices, and for the performance of services. Such arrangements shall be subject to:

- "(a) Article II;
- "(b) The limitations applicable to transactions between the Parties under Article IV; and
- "(c) Applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the Parties."

ARTICLE VII

Article X of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded to the Commission by Article VIII of this Agreement, during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in Paragraph A of this Article, either Party may, by notification, terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Republic of Colombia shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and still in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Republic of Colombia for its interest in such material so returned at the Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE VIII

Paragraph A of Article XI of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Agreement and shall remain in force for a period of fourteen years."

ARTICLE IX

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

DONE at Washington, in duplicate, this twenty-fourth day of February, 1967.

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ROBERT M. SAYRE
GLENN T. SEABORG

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLUMBIA:

HERNAN ECHAVARRIA

Certified to be a true copy, February 24, 1967.

BARBARA H. THOMAS, AEC.

EXPEDITING PATENTS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, recently President Johnson urged Congress to join with him in modernizing the patent laws of this country. The basic laws have remained fundamentally unchanged for over a century. During that time, the United States has changed from an agricultural society to a highly sophisticated technological society. The number of patents issued has risen from 109 in 1836 to more than 60,000 this year. There are long delays in the issuance of patents today and the backlog of applications is very high. Clearly, modernization is long overdue.

In 1965, President Johnson appointed a special Commission to study this problem. Their report was released last year, and legislation based upon the Commission's recommendations has been introduced in Congress for the purpose of overhauling the procedures of the Patent Office. There is near unanimity on the need for this action, as is attested to by an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of February 28, 1967. I urge Senators to read the editorial, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 28, 1967]

A SWIFTER PACE FOR PATENTS

Under present Governmental procedures, an inventor can only hope that he'll live long enough to obtain a patent on a new idea. The average time required for processing a patent is two and one-half years, and complex applications often take up to a decade.

Correctly deciding that the long delays make little sense, the Administration is recommending the first major changes in the patent system in more than a century. While there may be quarrels with a few of the proposal's specifics, the aim is impeccable: To help cut the maximum patent-issuing time to a year and a half.

This nation enjoys the world's highest standard of living in part because gains in technology have come more rapidly here than anywhere else, despite the patent lag. There is reason to wonder whether the pace would have been quite so rapid if inventors had not been assured, with patents finally in hand, that success would bring them a respectable return for their labors. If the paper work is speeded, they should be even better off.

Then there is the bearing of patents on research. Though U.S. research is not always ideally directed, it is sure to continue to be of considerable size. The need to provide jobs for a growing labor force and the intensifying pressures of competition, both at home and abroad, will see to that.

The U.S. effort is so energetic that it attracts growing numbers of scientists, not only from American universities but from other nations—the "brain drain" that understandably concerns those countries. With all the research that's going on, it's not surprising

that 93,482 patent applications were filed last year, an increase of 19% from 1960.

It is this influx of ideas, and the growing backlog at the Patent Office, that makes reform necessary—lest technological progress be snarled in the wheels of antique bureaucracy.

THE CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE SOVIET UNION—SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the near future, the Senate will consider whether to give its advice and consent to ratification of the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union.

I assume that Senators will wish to inform themselves before we begin the consideration of the convention. The hearings and the committee report were distributed to all Senators' offices this morning.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of some questions and answers on the convention, prepared by the Department of State, which I think provide much useful information on some of the questions that have been raised about the convention.

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

UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR CONVENTION—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What was the historical origin of the Convention?

When we first established relations with the USSR in 1933 an exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinov stated that it had been agreed that a consular convention would be negotiated "immediately following the establishment of relations between our two countries." Other problems intervened, however, and negotiations were never begun.

It was President Eisenhower's proposal at the 1955 Geneva Summit Conference for "concrete steps" to lower "the barriers which now impede the opportunities of people to travel anywhere in the world" and subsequent relaxation by the Bulganin-Khrushchev regime of tight Stalinist controls which led to greatly increased American travel to the USSR and to the realization that we needed to protect U.S. citizens by negotiating an explicit consular convention with the Soviet Union. At the Camp David talks in 1959, Secretary of State Christian Herter proposed such a treaty to Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko. Drafts were exchanged in early 1960 but there was little further activity because of subsequent strains in US-Soviet relations until September 1963 when formal negotiations began in Moscow. After 8 months of hard negotiations, the Convention was signed on June 1, 1964, and submitted to the Senate by President Johnson on June 12, 1964.

2. What is the basic purpose of the Convention?

We need this treaty to secure rights for Americans in the Soviet Union that they do not now have. Under present Soviet law Soviet citizens and foreigners alike can be held incommunicado for nine months or more during investigation of a criminal charge. The Consular Convention contains major concessions by the USSR. It specifies that U.S. officials will be notified immediately (within 1-3 days) when an American citizen is arrested or detained in the USSR and it stipulates that these officials will have rights of visitation without delay (within

2-4 days) and on a continuing basis thereafter.

3. Why do we need additional protection for American citizens?

Because increasing numbers of them travel to the Soviet Union and the number which encounters difficulties rises proportionally. Between 1962 and 1966 the number of Americans travelling to the USSR rose by 50% to 18,000, while the number of Soviet travelers remained static at about 900 per year. Since the Convention was signed in 1964, more than 20 arrests or detentions of American citizens in the USSR have come to our attention. In none of these cases have we been notified of the incident or allowed to visit the American within a reasonable period and certainly not within the time limits specified in this treaty. Meanwhile, our own constitutional system and democratic society automatically provide Soviet travelers here with protections similar to those our travelers would obtain from the convention.

Without the protection of such an agreement, Americans have frequently been isolated in Soviet prisons for long periods and kept from contact with American Embassy consular officers. One, Newcomb Mott, died in Soviet hands under these circumstances. During periods of strained US-USSR relations such as the present Soviet treatment of Americans accused of violating their law is likely to be harsher than usual.

4. Does the Convention provide for the opening of new Soviet consulates in the US?

No. It does not authorize, propose, suggest, provide for or require the opening of a single US consulate in the USSR or a single Soviet consulate in the US. It does not permit the Soviets to send a single extra person to this country nor does it let us send anyone to the USSR. What it does do is to provide ground rules for the protection of American citizens in the USSR—ground rules which we badly need.

Under the Constitution, the President's approval is all that is needed to permit foreign governments to establish consulates in the US. Between 1934 and 1948 there were three Soviet consulates in the US and an American consulate in the USSR, though there was no US-USSR consular agreement in force.

5. Why do we grant Soviet consular officers immunity from our criminal jurisdiction?

Because we believe it is vital to have the same protection for American consular officers and clerical employees in the USSR. Since 1946, 31 Americans at our Embassy in Moscow have been expelled by the Soviets, most often on allegations of espionage. Without immunity our consular employees could be jailed or suffer even harsher punishment on similar trumped-up charges. Furthermore, action against American consular personnel serving in the USSR without immunity could be a temptation to Soviet authorities whenever a Soviet citizen is arrested in this country for espionage. Other governments similarly protect their officials and clerical employees in the USSR; the British and the Japanese recently negotiated consular conventions with the Soviet Union containing immunity provisions modeled after those in the US-USSR agreement.

6. Is it right to extend this immunity to clerical employees as well?

We believe that the American secretaries, file clerks and communications and administrative personnel whom we might send to a consulate in the USSR need and deserve the protection of immunity as much if not more than the consular officers. Clerical employees we would send to a consulate in the Soviet Union would often be young women and it would be both unfair and from a security point of view unwise to give them less protection than we give our experienced officers.

Of course, the Soviets would not be al-

lowed to station a staff of Soviet nationals at a consulate in the US larger than the number of Americans we send to the USSR. If we send a staff of 10 to the USSR the Soviets may have a total of ten here.

7. What is the prospect for the reciprocal opening of consular offices?

There are no formal proposals or plans pending for the opening of separate consular offices of either country in the other. If at a later date it was decided to be appropriate to open one outside the respective capitals, it would be the subject of careful negotiation on a strict quid-pro-quo basis. Such an office would probably involve 10 to 15 Americans in the Soviet Union, with the Soviets permitted to send the same number here. In accordance with Secretary Rusk's statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we would plan to consult that body and the state and local officials of the community to be affected, before concluding such an agreement. While, as noted, such an arrangement would be reciprocal, the fact that the Soviet society is a closed one while the United States is open, and that the U.S. citizens needing service and protection while travelling in the Soviet Union far outnumber Soviet citizens with like needs in the U.S., indicate that the balance of advantage would be on our side.

8. If a Soviet consulate were eventually opened would it represent a threat to the security of the US?

The opening of one Soviet consulate in the US would not materially affect our internal security. The number of Soviet citizens now enjoying immunity, 452, would be increased by only 10 or 15 persons. We have the right under the treaty to screen the personnel of such an office before agreeing to their assignment. We are also authorized by the treaty to prevent them from travelling to sensitive areas in the country and to expel them if they prove to be undesirable. We could close a Soviet consulate in the US whenever we wished, and we could cancel the Consular Convention on six months' notice. Both Acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark and FBI Director Hoover have stated that 10 to 15 additional Soviet officials in this country would not place an undue burden on their organizations.

9. What effect will the immunity provisions have on our agreements with other countries? Would immunities received by the Soviets be automatically extended under MFN clauses to other countries?

We have 35 agreements in force with other countries which require us, on the basis of reciprocity, to extend most favored nation treatment to consular officers and occasionally consular employees. A recent survey shows that 27 of these countries have consular offices here with about 577 personnel. Should these countries agree to grant immunity from criminal jurisdiction to the 424 American consular officers and employees stationed there, we would have to extend the same treatment to their people here. All twenty-seven of these countries can be described as either friendly or neutral.

Our Embassies in these 27 countries were asked to estimate whether their host country would ask for most favored nation treatment—and give it to us in return. The replies indicated that at most 11 might make such requests, with 290 officers and employees. Assuming that we eventually decide to open a consulate in the USSR with 15 people, we would permit the opening of a Soviet consulate with 15 people here. In this case a total of 305 foreign consular officers and employees would be affected. This compares with the estimate of 9400 foreign diplomatic officers, members of their families and employees who now enjoy full diplomatic immunity in the US.

10. What do other countries do about their consular relations with the USSR?

Prior to the negotiation of the US-USSR convention the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria were the only non-com-

munist countries which had consular treaties with the USSR. Neither of these treaties contained firm guarantees on notification and access similar to those in the US-USSR treaty.

Since 1964 the French, Finns, British, Japanese and Italians have negotiated consular conventions with the USSR. The British and Japanese conventions are modeled after the US treaty both in the guarantees on notification and access and in the immunities provision. Of the non-communist countries, India and Turkey have consulates in the USSR. Italy, Japan and Finland hope to open consulates soon.

11. What effect does the Convention have on estate and tax matters in the US?

The estate and tax provisions of this convention are the same as those in other consular conventions which the US has negotiated recently. The United States made no concessions about estates in this Convention. In the negotiations the Soviet Government attempted to obtain wide powers for its consular officials in the settlement of estates of American citizens where a Soviet citizen is a beneficiary, or in the settlement of estates of Soviet citizens who die in the United States. The Soviet Government did not obtain these powers.

The Convention provides that consuls can play a role in the settlement of estates only if permissible under the existing applicable local law. If the Convention is ratified, therefore, the laws of the individual states would continue, as they do now, to govern the extent to which a Soviet consul can play a part in the settlement of an estate.

This convention, like many others to which the US is a party, exempts the consular personnel of the sending state from Federal and State taxes with certain exceptions. Also, property used for a consulate or as residence for consular and diplomatic personnel would be exempt from real estate taxes. This is normal international practice.

12. In view of the Soviet record of treaty violations, how can you make them observe this one? And what can be done if they don't?

It is true that, particularly in the Stalin years, the Soviet Union violated a number of international agreements and treaties. A careful study of serious violations can be found in "Background Information on the Soviet Union in International Relations" prepared by the Department of State in 1961.

Despite its earlier record of repeated violations of international obligations, the Soviet Union is party to a number of multilateral and bilateral agreements which it has not been accused of violating. There may have been infractions of some of these agreements, but the Soviet Government can be said to have generally found it to be in its interest to live up to them. Among the most important of these agreements are the Austrian State Treaty (1955), the Antarctic Treaty (1959) and the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963).

Treaties between sovereign governments are negotiated on the basis of mutual self-interest, not as rewards for good behavior or as evidences of good faith. We believe there are areas where the US and Soviet interests coincide, though these areas must be carefully delineated and explored before arriving at any agreement. The Limited Test Ban Treaty, the Treaty on Outer Space which we have just signed, and the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which is now under discussion are examples of agreements covering such areas. Each of these agreements either has built-in safeguards or is self-enforcing. The consular treaty is no exception—it is carefully drafted to provide full protection against abuse.

Should the Soviet Union violate the terms of this agreement we could suspend it or, with six months' notice, terminate it. Should a Soviet consulate be opened in this coun-

try and should its personnel violate our laws or the standards of behavior we would expect, we could expel them or close the consulate.

13. *Does the Convention prejudice the position of subject peoples incorporated against their will into the Soviet Union?*

No, it does not. The United States Government has never recognized the forcible annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Ratification of this convention would in no way change our policy in this respect, nor would any subsequent opening of a consulate or demarcation of a consular district. Recognition of incorporation of states into the Soviet Union would require a positive statement or act by the United States. The convention contains no such statements and provides for no such act. It is United States policy to support the just aspirations of all peoples of the world and to look forward to the day when all will be able to express these aspirations freely. The ratification of this treaty will not change this policy—any more than did the signing of more than 105 other bilateral and multilateral agreements which we have entered into with the U.S.S.R.

THE MENACE OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] expressed his views to the Senate on February 17 on the menace of air and water pollution. The Senator outlined steps that business firms in his State are taking to combat this continuing problem.

I congratulate the people of Washington for taking vigorous action to eradicate pollution. They have shown foresight in utilizing a program already available from the Federal Government. I refer to the business loan program of the Small Business Administration.

Having served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency from 1959 through the last session of Congress, I am acutely aware of the problems that small firms face, and I know the excellent programs the SBA has developed to deal with these problems. The President and his administration are making a concerted effort to define all of the problems that face the Nation and to develop programs that will deal effectively with these problems.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson said:

We should vastly expand the fight for clean air with a total attack on pollution at its sources. And because air, like water, does not respect man-made boundaries, we shall set up "regional airsheds" throughout this great land.

We should continue to carry to every corner of the Nation our campaign for a Beautiful America, to clean up our towns, to make them more beautiful.

I concur with the President's remarks. We must not wait, we must act now with the resources we have at our command.

My constituents in Wisconsin, as other citizens throughout the country, are faced with the problem of reducing and if possible eliminating air and water pollution. I am pleased to say that small firms in Wisconsin also have made extensive use of the financing available from SBA to install pollution abatement systems and to manufacture devices to cut down pollution. As a matter of fact, eight SBA loans to firms in my State

were made to help combat the pollution problem. I want to state for the record the names of these firms that are actively trying to reduce air and water pollution in the State:

Exhaust Aid Corp., Milwaukee, is using funds from a \$15,000 loan to make devices which reduce auto exhaust; Brisko's Mileage Saver, an Ojibwa, Wis., firm also makes these devices for automobiles and received a \$29,000 SBA loan; Carm Grain Co., of Sheboygan used an \$80,000 loan to install a dust collector in a grain elevator; the Oconomowoc Electro Plating Co. used a \$96,000 loan to install new acid vats which eliminate drainage into the sewer system.

A Platteville firm, Platteville Dairy, obtained a \$150,000 loan to install equipment to dry whey and keep waste out of the river adjacent to the dairy. Milk Products, Inc., of Weyauwega, used a \$275,000 loan for the same purpose. Jaski Construction Co., of Green Bay, which installs sanitary and storm sewers, obtained a \$175,000 loan, and Engels Plumbing & Heating firm, in Kewaunee, obtained \$7,500 for use in its business for special equipment required by State law in installing septic tanks.

I concur wholeheartedly with the Senator from Washington that the problem of pollution is one of the most urgent problems of the day. I join with the Senator in recommending that small firms throughout the Nation explore the possibility of using this valuable SBA program to help in eradicating the pollution problem.

THE NATION'S THIRD GREAT CRISIS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Howard K. Smith has been a highly respected news commentator and writer for some years.

I have often found his commentaries on events and men to be among the most enlightened and informative of anyone's.

An interesting article, entitled "A Nation Heading for Its Third Great Crisis," written by Mr. Smith, was published in the Washington Star a few days ago.

He describes this crisis as follows:

It involves the quality of American life which declines ever faster as the Nation grows ever richer.

He then goes on to describe crime, pollution of the air and water, and traffic jams, in Washington, a city which suffers from pretty much the same problems and in the same magnitude and degree of severity as any other city its size.

The point is not that these features are bad—

Which they are, of course—

but that they grow worse at breath-taking tempo. One cannot guess what forms they will take, but at the present rate of defilement, grave emergencies are bound to break out.

Mr. Smith continues.

I do not agree with his view that the British, or parliamentary system, is vastly superior for meeting modern problems. I am convinced that with strong and effective leadership, such as President Johnson has shown during his years in office, we can meet these problems and master them, in our own way.

But I do agree with Mr. Smith's concluding paragraph:

As our system is not about to be changed, the only alternative is an awakened public alarm. This recourse had better make itself felt soon or Great Crisis number three is as certain as tomorrow.

The problems of our cities already seem insoluble, or almost so, and we do seem to be "careening downhill" to a great crisis.

I hope that the people and we in Congress will take this article to heart, and will awaken to the seriousness of the situation.

I ask unanimous consent that Howard K. Smith's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A NATION HEADING FOR ITS THIRD GREAT CRISIS (By Howard K. Smith)

In its short life the U.S. has had but two really searing crises with enduring traumatic effects. One was the Civil War whose poisons still run in our veins. The other was the Great Depression whose central feature of utter impotence amid great might scarred at least one generation. Next to those two, the Cold War and the World wars were slight in effect, or were even beneficial.

The U.S. is now headed like an uncontrolled vehicle careening downhill to its third great crisis. It is as different from the other two as they were from one another. It involves the quality of American life which declines ever faster as the nation grows ever richer. People talk about it so much that it has become a cliché. There is an abiding assumption that something is being done, but in fact nothing effective is even projected. And, sure as sunset, it is going eventually to do permanent damage.

The elements of the trouble are well known. But it may be useful to cite the specific example of Washington, D.C. It should be noted, however, that—contrary to the fulminations of rural congressmen—Washington is not exceptional; it is about the median for American cities of its size.

The other day the head of the city's biggest drugstore chain reported that in 56 weeks his stores have suffered 62 burglaries and 31 armed robberies. Money losses were \$116,000. But the terrifying feature was violence to employes, one of whom was kidnapped in his home, forced to reopen the store, then pistol-whipped to unconsciousness. The chain can stand the losses, but smaller businesses have shut up shop and quit.

The lovely stream that runs through the city's central park, Rock Creek, has become so polluted that it is described as an open sewer and may have to be covered over. The Potomac River, in whose lucid waters John Quincy Adams and Theodore Roosevelt swam, is so filthy that a fall into it justifies preventive hospitalization.

Washington is a city without industry. Yet when the weather is wrong, the air becomes pure poison, so bad is exhaust from multiplying cars and burnings of trash from its swelling population. Traffic congeals so badly at some hours that one fears a crisis in communications could occur in the nation's government.

The point is not that these features are bad, but that they grow worse at breath-taking tempo. One cannot guess what forms they will take, but at the present rate of defilement, grave emergencies are bound to break out.

There are surveys galore. They emphasize two problems: first, remedy will take lots of money, and second, getting action from government is like trying to move Gibraltar with a crowbar.

Of these two problems, the easier to meet is

cost. A nation really concerned about the wreckage of its environment would agree to devote the whole increment in its GNP for several years to meeting the troubles.

The really hard problem is getting action from government. If systems of government were named after their most conspicuous functional feature, ours would be known not as republican or democratic but as a disaster form of government. Only catastrophe triggers action. It is an ambulance rather than a preventive clinic.

The point has been made that our Civil War could have been prevented by timely action, as the British acted to pass the Great Reform Bill of 1832 and avoided civil conflict. Our Depression could have been mitigated and shortened, had Congress followed Europe's example and passed welfare and other mechanisms at the turn of the century instead of waiting till disaster had struck in the mid-thirties.

Our essential trouble is that, two centuries later, we are still fighting George III. Our form of government is designed to prevent strong executive action by means of a hobbling system of negatives. Yet it is hard to think of an instance in which our nation has really been endangered by strong executive action, and it is easy to list disasters caused by our system of "checks and balances" which is nothing more than a way of preventing action. The British system which allows an executive the power to carry out a program until he loses his mandate is vastly superior for meeting modern problems.

As our system is not about to be changed, the only alternative is an awakened public alarm. This recourse had better make itself felt soon or Great Crisis number three is as certain as tomorrow.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 355, the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair recog-

nize the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time taken by the Senator from Ohio not be taken from either side.

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

JOHN W. DONAHEY—A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last Thursday John W. Donahey, one of Ohio's outstanding citizens, died in Columbus, Ohio, at the age of 61.

Few men in my State of Ohio have had as long and as distinguished a record as a public servant. He was elected Lieutenant Governor of Ohio in 1958. I have a happy personal recollection of campaigning with him throughout Ohio day after day in the summer and fall of that year. He served with distinction in the office of Lieutenant Governor of Ohio for 4 years.

Before that period he served in various capacities as an official in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. At the time of his death he was regional director of the southern district of Ohio for the Small Business Administration. I know from personal conversations with the present SBA Administrator and his predecessor that John Donahey was one of the most valued officials in that important agency.

John Donahey was a member of one of the prominent political families in Ohio. He was an outstanding citizen of Ohio by reason of his knowledge, ability, and industry. He was most personable—a most attractive man, and a fine friend to many thousands of Ohio men and women. I am sure that some of my colleagues will recall his father, the late Vic Donahey, who was Governor of Ohio from 1923 to 1929, and U.S. Senator from 1935 to 1941.

John W. Donahey was a fine human being, a great statesman, and a dedicated public servant. As Lieutenant Governor of Ohio he was the presiding officer of the Ohio Senate. On one occasion he made a statement which perhaps exemplifies the type of leader he was when he said:

Everyone who has a right to speak in the Senate will always be given the chance to be fully heard. Partisanship makes no difference.

Mr. President, Ohio has lost a great public servant, a very fine son. I have lost a very dear personal friend. John and his attractive wife, Gertrude, have been guests in my home. For many years John Donahey has been my very dear friend. Mrs. Young and I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife, Gertrude, his son, John W. Donahey, Jr., and to all the members of the Donahey family.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to associate myself with my colleague in the words of condolence he has expressed on the passing of John W. Donahey.

John Donahey came from a distinguished Ohio family. His father was a three-term Governor, having served from 1923 to 1928. John Donahey, whose death we mourn, was possessed of an excellent character and reputation. He was deeply devoted to the rendition of public service. He was unselfish, and, in my opinion, had a reverence for the State of Ohio that was surpassed but in very few instances.

I also campaigned with John W. Donahey. He was an indefatigable worker. He fought cleanly but vigorously.

I join with my colleague and the people of Ohio in the expression of condolences to his wife and son, and to the members of the Donahey family, in particular, for the deep bereavement which they have suffered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, my colleague and I both have a feeling of sadness that is shared by many thousands of citizens of Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent that newspaper articles from the newspapers of Columbus, Ohio, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen Journal]

J. DONAHEY, EX-OHIO AIDE, IS DEAD AT 61
COLUMBUS.—Services will be 11 a.m. Monday for John W. Donahey, a former Democratic lieutenant governor whose father was a governor and U.S. senator. He died in Grant Hospital here yesterday at the age of 61.

A graveside service will be 3 p.m. Monday in New Philadelphia. Calling hours at the Schoedinger Funeral Home, E. State St., in Columbus, will extend from noon Sunday.

Donahey, who had been administrator of the Columbus district office of the U.S. Small Business Administration, served as lieutenant governor from 1959 to 1963 under the administration of Michael V. DiSalle.

Donahey, a native of New Philadelphia, entered the hospital last week for gall bladder surgery. It was reported that complications had developed from a heart condition and he was placed in an oxygen tent.

Donahey's father, the late Vic Donahey, was Ohio governor from 1923 to 1929. He was U.S. senator from 1935 to 1941.

Survivors include his wife, Gertrude, secretary in the Columbus office of Sen. Stephen M. Young; and a son, John Jr., of Nashville, Tenn.

Donahey was defeated for state auditor in 1962 by Roger W. Tracy, a Republican, who also has died.

As lieutenant governor, he was presiding officer of the Ohio Senate. He had been quoted as having said, "Everyone who has a right to speak in the Senate will always be given the chance to be fully heard. Partisanship makes no difference."

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch]

DONAHEY, FORMER LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, DIES OF HEART ATTACK AT AGE 61

John W. Donahey, 61, former Ohio lieutenant-governor and son of a former governor and U.S. senator, died Thursday afternoon in Grant Hospital.

He had undergone surgery Feb. 24 and had been convalescing satisfactorily. Death was due to a heart attack.

The state's lieutenant-governor in the Di-Salle administration, Donahey had been district director of the Small Business Administration since leaving the state position.

He was born Aug. 26, 1905, at New Philadelphia, one of the 12 children of Mr. and Mrs. A. Vic Donahey. His father was Ohio governor from 1923 to 1928 and U.S. senator from 1935 to 1941.

Donahey received his early education in New Philadelphia and attended Ohio State University and Cleveland College.

His first positions were as commission clerk for the state, field supervisor for Motorists' Mutual Insurance Co., and general agent for the Donahey Insurance Agency.

From the mid-30s until the late 40s he was associated with various offices of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In 1952, he made his first bid for elective office in an unsuccessful race for the nomination for U.S. Senate.

Donahey was defeated again in a 1954 bid for the Democratic nomination for state treasurer. He was nominated for the post in 1956, but lost in the general election. He won the nomination for lieutenant-governor in a seven-way contest in 1958 and was elected to the office that November.

An advocate of economy in government, Donahey believed in it down to the string-saving level and prided himself on turning back something from his office budget each year.

He also good-naturedly accepted the jibes of skeptics for his work with grain enzymes, research which he pursued during his years in state office and which he confidently believed would some day yield some miracle products.

He was a member of Christ Episcopal Church and the Masonic Lodge.

Surviving are his wife, the former Gertrude Walton, of the residence, 2338 Sherwood Rd.; one son, John Jr., Nashville, Tenn.; three sisters, Mrs. Park G. Ogden, Toronto, Ohio; Mrs. James B. Johnson, Sarasota, Fla., and Mrs. H. Lloyd Smith, Marion, and five brothers, Robert F., Shaker Heights; Hal and Richard, Logan; Jim, Reynoldsburg, and Vic Jr., Worthington, and three grandchildren.

Funeral will be Monday at 11 a.m. in the Schoedinger State St. chapel, where friends may call after noon Sunday. Burial will be in New Philadelphia.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to offer an amendment, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement, as it would apply to the Ellender amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware proposes an amendment:

On page 67, between lines 14 and 15 insert the following new section:

"CONVERSION OF PAY RATES OF SENATE EMPLOYEES TO GROSS RATE BASIS

"Sec. 324. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate is requested to prepare, and make recommendations to the Senate at the earliest practicable date with respect to—

"(1) a plan for the conversion to a gross rate basis of pay rates of employees of the

Senate who are being paid on a basic plus additional compensation basis;

"(2) a schedule of gross salary rates to be applicable in fixing and adjusting pay rates of such employees; and

"(3) a plan for the conversion of Senator's clerk hire allowances from an aggregate basic salary basis to an aggregate gross salary basis.

Such recommendations shall include, or be in the form of, legislative proposals designed to carry into effect the plans and schedule referred to in this section."

On page 3, in the table of contents, after item 323 insert the following new item:

"Sec. 324. Conversion of Pay Rates of Senate Employees to Gross Rate Basis."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield himself time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the manager of the bill. I understand he is willing to accept it.

The bill as it is presented to us now contains a provision that in the House of Representatives the pay scale will be converted from the present use of a basic rate to one of gross payments. This is a step in the right direction. For a number of years I have advocated that the Senate follow such a procedure.

Last week I advised the chairman of the committee, the manager of the bill, that it was my intention to offer today an amendment which would make the same provision applicable to the Senate employees as it now provides for employees of the House of Representatives.

Over the weekend, however, working with legislative counsel we encountered a drafting problem. I concluded that the proposal needs more legislative consideration than we are able to provide by acting on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the problem is different in the Senate. The House of Representatives can freeze the basic allowances for Members of the House because the population bases of congressional district are quite evenly divided. Senators, however, represent both small States and large States, and to freeze the gross as it is today would freeze a different level for Senators from States with the same population.

Perhaps the two Senators from the same State are now using different allowances, yet the gross allowance should be the same. The entire matter needs more consideration than we might obtain by acting on the floor of the Senate.

Nevertheless, something should be done to correct the condition because it is utterly ridiculous to have the base rate as one figure and the gross amount received as an entirely different one.

The proposed amendment would instruct the Committee on Appropriations to report a legislative proposal which would provide the maximum allowance, based on population, that would be allowed each State, with such allowance computed on a gross salary basis rather than at the present formula.

This proposal certainly should be adopted to pave the way for a change to the gross formula. I wish I had an an-

swer to offer today, but at this moment I do not. I therefore offer this amendment in order to put the Senate on record as favoring this change.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time the Senator from Delaware has remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has used only 5 minutes of his time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Delaware. It is one which was studied at considerable length by the Joint Committee on Reorganization, in an effort to simplify the salary scale by reducing it to the gross figure only. The existence of both a basic and a gross figure has been confusing to everyone, including Senators.

As the Senator has well said, this problem is more complicated than it seems at first blush.

Because the congressional districts are similar in size, we could convert the system in the House to the one gross pay schedule. In the Senate, the various positions and numbers of States having different populations, and the different ways in which the pay scale has been used, means that the total salary break-out in gross can be considerably more for a particular employee on the payroll than would be possible if more higher paid workers are employed in Senators' offices.

Because of the flexibility required by the average Senator in meeting the needs of his own State, it was inappropriate for us to rush this. As the Senator has stated, he has himself found, in checking the matters out, that is a difficult and complicated system to change without damage to the present-day allowances that each Senator is using, or can continue to use, perhaps if present employees in his office were to be replaced by others.

For this reason, it seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware is acceptable. It would request the Senate Appropriations Committee, which is the proper committee, to study the matter and report back recommendations in legislative form for the adoption of a gross pay scale and the elimination of the basic pay scale which is now the rule of the Senate.

I am happy to accept the Senator's amendment to the bill, as it merely provides for a study to be made by the proper committee of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for accepting the amendment.

Let me add that last week I thought I had a solution to the problem, but on discussing this with legislative counsel, additional problems were pointed out. We were unable to come up with a solution for a vote today. For that reason I merely ask that the Senate go on record that it will instruct the committee to consider all these problems and then report back to the Senate the necessary legislation.

I will make available to the committee the results of the study which I have made and the solution we have found to some of the problems as well as point

out to it a couple of the remaining problems for which we as yet have not found a solution. I am more than confident that it can be worked out if we just sit down and determine that we want to change the present cumbersome and antiquated method of computing legislative salaries.

The present method of listing a clerk's salary as \$2,220 basic when in reality that means a gross salary of around \$6,437 is a farce.

It should have been corrected long ago.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think such a solution will take a great deal more time than we can devote to it this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I came to the same conclusion, but I am still convinced that it can be solved. The thing to do is just sit down and solve it.

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator has wisely and correctly stated, the present report on the employment of Senate staff on committees is now printed and available and is in the gross amount rather than the basic amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. There is nothing confusing from the standpoint of reporting. The present system conceivably could lead to abuse by utilizing the lowest ratio in the basic formula and an inflated expenditure obtained.

A correction of the situation is long past due. The time has come to overhaul the system, prevent possible abuses, and put it on a realistic basis. I am sure that this amendment will be a step which will lead in that direction.

For example, a Member now can list an employee as receiving a basic salary of only \$60, yet this employee would receive \$1,142.52.

This is misleading and is wide open for abuse. Let us correct it before it develops into a scandal.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I feel certain that the committee will work hard and diligently and report its recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask

for the yeas and nays on the amendment I am about to propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer his amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. It is amendment No. 110.

Mr. President, in that connection, since the amendment was printed, the words "in addition to" on page 16, lines 7 and 8, appear in the new unofficial print at the bottom of page 18a and top of 18b.

I now ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment so as to direct it to the words "in addition to" where they now appear in the bill.

The amendment is as follows:

In the language of section 105 of the bill which amends section 136(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, strike out "in addition to" and insert "within".

Beginning with line 23, page 56, strike out all to and including line 6, page 60, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 301. (a) Section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections: "(g) (1) Each standing committee of the Senate or."

On page 61, line 17, strike out "(j)", and insert in lieu thereof "(h)", and reletter the following subsections.

Beginning with line 8, page 64, strike out all to and including line 12, page 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

Will the Senator renew his request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana yield himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last Friday I submitted a series of amendments to S. 355, the bill now before the Senate. Most of them deal with the number of employees added by the bill to those now provided for under the act of 1946 and in addition to those provided by the various resolutions. Since at least four or five of these amendments deal with the question of the overall number of employees, I have asked that I be given a little more time on my first amendment, so that I can go into a little more detail in discussing the subject and can cover at one time the reasons why these five amendments should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the pending amendment, then, the amendment on which the Senator requested more time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; No. 110.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a half hour on this amendment and 15 minutes on each of the other amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Before I am through I may ask unanimous consent, with the approval of my friend from Oklahoma, that I may take time from the other amendments on this amendment, which will merely reduce the time on the other amendments. It will not add to the time taken. If that should

occur, I shall ask unanimous consent for additional time on this amendment. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will not object, provided I do not go over all the time provided for all the amendments I am offering.

This amendment would strike out the provisions of the bill which authorize or require additional staff for committees.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 authorized a staff of 10 for each committee, consisting of four professional and six clerical members. Each committee may appoint this number without special authority from the Senate. Where a greater number can be justified, authority to hire them can be obtained from the Senate or House. The report on this bill—page 8—points out that 27 of the 36 standing committees now exceed the statutory provision and each of the 27 has more than 12 staff positions.

The bill, by increasing the number of positions which may be filled without a showing of need to 13, and by providing that the additional three shall be in addition to any other additional staff members authorized prior to January 1, 1968, may encourage waste. In addition to these three additional professional staff members, section 301(c) of the bill provides in certain circumstances for the appointment of two additional professional staff members and one additional clerk for the minority, making a total possible addition of six staff members as the bill has been amended by the Metcalf amendment. The additional professional staff members could each be paid as high as \$23,583.70. Counting only the three professionals that could be employed under all circumstances, the cost of their salaries alone for each committee could come to almost \$70,000. For 36 committees this would be over \$2,520,000. They would, of course, require office space, secretarial assistance, travel expenses, and other items which would increase the cost considerably. They might also prepare reports which are not prepared today because of the lack of need for them, and these reports would be printed and distributed at Government expense.

The changes made at page 16 of the bill by this amendment would require the review specialist to be included within, rather than be additional to, the four professional staff members now authorized.

The balance of the amendment would strike out those provisions of the bill which first, increase the authorized professional staff from four to six; second, permit a majority of the minority to appoint two of the professional staff members and one of the clerical staff members; and, third, permit the staff appointees of a majority of the minority to be in addition to the 13 authorized staff members where there are no vacancies at the time of their appointment.

As I informed the Senate a few days ago, when we considered the various resolutions dealing with so-called temporary employees, it has been my privilege for the past 15 years, or more, to question the advisability of providing so

many more employees each year than that authorized by the act of 1946.

Mr. President, when the Reorganization Act of 1946 was adopted, we reduced from 30-odd to 15 the number of standing committees. We provided 10 employees for each committee, four of whom would be professionals and six clericals.

To facilitate the work of the committees, to make possible for each committee the necessary research, and to enable the administrative assistants and the office forces of Senators to have ways and means of obtaining information, we created the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. That Service was to be for the benefit of all Senators and all committees. As I pointed out last week, we spend for the Legislative Reference Service \$3,428,000, and there are presently employed 304 specialists in various lines to give information to the committees through their staffs, to the Senators through their staffs, and, of course, to the Senators directly.

It was my belief then that such a procedure would not only be workable, but, would alleviate much of the load in the Senator's offices, by enabling them to make a telephone call to the Legislative Reference Service and obtain much of the information necessary to conduct the affairs of the committees as well as the work of Senators.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the pending amendment or one of those which will later be offered by the Senator deal with the question as to whether or not the additional committee employees provided by the bill before us are to be in addition to or without regard to employees authorized and employed by special resolutions, and paid from the contingent funds?

Mr. ELLENDER. Special authority to obtain additional employees is not affected by my amendment at all. It deals only with the additional employees provided under this act, in amending the 1946 act.

In other words, Mr. President, my point is this: We have 15 standing committees. Those standing committees now have, in addition to the employees provided by the original act of 1946, a total of 465 additional employees.

My amendment does not disturb that situation, as much as I should like it to. Those employees remain intact. And, Mr. President, I wish to make the point clear that even though this amended bill is enacted, the Senate will still have the right to make provision for subcommittees each year, as in the past.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. My question does not go to the argument whether or not a particular committee should have a certain number of employees, or a few more or a few less. I do think it is important that the Senate and the Committee on Rules understand the issue. Perhaps the author of the bill can help clarify the problem I have in mind.

A number of committees have been provided additional staffing under reso-

lutions which have passed, which will carry through all of calendar year 1967.

This bill, if enacted, will take effect soon after it passes and is approved. In the case of a committee that has sought and obtained from the Committee on Rules and from the Senate funds from the contingent fund to employ additional employees, will this bill give such a committee employees in addition to those?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is what I am trying to take from the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. It does not differentiate between the committee that has not sought additional employees to be paid from the contingent funds, and the committee that has?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. In other words, Mr. President, under the original act of 1946, we had provided four professionals and six clericals. This amendment adds three for each committee, whether they need them or not, and whether or not they are provided for by special resolution.

In other words, Mr. President, let us take for example the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences. That committee, under the act of 1946 and the resolution recently adopted, now has six professionals. It also has eight clericals, for a total of 14 employees.

If this bill passes, it will give that committee three additional professionals, whether it wants them or not.

Mr. President, I think it would be horrible for a thing like that to happen. I do not believe any committee which has applied for additional employees did not receive the number of employees desired. I think it is extravagant to pile up for each committee employees additional to the number it now has, whether they are needed or not.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator, but I also think that the fact that this bill would take effect, perhaps, in the middle of the year, also creates an odd situation. In passing on the funds from the contingent fund, there is no opportunity to take into account what the committees are entitled to by statute.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of course, all employees—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes which the Senator allotted himself have expired. Does the Senator wish to use additional time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say further to my good friend that under resolutions heretofore adopted, eight of the committees now have additional permanent professionals. They do not have to come back each year and obtain funds, as is the case with employees provided by resolutions.

For instance, last week the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare obtained seven new professionals who will be permanent. They do not have to come back each year and ask for money for those eight new professionals; the funds will be provided automatically, just the same as would be the case in the event this bill is enacted and the additional employees are provided.

What I seek to do, Mr. President, is simply to say to the Senate that the number of employees now employed will be retained—that is, the four professionals and the six clericals for each committee, provided by statutes, and the additional employees made available by the committees by resolution are not disturbed. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this bill does not in any manner change the law or the rules or regulations to prevent special committees, subcommittees, or standing committees from coming before the Senate and asking for more people.

Mr. President, I wish again to reiterate how wrong I think it would be to provide additional unneeded employees for such committees as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which now has 50 employees—24 professionals and 26 clericals. The bill would provide three more professionals whether they are needed or not.

Senators know what will happen if the bill in its present form is enacted. Of course the additional employees will be put on the payroll. The urge will be there to put them on—all this in addition to what the law now provides.

There is another quirk in the pending bill to which my pending amendment is directed. A provision in the pending legislation would give the majority of the minority party the right to select two additional professional employees and one clerical should there be no vacancies in the committee. For example, the minority on the Committee on Finance could demand, by a majority of the minority, three additional employees and the majority would have to furnish those three employees to them.

The majority, on the other hand, would have the right to curtail the number of employees on the committee, but those employees who were placed on the committee staff by the majority of the minority cannot be affected unless the majority of the minority takes action against them.

I am sure that my good friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, did not intend to do that, but yet that provision is contained in the bill.

The bill provides for more professionals and more clericals for the benefit of the minority. As to whether these employees are needed, the majority of the minority party merely has to state that they want them. If one of them makes a motion that they need three additional men and the motion is carried, the majority of the committee would have to accept that demand. I do not think it is right.

I am sure that no standing committee has been reticent in coming before the Senate and asking for additional employees.

It happens that there are only two committees that have not come before the Senate to ask for additional employees. These committees are the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am chairman, and the Committee on the District of Columbia. Those are the only two committees that have not come before the Senate to ask for additional employees. Every other committee has presented resolutions

every year to the Senate asking for additional employees.

As I have just indicated, some of the committees have actually had resolutions to make these employees permanent.

I think it is wrong for us at this time to amend the present law and add other employees to the employees that are now employed by the committees. It would greatly increase the cost of running the Senate.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment, principally to try to straighten out the numbers confusion that exists.

We are talking here about a total of three professional employees authorized in the bill. Two of these three professional employees may be employed at the beginning of next year if the Republican members of the standing committees claim that they need additional staff because the present staff is imbalanced as a result of the vast majority of the staff devoting its time to serving the majority party.

We are talking about three employees in the professional classification and two in the clerical, one of which would be hired from the regular staff. One new clerical position is provided.

The reason why that date is contained in the bill is that by that time they will be coming before the Senate for additional resolution money with which to operate the staff. Provision is contained in the bill for two employees with reference to the minority staff, and the one man in the review specialist classification will be taken into consideration, I am sure, by the Committee on Rules and Administration when it requests additional money for the staffing of these standing committees.

The committee is aware, I am certain, that the very diligent, energetic, and distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana will be watching, because there will then be three additional professional staff members authorized for employment. If committees have employed them, I am sure the Senator will not be willing to give them three additional staff members merely because they come in with a resolution.

This is the control that we have over the additional members who are not included here, except for the review specialists this year. The other two will be subject to the decision of the committee as to when they should be put on as members to serve the minority as regular members of the duly constituted staff. The question was whether the committees should come in on a year-to-year basis, as they sometimes do, to ask for additional professional staff members with which to conduct public business requirements of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, sup-

pose that there were no vacancy. What does the language of the Senator mean when it states that even though there is no vacancy at the time, if the majority or the minority should desire to press its case, they can be appointed.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would not take effect until January 1. That is on page 125.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to page 9.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am talking about the effective date of the act. Part of the suggestion of the Senator relates to that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it then necessary to include in section 202 the suggestion that if there are no vacancies the majority of the minority can force the issue, and if they vote to put on additional employees the majority of the committee must accede to that request?

Mr. MONRONEY. The minority would not otherwise have any right to staff unless it were given to them by the majority.

We are trying to provide—and we have stated it a number of times and written the language as clearly as we know how—that when the majority complains that they are not getting the staff help that they need, there will be two professional positions that are authorized and can be filled by the minority.

That would be effective, with reference to parts 2 and 3 of title II, on January 1, 1968. That is to be found on page 125.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator can look at the language and see that in the original act of 1946—

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, may the Senator be charged with his time and I with mine. I want the Senator to ask questions, but I do want to keep from running out of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana want to ask questions on his own time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not on my own time. I am just asking questions.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was trying to divide the time. I do want to answer all of the questions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder why the new law seems to change the original law, in that the original law intended that these people be appointed on a non-partisan, permanent, and career basis.

If that be the case, why did the committee put in the bill the language that these two employees selected by the minority will serve the minority and not the full committee? That is what I cannot understand. We would veer away from the original concept of the act of 1946.

Mr. MONRONEY. The testimony was irrefutable that there was an imbalance in many committees. Many other committees scrupulously observed the non-partisanship of the career staff, but there are cases that need adjustment.

In order to provide this, we did authorize, when requested by the minority because there was not adequate staffing—and I am sure they will not abuse that

provision—the employment of two professional staff members.

That is a cheap price to guarantee bipartisanship in the consideration of these matters.

The situation is worse in the other body. Complaints in the House have been much more numerous than they have been in the Senate, because our Senate committees go on and on for several years, and they have become generally nonpartisan as they have worked together. We received not too many complaints in the Senate, but we had many in the House. For that reason, we provided for the two extra staff members, if requested by the minority leadership, and they would be requested on the basis that adequate staffing cannot otherwise be achieved.

I do not believe that any member of the majority really wants to monopolize committee staff or to prevent the minority from having access to information and to staff work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

We in the majority have men downtown—or are suspected, at least, of having them—in the executive departments who do much extra work in giving us information and research on legislation. I do not see it, but it is claimed that we do have, and for that reason we wanted to make sure that the minority will have this equal access.

I would hate to see the review specialist cut out, because the majority leader has specified that we need to do extra work, to follow up on legislation we have passed, and this gives us a man who will devote his time to that work. Common-sense experience over the years indicates that unless you have a staff member appointed for that specific duty, you will not have that work done. It is a specific performance that will be required, and for that reason we have the review specialist and the two staff specialists who will be used by the minority. If they are not used by the minority, I would say that they are entitled to work as career staff members, and thus they would be reduced from the numbers that would be voted on as the resolutions for extra money are presented in the Senate.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. On the time of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has stated that there is an imbalance in some things—the minority is not adequately represented, the majority is overrepresented—and therefore it has been decided, in justice, to give the minority the right to select two members when it does so by a majority vote of the minority.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now, then, if all the

posts are filled and the minority desires two members, two new men will go on the posts. My question is this: "Why not remove two of the employees of the majority, to give the minority proper and just representation?"

Mr. MONRONEY. None of these staff members will be appointed until January 1968.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not change the situation at all.

Mr. MONRONEY. The resolution money expires at that time, and many of the staff members are on the resolution. The matter can be taken into consideration at that time, when we authorize additional money in the resolutions, which we do in great amounts, for additional professional staff members.

This gives the distinguished Committee on Rules and Administration—and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—the right to make sure that reductions are made in the staff if the minority has asked for these two staff specialists.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question is this: "Why not remove two staff members from those of the majority, so that two could be given to the minority, instead of increasing the total number by two?"

Mr. MONRONEY. It is up to the committee. They can do that. They do not have to add two more. But the distinguished Senator from Ohio knows, and I know, that the staff of these committees must be valued and experienced men. The extra men are employed on a year-to-year basis.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will permit the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to support the argument so ably presented by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in opposition to amendment No. 110, offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The review specialist, who would be eliminated by the action of the resolution in the form of an amendment by the Senator from Louisiana, is, in my opinion, one of the most important reforms we have encompassed in this entire piece of legislation. If this review specialist, operating as he does under the direction of the majority leader and the minority leader, remains in the bill, this will provide all Members of the Senate with valuable information, which inevitably will result in a great saving to the taxpayer, because it provides, for the first time, the means whereby legislative committees can fulfill a function which they are presumed to be able to fulfill but never have fulfilled. It will mean that not only the Committee on Government Operations, on which the Senator from South Dakota serves as ranking minority member, will have this responsibility, but also that each legislative committee will be empowered and authorized and di-

rected to make these annual reviews and to make the facts known to Congress.

Our able, overworked Committee on Government Operations cannot begin to do the supervisory job which the legislative branch should engage in concerning the executive departments, to determine whether or not, first, they are carrying out the intent of Congress; second, whether there are duplications and overlapping of efforts and ways by which the situation could be corrected if the facts were brought to the attention of Congress and the Committee on Appropriations.

I am surprised that the Senator from Louisiana, who has been a consistent exponent of economy in this country, would object to establishing the tools required in order that the Senate and the House can bring about these economies. We cannot shoot in the dark. We must get the information. We spent literally days and weeks, as the members of our joint committee know, attempting to work out a formula which would be both effective and just and which would result in the programs we have.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that we have as our watchdog the GAO. They do a good job. Under the act of 1946, each committee can call on them. I know that we do it in our committee.

Mr. MUNDT. We do it, but not nearly so well as we should do it. We should supervise more carefully a great many operations of the Department of Agriculture. We have an excellent staff, which serves on a bipartisan basis; and I salute the chairman for his selection of it. But it does not have the manpower to get the job done adequately.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have never heard of any complaints.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator may not have heard of any complaints because of the respect that we generally have for the chairman. But the job has not been done adequately, and the Senator recognizes that the size of our staff is utterly inadequate to cover an operation as broad as the Department of Agriculture.

The General Accounting Office does a good job. It sends up the reports. We do not even have the staff members and the time necessary to devote adequate analysis to what the reports provide when they come from the GAO.

As to the other aspect, I do not believe that our chairman is partisan. He never proved that when I served on the committee. I do not believe that the leopard changed his spots.

We had much testimony before a joint committee of the Senate and the House, where this situation does not obtain; and if we believe in bipartisan government—which we do—we should give at least this small recognition to the minority. It is not very large. In the whole staff, it reserves only two for that purpose, and then only where conditions prevail so that the minority feels that in order to have have an adequate "look-see" and

the necessary information, it should provide the necessary staff.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will not destroy the hard work of this joint committee by deleting from it two of the most important reforms which we put in by unanimous vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator answer this question?

Mr. MUNDT. Surely.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], we had in mind that the staff of all committees would be selected by the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

We had in mind that the staff of all committees would be selected by the majority, and be assigned by the chairman and the ranking member.

These additional employees and staff members appointed pursuant to request by the minority members of the committee in this instance shall be assigned to such committee business as such minority members deem advisable.

We are getting away from the original concept of the act of 1946, whereby the employees of the committee are to serve all of the members. Here they could be serving a majority of the minority group only.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that we would not be getting away from the original concept. It provided for one position for the minority. On the Committee on Government Operations, of which the chairman is the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and on which I have the honor to serve, we are faithfully following the right of the minority to pick this single member.

If the minority feels that it can be best served by Democratic employees, they all serve the full committee, and they would in this case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill, as I read it, it would not do that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I have 30 seconds?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. This section would provide exactly as is now provided, but it provides a safeguard for the minority where it becomes necessary to have someone serve them. If that becomes necessary, then they can have someone. But in 90 percent of the cases, the member picked by the majority and the minority will serve the full committee.

I am shocked that the Senator says the majority picks them all and they serve the full committee. I think that the majority should pick most of them, and the minority should pick a part of them, and they would all serve the full committee.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Actually, the testimony before the committee was to the effect that the system that we had be-

fore had not worked in some of the committees, mostly in the other body.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. METCALF. We tried to take care of the problem to protect the rights of the minority. In many cases the chairmen and acting minority chairmen came in and testified that they were satisfied. We who serve on the Committee on Government Operations are satisfied. Apparently those who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are satisfied. However, there were instances where the minority was not satisfied, and we were anxious to take care of the problem. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I support the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana. I begin with the premise that on some committees of the Senate the minority is inadequately represented by staff members; and I subscribe to the proposal that the minority, in order to function efficiently, should have adequate representation on the staff to keep it informed and to provide information and papers for it.

But the weakness of what is happening is that in the effort to cure a wrong, the minority—and I address this remark to the minority—have taken the plum by which they are supposed to get some assignments, but allow the majority to remain with an imbalance of strength. There are violations of the old principle.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot yield. I have only 5 minutes.

Too many employees are on one side of the staff. Instead of reducing the number of the majority, they are allowing the majority number to remain intact, and are then adding two employees to the number they now have on the staff membership.

I have read the document, and I understand clearly what it says. If and when a majority of the minority determines that it wants representation and it so votes, it shall be given two members, provided there are vacancies, one would think; but the language further states that if there are no vacancies, the staff number shall be increased by two.

Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as this session continues, one will find argument being made, especially during the authorization and the appropriation periods, for a reduction of expense in order to avoid the imposition of a surtax. That argument will be resounding through the Chamber day after day.

Buried in this bill is a proposal of \$950,000 for new employees for 15 committees. Three new employees for each committee would mean a total of 45. The salaries will be about \$22,500 a year. I figure that to mean \$900,000. But that is not all.

Two weeks ago we added new employees, new staff members. When the

Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed, it was contemplated that there should be four professionals and four clerks on each committee. Manifestly, that number is not adequate. But throughout the 20 years since 1946, the number of professionals has been expanded and the number of clerks has been expanded.

In 1946, the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, was given four professionals and six clerks. It now has how many?

Mr. ELLENDER. It now has 44.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has 22 clerks and 22 professionals. This proposal would give that committee three more employees. The taxpayers bleed and sweat. The burden will be heaped upon them with increasing frequency as this Congress goes on.

If there is to be economy in Government, I respectfully submit that the place to start is in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. If there is to be obedience to law and order, respect for constitutional government, and the sovereign strength of the State, obedience must first begin in Congress.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. We will demand economies from all. We will be yelling for the maintenance of law and order so far as it pertains to activities outside Congress; but within Congress, anything goes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 14 minutes remaining; the Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have 14 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Louisiana is using a full hour on this amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the following question: Does the wording of the bill mean that the seniority system on the minority side is eliminated and that the chairman of the committee deals with the majority of the minority members, rather than doing business at all with the ranking member?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are some essential questions involved here. Page 57 of the bill states:

Such professional staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable, except that whenever a majority of the minority members of such committee (other than the Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives) so request, two

of such professional staff members may be selected for appointment by majority vote of the minority members and the committee shall appoint any staff members so selected.

This is customarily the uniform practice of all of us. Committee employees are assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member, but the committee as a whole authorizes the selection, usually by resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. It means also that the minority ranking member has no more to say about selection of who shall be assigned to him than any of the other members on the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. No. The ranking minority member of each committee—

Mr. AIKEN. Would be assigned to him, yes; but the selection is made by the majority of the minority.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is right. Authority to select committee staff generally is delegated to the ranking minority member by the minority side, and to the chairman by the majority side. That is the custom. But the law requires, uniformly, that all committee employees be selected by a majority of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. If the majority of the minority party on a committee have a lack of friendly feeling for the ranking member, they could select a staff member who might not work with him, could they not—but who would be assigned to him?

Mr. MONRONEY. The minority.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

The other question which I had is on page 59, where it states:

(g) In any case in which a request for the appointment of a minority staff member under subsection (a) or subsection (c) is made at any time when no vacancy exists to which the appointment requested may be made, the person appointed pursuant to such request may serve in addition to any other staff members authorized by such subsections and may be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, until such time as such a vacancy occurs, at which time such person shall be considered to have been appointed to such vacancy.

On the two additional members presently appointed to the staff, what pay would they get? Would they be expected to receive the same pay as the regular members of the staff?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that they would, but this would be only until the first of the year. This is to take care of the contingency.

Mr. AIKEN. That means that they might become regular members of the staff after 15 or 20 years if a vacancy occurs then?

Mr. MONRONEY. If there is no vacancy on the staff until the first of the year, we would provide for the contingency and keep them on as staff members until the new funds were adjusted by resolution, or by the thinning down of the number on the committee, or by addition under a section of the bill which would provide for the additional two staff members after January 1, 1968.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Would they be listed in such a way that they would receive full retirement credit?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It is intended that that should be the case?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to read to my good friend from Vermont—he raised a very important question as to the change of concept on the way we have been going on:

That that staff member and members all appointed pursuant to request by minority members of the committee shall be assigned to such committee business as such minority members deem advisable.

Mr. AIKEN. We might find a campaign going on to get the majority of the minority membership on a committee which might agree with someone who had some particular idea to promote.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is a change of concept, as I said. In the bill as now written, if it is enacted next week, the minority members are desirous of increasing the amount. All they need to do is meet, and we can adopt two or three—whatever the number is.

Mr. AIKEN. And the ranking minority member in order to protect himself would have to see to it that the new members coming on his committee were, perhaps, sympathizers, or at least would not tend to thwart him.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have complete faith in the minority. They will be fair and not request the two additional staff members—

Mr. AIKEN. I have been in the Senate long enough to know that we cannot take everything on faith.

Mr. MONRONEY. I still have that faith. I am certain that it will work out. There are few exceptions in the Senate—perhaps more in the other body—where there is unfair or a disproportionate division of the staffing. But, if that is the case, that would be intolerable to me and should be corrected. I am willing to risk the fairness of the minority rather than leave that situation—

Mr. AIKEN. I would not want to see even one instance of unfairness. I hope that it would never come to light.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure that the minority would not unfairly use this provision.

Mr. President, the Senator's amendment would delete two provisions of the bill which I think are quite important and which are recommended by the committee on a unanimous vote: first, in correcting the staff situation, the committee felt it was quite important that one staff position should be separated completely from the others; namely, the position of review specialist. If we feel that the job of looking backward to see how the programs we have enacted are actually working out is an important task, there must be someone to attend to that job. In all likelihood, the job probably will fall to a senior, present-day staff member. There will be new people coming to the committee staff, but more than likely there will be promotion of a present outstanding staff member to the position of review specialist. I think it is necessary that we have this provision in the bill. If we are going to look backward at our mistakes on many pieces of legislation,

review the faulty administration of many programs where the bureaucrats, those appointed to administer the programs, do not follow the wishes or the expectations of the mandate of Congress, we need a review specialist on each of the appropriate committees.

I would desperately hate to see the review specialist provisions cut out of the bill because what is everyone's business is no one's business. We have to have someone on the staff following up the programs we passed last year.

The other matter—of striking the provision for minority staffing—would be cruel. I think it would be destructive of a very necessary but probably little used provision in the rules where the staffs are out of balance.

Another point relates to the Rules Committee and the very diligent and vigilant efforts of the Senator from Louisiana for the control of cutting down of the provisions for professional members when money is requested in the resolutions at the first of the year. With the addition of the two additional minority staff members who are possible under the provisions of the bill, many people who are presently requested in these resolutions would not be necessary. The professionals can be cut out of the resolution money, and certainly if it is the feeling of the Senate itself and the Rules Committee that the position of the staff member who has been made the review specialist is not needed to be filled, then they can cut that money out. But there are dozens and dozens and dozens of professional jobs that go through these resolutions, and this is the place to cut, not in the bill providing the permanent professional staff which we need so badly and which as the Senator says, is costly; but I repeat again that the entire cost of running House and Senate together is less than the cost of operation of the office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I take this time primarily to answer the misimpression that the Senator from Ohio apparently has, concerning the operation of minority staff members. There is nothing in the legislation at all which indicates this is in addition to the staff. As the chairman of the joint committee has pointed out, that is in the way staffs are selected. At the beginning of a Congress, we decide among ourselves as committee members the size of the staff which we will need to do the job, and prepare a budget which goes to the Rules Committee. That budget includes the salaries of those who are appointed by the majority of minority members. It does not add anyone else. The Rules Committee ordinarily—not always—gives the amount of money that the committee requires. Then it comes up on the Senate floor. But we are dealing with a changed budget. We are not adding ad-

ditional expenditures simply because a part of the staff finds that such has been agreed to by a committee session, or simply because two members of that staff are going to be appointed by the minority ranking member on the committee.

I would point out that this particular section—I ask the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to correct me if I am wrong—becomes effective on the first day of the next calendar year. So we have this maxim established for developing a staff suitable to do the job, no more or no less in the aggregate than if the minority continued to be ignored. It operates precisely in conformity with the existing policy on the committee that I mentioned, on which I serve, the Government Operations Committee, that, according to the Reorganization Act of 20 years ago, the minority nominates its fair quota and they are a part of the package.

Concern has been expressed that they are serving minority interests; we propose that they serve with the staff as a part of the staff team. There is no division there. There is a feeling that a staff picked by the majority and directed by it to carry out its position is not satisfactory. Whatever needed safeguards may be necessary in the House committees, it is necessary in only a few committees of the Senate. I hope we do not destroy that which has now been accorded us by unanimous consent thus far from the joint committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 4 minutes remaining and the Senator from Oklahoma has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not like to repeat myself too often, but as Senators know, for the past 15 years I have been interested in trying to keep the subcommittees in line. Over the years, I cannot claim to have been very successful. Every year there is an increase in the number of employees on practically every subcommittee. More money is being requested. Now, we are told, "Provide in the bill two additional employees for the minority, and next year, when the subcommittees are created, we are going to lop them off."

As I recall, Mr. President, in practically every resolution that was adopted creating the subcommittees, the minority was pretty well taken care of. I recall that practically every resolution had some wording in it whereby the patronage—because that is what it is—will be divided up, not equally, but the minority will have so many, and majority will have so many.

What I resent, and what I think is wrong, is that we are getting away from the act of 1946, under which employees on these committees represented both sides, Republicans and Democrats. No preference was shown. It was supposed to be bipartisan. However, under this language, as I understand it—and I challenge any one to read it and not come to this conclusion—the members of the minority that are appointed on it will owe allegiance to the majority of the mi-

nority. Even the ranking Republican on a committee will not have any say if the majority of the minority decides against his wishes.

I repeat, it changes the entire concept of the act of 1946.

I shall place in the RECORD at this time a table to indicate what is happening. The cost of running the Congress has been on the increase every year, particularly with respect to the subcommittees. In the 84th Congress the amount expended was \$4,769,598.02. In the 89th Congress, it was just double that amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to take another minute from the time allotted on the next amendment that I intend to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, the cost for the subcommittees has grown greatly from the 84th Congress. The amount of expenditures has doubled. Now, instead of trying to remedy the situation, we are simply making it possible for each standing committee to have three additional members appointed. Of course, it applies to a large number of committees in the House as well.

We are not trying to cure the evil that I have been pointing out for the past 15 years. Even though we are increasing the number of employees for each committee, the fact remains that next year, and the year after, the chairmen of the subcommittees will be able to come before the Senate, and I am sure with success, judging from the past, and continue to increase this number.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the cost of running the subcommittees alone.

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

Summary of committee authorizations and expenditures for inquiries and investigations, 84th through 90th Cong., 1st sess.

	Authorized	Expended
84th Cong. (1955-56):		
Inquiries and investigations.....	\$6,578,859.94	\$4,530,074.67
Routine.....	315,000.00	239,523.35
Total.....	6,893,859.94	4,769,598.02
85th Cong. (1957-58):		
Inquiries and investigations.....	7,958,780.14	5,696,275.34
Routine.....	320,000.00	210,445.89
Total.....	8,278,780.14	5,906,721.23
86th Cong. (1959-60):		
Inquiries and investigations.....	10,458,231.37	7,619,895.65
Routine.....	300,000.00	214,326.52
Total.....	10,758,231.37	7,834,222.17
87th Cong. (1961-62):		
Inquiries and investigations.....	9,458,700.00	7,308,844.72
Routine.....	283,300.00	215,888.67
Total.....	9,742,000.00	7,524,733.39

Summary of committee authorizations and expenditures for inquiries and investigations, 84th through 90th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

	Authorized	Expended
88th Cong. (1963-64):		
Inquiries and investigations.....	\$9,802,933.00	\$7,716,828.20
Routine.....	280,000.00	202,089.85
Total.....	10,082,933.00	7,918,918.05
89th Cong. (1965-66):		
Inquiries and investigations (total).....	12,298,415.00	19,597,682.49
90th Cong., 1st sess.: Inquiries and investigations (projected) (total).....	5,896,000.00	-----

¹ Through Dec. 31, 1966.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I pointed out a while ago that we have now on the books resolutions that provide for 465 employees in addition to the ones provided by the act of 1946, at a cost of \$6.5 million.

My time is up, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield back his time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I only wish to say that the Senate itself can correct the imbalances in staffing if too many are being hired. The Senator from Louisiana need make no apology to anyone for the fight he has made for economy. The chairmen of the committees should be interested in cutting down on so-called part-time employment of committee professionals provided for by resolutions. I think it is far better to have a complete staffing pattern by way of permanent appropriations, so the committees will have the benefit of the knowledge, skill, and understanding of highly trained professional employees.

This amendment would delete a very valuable part of the organization proposal by striking out the provision for a review specialist. Without such a staff member, we will not have a specialist who can follow up on legislation that has already been passed, a function that has been needed for so long.

I feel that there is an exaggeration of the problem of over-staffing, particularly in the Senate, by saying that minority staff professionals will be placed on every single committee. I doubt that. I think that only a few committees will ask for them, when they feel the need, in justice, to have an equal opportunity to have staff help.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I think the yeas and nays have already been ordered on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired or been yielded back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are we voting on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, as modified.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 110) of the Senator from Louisiana. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with my senior colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator

from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Alken	Fulbright	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Spong
Cannon	Hruska	Stennis
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Church	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Curtis	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Pastore	Young, Ohio
Ellender	Russell	

NAYS—51

Allott	Hart	Morton
Anderson	Hayden	Moss
Baker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Holland	Murphy
Bible	Inouye	Nelson
Boggs	Jackson	Pearson
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Percy
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Prouty
Dirksen	Kuchel	Proxmire
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Dominick	Mansfield	Scott
Fannin	McClellan	Smith
Fong	McGovern	Symington
Gore	Metcalf	Thurmond
Griffin	Miller	Tydings
Harris	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—26

Bartlett	Hansen	Mondale
Bayh	Hartke	Montoya
Brewster	Hatfield	Morse
Brooke	Hollings	Muskie
Burdick	Javits	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, La.	Sparkman
Cooper	Magnuson	Tower
Ervin	McGee	Yarborough
Gruening	McIntyre	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment (No. 110) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 113

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 113.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Beginning on page 64, with line 15, strike out all through line 13 on page 65.

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not think it will take very long to consider the pending amendment.

The pending bill would provide for an additional legislative assistant for each Senator. The funds with which to pay these legislative assistants are not to come from the regular amount allotted to each Senator for his other employees.

With respect to the State of Louisiana, which I represent in part, \$57,000 is allotted to each Senator to operate his office. That is the base amount that I receive.

I do not care to have everyone do what I am trying to do, although I am sure many are, but each year I return to the Treasury approximately \$75,000 which I could use to operate my office. However, if I were to use all of it, I would feel like a burglar because I have no need for it.

The great trouble that I find today with the operation of the Senate is that

Senators have too many advisers. They have too many people telling them what they ought to do. And I doubt that all Senators do the job that should be done.

We now have administrative assistants and they are paid for out of the regular allotment of each Senator. The base is \$8,880, out of the \$57,000 base that I am allotted. There is added to that from the contingent fund an amount sufficient to pay each administrative assistant as much as \$24,460.

Mr. President, in addition to that help, we now propose to add a legislative assistant for each Senator. According to the committee report, section 321(a) authorizes the employment by each Senator of a legislative assistant to assist him in the performance of duties involving legislation.

I wonder what the administrative assistant does for the Senator? What does his staff do for him?

Is this person to be employed by a Senator to look into only legislative matters? I think we are simply overdoing it.

The report provides:

The basic compensation of the legislative assistant may be fixed by the Senator at a rate not in excess of \$8,460 per annum.

That is the base.

The report further provides:

The compensation of this employee would not be chargeable to a Senator's regular clerk hire allowance, and no part of the amount available for the payment of such compensation could be paid to any other employee in the Senator's office. Subsection (b), of section 321 makes a technical amendment to the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, to make it clear that the legislative assistant would be in addition to the other two Senate employees in a Senator's office whose basic compensation may be fixed at an annual rate of \$8,460.

As I understand the purpose of the proposed legislation, this legislative assistant will be limited to looking into legislative matters only, and I am wondering where we are going.

As I pointed out earlier the cost of operating the Senate has increased tremendously since the 84th Congress. For the life of me, I cannot see why each Senator, irrespective of the size of his State, should be entitled to a legislative assistant whose salary could be as much as \$23,244.66. That would mean that each Senator, whether he needs him or not, would have the opportunity to appoint this legislative assistant, who evidently would be a specialist in legislation.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The authority to appoint a legislative assistant does not disturb me nearly as much as does the listing of the base salary of \$8,460 a year. Will the Senator advise us what the real salary of this person would be?

Mr. ELLENDER. \$23,244.66.

Mr. AIKEN. And can the Senator tell me why, when we read the salaries paid by the House, the base salary is made public, I believe, whereas in the Senate the exalted salary is the one that is always published, making it appear that the Senate pays its employees about three

times as much as the House? What is the use of carrying on this deception against the public any more?

We do not pay legislative assistants \$8,460. We pay them almost three times that, and the Government takes nearly half of it for taxes, of course. But that is a deception on the public which ought to be eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been my contention all along. I will not say it is a deception, because each year—in fact, every 6 months—a publication is issued by the Secretary of the Senate—

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. Mr. ELLENDER. In which is set forth the exact amount received for each quarter by a Senator's employees.

As I pointed out earlier, I employ 12 people in my office. I take out of my base pay about two-thirds of the base pay, and then the contingent fund adds to that, to make the salaries increase from the base pay of \$8,860 to \$24,460.

Under the Base Pay Act, you could use \$60, as I recall, of your base pay, and the contingent fund would put in about \$1,700 more. So that by taking \$60 out of your base pay, you could hire somebody who would get \$1,800. I do not like that system, but that is the method we have been using for quite some time.

As I have said, in my opinion, each Senator has enough money to properly operate his office; and for us to add another employee who will be paid \$23,244.66 merely to look into the legislative aspects of the work of the Senator, I believe we are simply outdoing ourselves.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that the Senator from Florida has had a legislative assistant in his office for a great many years who draws pay at the second rate permitted under the pay scale, which I think is something like \$1,000 under the maximum. I have understood that many Senators have followed that same course, having both an administrative assistant and a legislative assistant. Does this mean that we are going to have a second legislative assistant?

Mr. ELLENDER. It does. And he will be a real one, because the intention is that he do nothing but that, and he will not be paid out of the same funds as the Senator's present legislative assistant.

Florida having about 4 million people—

Mr. HOLLAND. Six million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that in operating his office, the base pay of the Senator from Florida is over \$60,000, perhaps \$70,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Whatever it is, not only are we getting along on it, but also, we have an administrative assistant and a legislative assistant, whom I have just mentioned, and 13 others, and still do not quite use up our allowance.

Am I correct in my understanding that this amount, while it is paid out of another fund—of course, it comes from the same Government—will not be shown in the law as added to our allowance for our office?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's

understanding is correct. It will be paid out of a separate fund, and the Senator's present allowance will not thereby be affected.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator in his approach on this amendment, and I expect to support him.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This is a provision of the bill on which I believe the committee was unanimous, to put additional emphasis on the primary job that we are sent to the Senate to do, and that is to legislate.

I do not know how many committee assignments Senators average, but I would guess that we would average at least three, and in many cases four, counting the special, joint, and other committee efforts.

I do not know how many conflicts other Members experience each day in committee meetings, but scarcely a day passes when I do not have at least one conflict in getting to one of the subcommittees on appropriations or to subcommittees on commerce or in providing myself time to go to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We all have these conflicts.

We are sent to the Senate primarily to legislate. Providing a legislative assistant who could cover a meeting in the compelled absence of the Senator he represents, who must be at another committee meeting, and detail to the Senator the proceedings of the testimony and the discussion that took place, would be the next best arrangement we could institute to having the Senator himself present. It will require a man of some ability to be able to gather and understand the testimony, to be able to switch back and forth among several committees, to report to the Senator what occurred, to bring back the information as to why the request perhaps for a billion dollars, \$2 billion, or \$10 billion additional is necessary, in the appropriations subcommittee or in the authorization committee at which he was present.

We set this aside as a matter in which we desired economy. Most of the committee members and those who testified before us believe that the job of administrative assistant is filled well. But we all know that this man generally must take care of the multitude of problems that are waiting to be solved back in the Senator's home State, problems which require some agency or departmental checkup by someone of high skills and talents in the office. He must handle the problems of constituents by the hundreds who ask for guidance in finding information regarding their economic interests or problems.

The administrative assistant must handle almost all of the service problems, and the problems of constituents, upon which a Senator must render assistance. If the offices of other Senators are like mine, this service has been escalating at a tremendous rate, to the point where an administrative assistant no longer has the time to double in brass and become an expert in legislation and also take care of the problems which the administrative assistant was employed to help the Senator handle. Above all, the administrative assistant must followup,

after he gets the problem, to see that the agency or the department of Government involved makes some interpretation on what this problem is.

For those reasons, I believe that there is a clear need for the legislative assistant.

He does not have to be paid \$23,244 per year. At no time has this committee ever released a figure lower than the gross figures because we feel, since we are compelled to act on a basic figure, we owe it to the public to translate that into a clear listing of what it is going to cost.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is speaking of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I have seen salary figures emanating from the other body—whether the House of Representatives does it as a practice, I do not know—listing the base pay, which make it appear that the Senate is paying three times as much for the same help that the House of Representatives is paying.

I realize that there are some States where a Senator needs more money. Whether he needs 70 or 80 employees would be another question. However, it seems to me that it would be a simple matter to add more money to the amount available to Senators from States of 3 million to 5 million people or more.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have been doing that lately.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that would be the better way to handle the situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Before the Senator from Vermont entered the Chamber we had agreed to an amendment which was offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to request that the Committee on Appropriations work out a schedule that would reflect only the actual pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are trying to work out this matter. It is not as easy as it would sound. Even though we have tried to work it out, an answer has not been found that would treat all Senators fairly.

Mr. AIKEN. If the House of Representatives would do that, it would not make the Senate look so extravagant.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I know of no Senator who would want to use this legislative assistant position if he did not need it. The reason we did not add it to the general pay was that we did not feel we wanted to put \$23,000 more in the clerical account and have it used for employees back home, or low pay salaries for clerks, secretaries, or stenographers. We wanted to specify that this was to be used only in the event that the Senator felt he needed the services of a legislative assistant who would report to him on the dozens of committee matters each month which the Senator might miss, or to report to him on hearings, and advise him of

things that he should know with respect to legislation that is going to come up which is of vital importance. Since we are here to legislate primarily, it is proper to have a man, if we feel we need him, who can supplement the limited time that we have to inform ourselves about the legislation we are called upon to consider.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are on a limitation of 30 minutes to an amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator now has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I have not addressed the Senate, as the Chair knows, in any way on this bill. In my humble opinion, and based on my experiences here, there is not a greater need that the average Senator has, than a qualified, competent, permanent legislative assistant; a chance to pay him enough money to get the man in the first place who is qualified, and keep him after he gets him. I have had some good ones but lost them to industry.

The way legislation sails through this Chamber, without a proper chance, as I see it, for the average Senator to know what is in it, is becoming a very serious matter for the Congress and for the country.

I voted for the last amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] a few minutes ago. He is sincere, he is always alert, and he is the hardest worker in the Senate. He is an outstanding chairman of an important, major committee, and he has all of that staff at his beck and call. He does an excellent job as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations. His service there is outstanding and he has the benefit of that staff. However, the average Senator does not have added staff members at their call.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] told me a few years ago in the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture alone, as I recall the number, there were 3,100 different line items that have to be passed on. I am on that subcommittee. It is impossible for a member who is on that subcommittee to have personal knowledge of that many items. He must have a great deal of assistance and it must be qualified if he is to keep up with the items affecting his State.

Last year I saw appropriation bills sail through this Chamber with \$4 billion to \$6 billion in them. They were reported one night and passed the next morning. I recall in the case of one bill that was brought in of about that magnitude, the report was not filed until the next morning around 10 or 11 o'clock. There was

not a scintilla of testimony from the hearings until just before the bill was voted on; still it sailed through the Senate like a kite.

I am on the Committee on Appropriations and I have a chance to know something about those matters. My legislative assistant had a long list of items about which I needed information in order to protect my State. We need a highly superior man to do this work.

Sometimes these bills are reported one night, there is no report available, and the next morning the bill is passed. That usually happens near the end of a session. Many other bills are passed in the same way.

I now have more money available than I am using for the staff, but there have been times when I did not have enough. I recall 2 or 3 years ago in my office I said to one of my secretaries, "It looks like things are piling up in the office." She said, "Senator, we are all just tired to death, and we have been for almost a year." There is no secretary on the Hill who is superior to her and she was never a complainer. I have no drones on my staff, and whenever I have had one they did not stay long.

Mr. President, I think that this matter presents one of the gravest problems that could possibly confront the Senate. The idea that too many of these people are employed now, that they do not do anything, and that the Senator would be better off with less help around him, with all deference to my friend, is exactly contrary to my experience over the years; not only now, but over the years. I think that the problem is becoming graver every day. I hope that we retain this provision.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MONRONEY. I had told the Senator from Colorado that I would yield to him. I have 4 minutes remaining. Is that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and 1 minute to the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. I shall be pleased with whatever time is yielded to me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on this matter, and I say them with this background.

Everyone in the Senate knows that there is no harder working Senator than the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. In addition to that, we admire him for his adherence to principle and his courage.

However, I have to disagree with him this afternoon. I do not exactly like the way this particular problem has been brought out in this bill. I had hoped that they would expand the opportunities for the employment of specialists in given areas. This could be done now. It is rarely done, so that we have more committee background in given areas and committee advice, independent advice on certain phases of legislation. I wish to give the following example. I serve on the Subcommittee on Independent Of-

fices, on which the Senator from Louisiana serves. We have matters coming before us dealing with space, FAA, or did have, CAB, all regulatory agencies, housing, and veterans. We run the whole gamut on our committees such as HEW on which the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and I serve. There is involved there questions of medicine. I felt, and so testified before the committee, that what we needed was independent expert advice. We needed legislative assistance. They have gone at it the other way, but I think it is an improvement.

I rise today because of some of the things the Senator from Louisiana has said that have a negative reaction on some of our problems.

I have 15 people in my office. I do not think any of them are overpaid. I have never, at any time, carried on any kind of business or any remnants of my law practice in my office.

It is devoted completely, wholly, 100 percent, to the legislative business of the Senate and the servicing of my constituents.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

The people in my office—and I believe this to be true in many offices—work 9 and 10 hours a day—sometimes longer. The girls in the office, particularly, work every other Saturday at least a half day, so that they are putting in more work than we could get anyone to work in private employment almost anywhere. I do not feel that any of my employees are overpaid in any respect. The point is, they are doing only one thing. They are helping me take care of my legislative business. They are not taking care of any business outside the Senate, either for me or for anyone else. They are not moonlighting. Frankly, I am proud of my loyal staff. I am proud of their competency.

As I say, I did not quite agree with the way the committee worked this out. I think perhaps it would be better to put this in the form of legislative history. It could be a part of the budget of each individual Senator including limitation as to how the money could be used.

Frankly, I feel that with the expanding science and technology apparent on every side of us in this country, with so few of us in the Senate being educated along mathematical or scientific lines, we badly need—I repeat, badly, because it is costing us hundreds of millions of dollars a year—people on our staffs, and on committee staffs, on whom we can depend for an independent voice, independent thought, who can bridge the gap—soon to become a big gap, an ever-enlarging gap—between testimony which comes to us from the scientific community. I think, for example, of NASA and other places, of the gap which exists between those scientists who appear as witnesses, and the training which most Senators have had.

Thus, Mr. President, while I would rather have done this another way, I want to support the distinguished chairman of the committee. I think that we should not agree to the pending amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I am going to vote for the amendment, perhaps not for the same reasons as the Senator from Louisiana, but because I think that the timing of this provision is very unfortunate. Here we are, talking in terms of a \$135 billion budget—even if the 6 percent surtax is imposed, we are going to end up with a deficit in that budget of \$8.1 billion, and if we do not impose the 6 percent surtax, the deficit will be over \$13 billion. Furthermore, we are the one body in Congress which should be setting an example to the country at a time when the country is talking in terms of guns or butter; but what are we doing in the Senate?

We are going to increase our staffs to the total of \$23,000 a year more for each Senator.

I say that this is unfortunate, because the minute this is done for the Senate, the House will do the same thing and there will be 435 extra jobs in the House.

Here we are at a very sensitive time in the fiscal stability of the Nation, when we are spending \$2 billion a month in Vietnam and do not know what the end will be; yet we are setting this questionable example.

I ask the proponents of the reorganization bill which provides for the extra jobs: What have we been doing up to now? What has been the deficiency of the Senate? I think that we have been doing a pretty good job. We have done our work with the existing help we have. We have no apologies to make. But if we are to increase the number of our employees, why do we not do it in the regular way? Let us do away with all this hocus-pocus of paying for it out of a special fund.

The basic argument I make in support of the amendment is: This is the wrong time and the wrong place for the Senate to be increasing its help.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in my admiration for the Senator from Louisiana. I would also like to point out, in deference to the Senator from Rhode Island, that possibly had the staffs been more able, previously enacted programs might be working better and more efficiently. Perhaps, we might have avoided the precarious financial position we find ourselves in today.

I should like to point out that I represent a State, with a population of 19 mil-

lion persons, over 1,000 letters come to my office each day. I have a staff which completely uses up my budget. I have had to put people on at my own expense, in order to get the work done.

I reiterate what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], that these youngsters come in and they work 10, 11, and 12 hours a day. They come in on Saturdays. They also come in on Sundays, if necessary. The work is endless.

In all my life—which has been a long one—I have never seen a more conscientious or harder working group than those who work in my office.

Thus, I assure the Senate that there would be no wasted money.

Let me suggest that a State as large as California has many, many problems. It has air space, yes—lots of it. It has fisheries. It has lumber. It has mining. It has the motion picture industry, of course. The list is endless.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MURPHY. It has many military installations, shipping, and transportation industries, and a great agriculture industry.

I can therefore assure the Senate that the addition of a legislative assistant in my office would not only increase its efficiency—and I already have one good legislative assistant and he works full time, but the workload is impossible. There is enough work for another full-time expert—but I am also quite certain it would also more than pay for itself in a short period of time.

If this did not prove to be so, I am sure that Senators know my reputation for economy, I would be against the pending amendment.

In this particular case, I think it is something which is badly needed. I know that I would greatly appreciate having another legislative assistant. One is clearly needed in my office at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we talk about eliminating the Teachers Corps, doing away with rent subsidies, doing away with other programs affecting the well-being of our people—the poor and the poverty stricken. We talk in terms of cutting those things out, yet we talk in terms of increasing jobs in our offices.

I say that we are working under a double standard. We should do unto others what we do unto ourselves. We should do to ourselves what we are trying to do to others.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not criticize the point of view of any Senator. I merely wish to call attention

to the fact that nearly every Senator has a legislative assistant. I have had one ever since I came to the Senate. He has been paid, as I recall it, something like \$1,000 less per year than the administrative assistant; yet I have had no difficulty in obtaining very able men for that job.

The pending amendment provides for an additional legislative assistant. My feeling on that is this: If we get a second top level man, that will mean another clerical worker, too. We cannot do it any other way.

If any Senator thinks there is room for 200 additional workers over there in the two Senate office buildings, he is mistaken. I think it means that we will be committing ourselves to the expansion and completion of the New Senate Office Building right away.

I think this is the wrong thing, at the wrong time, for the wrong reason, and is being done in the wrong way. When the time comes that we need extra assistants, we should put it in a bill so that everybody will see that we are increasing the allowance of a Senator in proportion to the size of his State. That is the proper and appropriate way to do it.

I shall support this amendment because I think that otherwise we are committing ourselves to a long-term and expansion of the Senate if we ever vote for the provision in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it has been argued that, because of the complexities of a multitude of issues that come before us, we Senators need additional help. If that argument is applicable to each Senator, I submit that it is also irrefutably applicable to each of the Members of the House. Each Member of the House of Representatives is confronted with the same multitude of problems that I am. If I am entitled to another legislative assistant, it cannot be argued logically that a Member of the House is not entitled to one.

The bill does not provide for a legislative assistant for each Member of the House; but if each Member of the House demands it, how can I, or any Member on this floor, say that an individual in the House does not need the help, but he, the individual Member of the Senate, does need it?

We added an expenditure of \$900,000 by voting down the amendment that was just offered. The pending amendment will impose a potential cost of 100 times \$23,000—in other words, \$2.3 million. If the House demands what we are giving to ourselves, it will be 435 times \$23,000, or \$10 million.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have a half a minute more, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio be granted 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I doubly thank him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It means that we are already adding to the costs of the taxpayers about \$13 million, and we are not through.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 15 seconds?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would like to make the observation that late last year the House of Representatives passed legislation providing each Member of the House with a legislative assistant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They asked for another one after we set this great example of thrift with the taxpayers' money; and that remark is directed to that side of the aisle in the main.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that, in the construction of my State of California, the complexity of the entire State does not always affect each individual Member of the House of Representatives from my State. For instance, we may have a man who represents a certain district. The population for that activity may be increasing, but the problems involved are nearly the same. Another man may represent a district interested in timber. The same thing takes place there. As Senators, we must face and answer all the problems of all the State. Our focus is not only on a single district.

With regard to the two Senators from my State, Senator KUCHEL and myself, the complexity increases as new industries come into our State. Ours is not a regional approach; ours has to be an overall, complete knowledge.

I am sure the Senator from Ohio will understand the importance of staff to a man of my background and experience coming into this distinguished body. I have had no legal training and no former knowledge of the complicated rules and procedures of this high Chamber. The Senator will understand the problems placed on such a man who must answer on how he votes and how properly to represent his State.

I assure the Senator that I am for cutting costs. I assure him that I do not want to spend one unproductive dollar. But I assure him that, coming from the No. 1 State of the Union, I would like to try to represent the people of my State to the best of my ability. Therefore, I assure him that everyone employed in my office, as is now the case, will be a hard working employee. There is a crying need for large States, like I represent, for the additional staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana (No. 113). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from

Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 51 Leg.]
YEAS—26

Aiken	Holland	Prouty
Anderson	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Bible	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Cannon	Lausche	Talmadge
Church	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dirksen	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Hickenlooper	Miller	Young, Ohio
Hill	Pastore	

NAYS—55

Allott	Griffin	Moss
Baker	Harris	Mundt
Bennett	Hart	Murphy
Boggs	Hollings	Nelson
Brewster	Hruska	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Percy
Carlson	Javits	Proxmire
Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smathers
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Spong
Dodd	McGee	Stennis
Dominick	McGovern	Symington
Eastland	Metcalf	Tower
Fannin	Mondale	Tydings
Fong	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Morse	
Gore	Morton	

NOT VOTING—19

Bartlett	Hansen	Montoya
Bayh	Hartke	Muskie
Brooke	Hatfield	Randolph
Burdick	Hayden	Sparkman
Cooper	Long, La.	Yarborough
Ervin	Magnuson	
Gruening	McIntyre	

So Mr. ELLENDER'S amendment (No. 113) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 117

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendments numbered 117, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] proposes amendments, as follows:

On page 114, strike out lines 7 through 21, and insert the following:

"(e) Each employee of the professional staff, and each employee of the clerical staff, of each standing or select committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees of the Senate, the majority conference of the Senate, and the minority conference of the Senate), and of each joint committee of the two Houses, shall receive a per annum (gross) rate of compensation, constituting his total rate of compensation, to be fixed by the chairman, which is not in excess of \$24,460."

On page 115, beginning in line 9 with the words "the highest" strike out all through the word "Code" in line 11, and insert "\$24,460".

On page 64, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(g) (1) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a-1a and 72a note), and Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a-1), are repealed.

"(2) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Appropriations Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; sec. 302(h) of Public Law 89-504), is amended by inserting before the word 'law' the following 'section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 or other'."

On page 78, line 4 strike out "(1)".

On page 78, line 11, strike out "(1)".

On page 85, line 5, strike out "(1)".

On page 85, line 18, strike out "(1)".

On page 87, line 17, strike out "(1)".

On page 117, line 12, after "section" insert "(other than subsections (f) and (g))".

On page 125, line 5, after the second comma, insert "and".

On page 125, beginning in line 6 with the comma strike through the word "Act" in line 7.

On page 125, in line 9 before the period, insert a comma and the following: "except that section 301(g) shall take effect on the thirty-first day after the date of enactment of this Act".

On page 125, beginning in line 12 with the second comma, strike out all through line 21, and insert the following: "sections 471(f) and 471(g) shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this Act."

On page 125, after line 21, insert the following:

"(4) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Does the Senator request that these several amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, these amendments would reduce the top pay for employees of House committees to \$24,460; and give Senate committee chairmen the authority to pay any employees of their committees that amount. It would thus provide equal authority for House and Senate committee chairmen, and permit equal pay for positions of equal responsibility.

At present House committee chairmen can pay any member or members of their committee staffs any amount up to \$25,890. Senate committee chairmen are limited to one at not more than \$24,460, two at not more than \$23,244.66, three at not more than \$22,230.09, four at not more than \$10,479.21.

The restrictions on Senate committee chairman were imposed by Public Law 4, 80th Congress, and the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, all of which conflict with section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Public Law 4 and the conflicting portions of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, would be repealed or made inapplicable by the amendment. The amendment would also extend section 202(e) to select and joint committees and Senate minority and majority policy committees and Senate majority and minority conferences. All of these, except House select committees and joint committees paid other than from the contingent fund of the Senate, are now covered by the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956.

The provisions of this amendment would be effective beginning with the 31st day after the date of enactment of the bill. It would then supersede the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] which the Senate adopted yesterday.

Mr. President, judging from the results of the last two votes, I can see the futility of having any more record votes on the remaining amendments I propose to offer.

Nevertheless, I am compelled to say that we should not aggravate the situation that I have been complaining about for quite some time. That situation is one in which the House of Representatives is able to pay its employees a greater rate of pay than we in the Senate can pay our employees for the same work.

We are aggravating the situation by consenting to the pending bill. That bill would provide for three additional positions for each standing committee of the Senate and the House.

In the Senate the top amount that could be paid to one of these employees is \$23,583.70, whereas in the House for an employee doing the identical work the pay would be \$25,890.

We would provide, in other words, in the pending bill for three additional positions on the standing committees of the Senate and the House, and the most that could be paid by the Senate for any one of these positions is \$23,583.70, whereas the House could pay \$25,890 for each of the three positions.

I think that is unfair. It leads to pirating. As I stated on the floor of the Senate last week, it happened in my committee.

I was not able under the rules to pay the same amount as the House could pay for an attorney for the committee. So an attorney who had been with the Senate and with the committee of which I am chairman for a total of about 20 years was able to obtain more money from the House committee than I was permitted to pay. What did he do? He resigned from my committee so that he would get \$25,890 from the House.

Mr. President, I think pirating is wrong. My amendment seeks to equalize the payments and have the same pay on each side.

My good friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], had an amendment last week to raise the pay. My amendment would put the pay at the same level.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would lower the pay to the Senate level and wipe out the amendment agreed to last week which would increase the pay of the Senate employees to that of the House level?

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be the effect of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator is one which would strike at comity between the two Houses. It would raise a problem that I think we would regret to raise.

Nothing ties the two bodies together except the good will, spirit of cooperation, and friendship that have existed down through the decades. We have no more chance of successfully telling the House to reduce the pay of its top staff people in charge of their committees than I have of telling any Senator how much he is going to pay a stenographer or a clerk in his office.

It has been an historic right of the two Houses to act independently.

The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure he is aware when an appropriations bill comes over from the House that we do not have—because of comity between the two Houses that has existed down through the years the right to cut the salaries that the House pays to its staff people whether they be office, committee, or other employees.

The Parliamentarians are paid according to the level the House sets for them. Our Parliamentarians are paid at the level that we set. Our doorkeepers are paid the sums that we set over here.

The House of Representatives does not attempt to dictate to us, and we do not dictate to them. Such action would result in the destruction of the pending bill.

I am familiar enough with House procedures, having served there for a great many years, to know that if we were to send a bill over there cutting the House salaries, saying we are doing this because we are going to lower the salaries to what we think the House should pay, which is what we pay here, we would have no bill at all.

I do not think we want to get into the position of building this clash between the House and the Senate into a full head-on collision. We would accomplish nothing by such action.

The House would not even sit down and discuss the matter.

I feel, for that reason, that agreement to this amendment would be extremely dangerous to the relationship existing between the two Houses. It would accomplish nothing because the bill would not be agreed to. It might result in the defeat of any legislation for the modernization and reorganization of Congress.

For that reason, I ask that the amendment—which is, I think, ill-conceived in the light of what the distinguished Senator from Montana has accomplished—be rejected.

We held out for about 4 years by example, hoping that the House would meet the lower figures we were paying for our top assistants on our committee staff.

The House would not do so. So the junior Senator from Montana offered his amendment after a long period of waiting and wishful thinking that they might readjust. We felt sure they would not, but our people were compelled, as the Senator said, to take less pay for the same work over a great many years.

Our only course, I think, is to accept this scale, because every Senator knows that the top staff members of the Senate can go downtown and work in departments at higher pay or can be hired by national trade associations at higher pay.

We would be not only stirring up unnecessary disagreement with the House on this matter, but we would also run the risk of losing our top staff people to private employment and other employment, if we were to attempt at this point to roll back the approximate 5-percent raise in top salaries that was necessary to bring the two in line. I ask, therefore, that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I simply want to bring to the attention of the Senate the import of the Metcalf amendment.

My amendment, as I said, would bring the House to the level of the Senate. If my amendment is rejected, it means that even under the Metcalf amendment we do not equalize the figures at all.

As I understand the Metcalf amendment, no effort is made to cut back on what the House can do. Under the Metcalf amendment the House can pay all of its help the top figure of \$25,890, whereas the Metcalf amendment provides for only two employees at \$25,890, four at \$25,100, and three at \$23,583.70, and four at \$10,479.20.

It can readily be seen that the Metcalf amendment will increase the cost to the Senate but still leave that inequity, still leave the House committees with the capability of being able to pay all their employees the full \$25,890. It is a wrong that should be corrected, and the purpose of my amendment is simply to put the House on the same basis as the Senate.

I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a few minutes to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the amendment I have submitted is subject to the inequity that the Senator from

Louisiana has presented. In the House, they can pay every employee of a committee \$25,890. They do not. They have not abused that privilege.

My amendment attempts to bring some of the chief staff officers of the Senate up to the level of the House employees, some of the other staff officers to the level of the other staff officers in the House, so that we would have equality.

I do not believe that we should come into the Chamber and say that we should be permitted to pay every clerical employee \$25,000 a year. In the House of Representatives, 50 employees of the staff are paid \$25,000 or more. Thirty-four employees of the staff in the House receive the maximum amount. Under my statement, we would permit the chief clerk and the chief counsel and other members of our staff to receive an equal amount.

We approached the matter from a different angle. We said that we would not go to the Civil Service Commission and get a GS-19; we would try to apply our own Senate pay schedule. In dollars, it comes out the same.

Actually, under my amendment, there cannot be any more raiding of Senate committees by the House. Under my amendment, the morale in the Senate would be the same as in the House. There would be a possibility of every Senate staff employee reaching the top staff salary, just as any House employee can reach the top staff salary in the House.

But if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, it would mean that we would cut everybody in the House back to the Senate level.

I have served in the House, and the Senator from Oklahoma has served in the House. We know very well what will happen there. They will not accept it. This amendment, if it is adopted, will not only correct the inequities that the Senator from Louisiana is speaking of, but will also kill the bill. It will absolutely kill all the other changes and all the other improvements that have been made in the proposed legislation.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois such time as he may require.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me make two points with respect to the proposed amendment.

I served on the joint committee with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in 1945 and 1946. Well, that is a little over 20 years ago. And we encountered the same difficulty then that is encountered now.

I remember that in many of the tiffs that we had with the House, they simply and politely said, "Well, suppose you go and fry your own fish, and we'll fry ours." They insisted always that that comity of relationship between the two bodies be maintained. They have done that always in every respect of which I have any knowledge.

When, for instance, we violated the rule with respect to appropriations, they were quick to send a resolution over here, telling us to mind our own business. They have done that so far as the con-

stitutional provision is concerned with respect to taxes, and we have always tried to be mindful of those limitations and considerations, because we have to maintain a good relationship.

That very philosophy runs through our own rule book. No Member can get up on this floor and speak disparagingly of a House Member without violating the rules of the Senate; and yet, they would figure that we were trying to disparage their privileges and prerogatives if we tried to tell them what to pay for their help. It simply is not being done. It has not been done. And I am just as confident as I stand on this Senate floor today that it will not successfully be done, because the House will just politely tell us, "Mind your own business."

So, rather than fracture this relationship, which has been delicate but has been preserved rather nicely in all these years, an amendment of this type should not be adopted. I think when they took care of it by the amendment of the Senator from Montana, that took care of it, and they lifted the pay so as to be at parity with that of the House.

There is one other consideration. I never cease to marvel at the fact that we can be so meager with respect to our own help. There can be these emotional outbursts about the welfare of everybody and everything. But how does this work get done in a country where the population will reach over 200 million people before the year 1967 is out? I have been watching the census figures, and it can probably be early in the fall when the United States of America will be a country of 200 million people or more.

Well, obviously, a staff that would do in the days of Abraham Lincoln, when the population certainly did not exceed 32 million, would not do so far as 1967 is concerned. The country grows, the needs grow, the activities grow, and certainly the activities of Congress grow. You have to keep pace, and, in addition, you have to be able, in a competitive market, to pay a salary that is reasonably comparable.

We adopted the comparability principle so far as the Post Office is concerned. We tried to equalize it so that at the different pay levels they would be paid for comparable responsibilities what is paid in industry today. Well, if we expect to get the kind of talent that we so richly deserve, to carry on the business of the legislative branch, we have to be competitive in the brains market. It is just that simple. I think the wise solution was to bring up the Senate level and let it go at that.

I make one other point. I remember that whole series of articles, published either last year or 2 years ago, written by the well-known Columnist Roscoe Drummond, in which he unmercifully scolded Congress for its failure to adequately staff itself. The executive branch does not go about it in so restrained and delicate a fashion. When they need somebody, they get him, and they pay whatever they have to pay in order to get that talent.

Well, the situation is no different here. There are many abstruse problems that require a high degree of skill and competence, so let us pay for it, because we are not going to get them any other way.

And by all odds, let us not fracture that relationship that has existed so long and has been so beautifully balanced between the Senate and the House of Representatives.

This noon I made a little telecast on the question of electing the President by the direct popular vote of the people, and it occurred to me that while we have made some modest changes, we have followed that old system for nearly 177 years. It is a testimony to the viability and robustness of our form of government. In that scheme of government are these two branches of Congress, which have to operate together and in tandem, to pass upon matters of congressional importance before they are ever inscribed upon lawbooks of the country.

We cannot afford to ruin or fracture that relationship, and for that reason I think that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana ought to be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting the Senator from

North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 66, as follows:

[No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Byrd, W. Va.	Lausche	Talmadge
Cannon	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	Miller	Williams, Del.
Hickenlooper	Pastore	Young, Ohio
Holland	Smathers	

NAYS—66

Alken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Griffin	Morse
Anderson	Harris	Morton
Baker	Hart	Moss
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Hollings	Murphy
Boggs	Hruska	Nelson
Brewster	Inouye	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Pell
Carlson	Javits	Percy
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Spong
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dominick	McCarthy	Symington
Eastland	McGee	Tower
Fannin	McGovern	Tydings
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—20

Bartlett	Hansen	Montoya
Bayh	Hartke	Muskie
Brooke	Hatfield	Randolph
Burdick	Hayden	Russell
Cooper	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ervin	Magnuson	Yarborough
Gruening	McIntyre	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment (No. 117) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 111

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 111 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Beginning on page 15, with line 11, strike out all up to but not including line 6 on page 20.

On page 20, line 7, strike "Sec. 106." and insert "Sec. 105."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate partially voted on this matter a while ago. I merely wanted to make the complete record.

This amendment would strike out the provisions of the bill dealing with legislative review by standing committees. It would strike out: First, the provision authorizing each standing committee to employ a review specialist, who would be additional to the number of other professional employees authorized by law; second, the detailed list of review activities required of each standing committee; third, the requirements for an annual report by each committee on its oversight activities and for transmission of those reports to various officials; and fourth, exemption of the Appropriations

Committee from legislative review requirements.

This amendment would leave the existing provisions of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which provides for legislative oversight, exactly as they are today.

All committees today review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, operation, administration, and execution of the laws within their jurisdiction. When correction or improvement in administration is required they may recommend such action as may be necessary to the Executive or to the Senate. This type of oversight, which results in real improvements in the laws and their administration, can be handled by the regular committee staff which works on the legislation and legislative reports handled by the committee. With this effective type of oversight, the annual report would largely be a report on matters which had already been corrected or matters which needed no correction. However, if the committee is required to make such a report, it would be required to employ the necessary staff to conduct the review and make the report.

Furthermore, the Congress has created the General Accounting Office as its investigative arm to oversee all agencies of Government. The General Accounting Office is responsible directly to the Congress for conducting independent reviews, audits and investigations of programs, activities and financial transactions of Federal agencies. It is responsible for the rendition of legal decisions relating to Government fiscal matters; for developing, reviewing, and evaluating Federal agency accounting systems; and for advising and assisting the Congress and Government agencies on matters relating to public funds. In addition, the General Accounting Office stands ready to make any special reviews or investigations desired by the Congress. As a matter of fact, on occasions the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has requested certain reviews, all of which have been highly beneficial. The proposed budget for the General Accounting Office for 1968 amounts to \$52,965,000. It is authorized a total of 4,600 permanent positions and the average GS salary is \$10,196. With this huge reservoir of trained and specialized manpower at the beck and call of the Congress, I can see little purpose in adding one review specialist to each standing committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this section of the Reorganization Act has been discussed a great deal during the course of debate. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the cost of this was \$42 million, was it not—that was the cost of the GAO?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, sir. We are printing that money. We are adding on to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is a very important figure because at the present time there is no organized or general committee pattern for any one in charge to follow up in detail the reports made by the GAO on many departments and agencies of government which it inspects and investigates.

The reports kick around in Congress. Sometimes, someone will pick them up

and discuss them and talk about them on the floor, or introduce legislation to correct the failures; but there is no regular committee procedure to deal with amplifying, or utilizing, or having this as evidence to correct failures in the various departments. It is left up to the legislative requirements, or talks about normal rules of economy in matters of this kind.

We feel—and I think the vote was unanimous in the committee—that one of the purposes of a legislative review specialist is to vitalize and make effective recommendations of the General Accounting Office. We do not have anyone to follow through on reports, to call such matters to the attention of the committee, to propose changes in legislation as a result of discoveries and failures reported by the General Accounting Office. Without such a review specialist, we are not going to have many corrections. A legislative review specialist is needed to follow through and determine whether programs enacted by Congress are being carried out by administrators in accordance with the intent of Congress. We need someone to carefully review these matters and recommend changes in law, if certain administrators or certain activities are not in line with what the committee or Congress had in mind at the time the legislation was enacted.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The law as it now is gives each committee such power; does it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, the committee has such power. The purpose of this provision is to see that it uses the power.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means that is to be done simply by employing more people?

Mr. MONRONEY. By employing a review specialist, by making it mandatory that he report to the committee, and check up on information that may have been provided, to correct the errors found. The greatest trouble with the committees is that they never look back to see what they have done or what has happened to legislation passed last year; they are always thinking of legislation to be passed next year.

For that reason, I think it is essential that the committees have one man who can follow up on legislation or inquiries made by Members of the Congress or the Senate or committees, so that the committees can have a real review function performed which will require the full time of the man working in that position. He could be a man from a committee's own staff, who would be identified as the review specialist, if there are staff members on that committee who could do that work and who are not otherwise too busy with other committee work. Most of the specialists will be selected from members of the staff, who will be promoted to this responsible position. I think it is highly important to the committees that they have such a review specialist looking into programs that cost a great deal of money.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment (No. 111) was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 112), as follows:

On page 57, beginning in line 7 with the comma, strike out all through the word "advisable" in line 16.

On page 57, beginning in line 19 with the word "and", strike out all through the word "request" in line 22.

On page 58, beginning with the comma at the end of line 12, strike out all through the word "selected" in line 18.

Beginning on page 58 with the comma in line 22, strike out all through the word "work" in line 4 on page 59.

Beginning on page 59 in line 6 with the word "and", strike out all through line 5 on page 60, and insert a period, closing quotation marks, and another period.

Redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate that there was quite a discussion of this same matter earlier in the day. This amendment would strike out the provision for appointment to the committee of employees by a majority of the minority members.

As I pointed out, we are simply changing the complexion of the act of 1946. As I see it, from this point on, we will not have employees on the committees who will serve the majority of the committee, but will have appointees by a majority of the minority who will stand separate and apart from those appointed by a majority of the committee.

This amendment would strike out the provisions for the appointment of committee employees by a majority of the minority members of a committee.

The law now provides for the appointment of professional staff members "without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office." Such staff members are to be "assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable." The clerical staff members are "to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable." This rule is completely fair. It provides equitably for both the majority and minority, and leaves the committee in complete control of its staff.

The proposed rule, on the other hand, is manifestly unfair and unwise. It gives the minority rights that are not possessed by the majority or even by the whole committee. It permits the committee's business to be controlled in part by a minority, and concentrates greater authority in minority members as the size of the minority diminishes.

Let us consider a 15-member committee consisting of 10 majority members

and five minority members. A majority of the majority—six members—have no authority to appoint a single staff member, while a majority of the minority—three members—can appoint three staff members. Furthermore, the professional employees appointed by a majority of the whole committee are to be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member as the committee may deem advisable, while the professional employees appointed by a majority of the minority are to be assigned to such committee business as such minority members deem advisable. Thus, the three least senior minority members might have two professional employees under their direction, while nine members of the majority and one member of the minority would not be entitled to have any staff members under their direction. In addition, a clerical staff member appointed by a majority of the minority would handle committee correspondence and stenographic work for the minority members of the committee. Majority members are not accorded a similar right.

In addition, a majority of the committee could not discharge an unsatisfactory employee hired by a majority of the minority, no matter how objectionable he might be.

Committee staff members should be employed by, work for, and be answerable to the committee to which they are attached.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

This is the second half of the amendment that we voted on earlier to eliminate the provision for two staff members for the minority when members of the minority request them on the basis that they cannot get fair treatment as the staff exists. I feel it is fair to have this provision for extra staffing. There is no use further debating it, because the amendment, relating to the legislative review section, was rejected by an overwhelming majority only a few moments ago. Therefore, I seek the defeat of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment (No. 112) was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 114.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 18, line 10, strike the word "shall" and insert "which during the immediately preceding calendar year has employed a Review Specialist shall, and each other standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives may,".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was in hopes that the distinguished chair-

man of the committee would accept this amendment. It is a very simple one. It makes reporting optional for committees not appointing review specialists. The amendment simply means that if a committee decides not to appoint a specialist, it will not be compelled to make a report on review activities. It would be made if the committee appointed a specialist. It is that simple. I hope my friend from Oklahoma will accept at least this amendment.

As I understand it, under the bill it is optional whether the committee appoints a specialist. Under the amendment, if it appoints a specialist, then it will have to file a report of its review activities. The specialist will have to make a final report. If a committee decides not to appoint a specialist and decides to act as it has done heretofore, it will have the privilege of so doing.

The salary of a review specialist and such clerical assistance as he might need would probably approximate \$30,000 per year per committee, or \$1,080,000 for 36 standing committees. In addition, the chairman, ranking minority member, the committee as a whole, and other staff personnel would undoubtedly be required to devote considerable time to supervision and assistance in the work of the review specialist, increasing the cost by a further considerable amount, not counting the cost of reports, materials, and additional work on the part of the executive which would be generated by the review specialist.

All committees today review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, operation, administration, and execution of the laws within their jurisdiction. When correction or improvement in administration is required they may recommend such action as may be necessary to the executive or to the Senate. This type of oversight, which results in real improvements in the laws and their administration, can be handled by the regular committee staff which works on the legislation and legislative reports handled by the committee. With this effective type of oversight, the annual report would largely be a report on matters which had already been corrected or matters which needed no correction. However, if the committee is required to make such a report, it would be required to employ the necessary staff to conduct the review and make the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I regret that I must oppose the amendment. As the Senator has said, the employment of a review specialist is optional, and who is appointed is optional with the committee. We did it on the same basis that the Senator referred to; namely, that this function can be performed by a committee's present staff. But if a member of the staff can perform the function of the review specialist by being assigned from his present position, that does not and should not relieve the requirement of a report which the entire Senate is entitled to from any one of the committees, whether it be the Commerce Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, or any other committee. The Members of the whole Senate are entitled to a report as to what the committee believes has been done with re-

spect to the operation of legislation which has passed under its jurisdiction. It is the only way we can check on it. It is the only way to have a better function. It is an inexpensive way to require the bureaus and agencies to explain whether legislation is being administered within the perimeters and aims and objectives that Congress had in mind when the legislation was enacted.

So even if the committees have persons on their staffs whom they feel they want to serve as review specialists, this fact should not relieve them from reports giving details of legislation over which committees have had jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not want to change the present law to force a committee to file an unnecessary report. If a committee sees fit to review past legislation at length and has a reason for it, leave it to the committee. If this amendment is not adopted, it means that each committee will be compelled to employ a specialist. I know what is going to happen. What I am proposing to do is to leave the law as it now stands. If the committee thinks it is necessary to make an annual report, it can now do so. However, if a committee hires a review specialist then it should be compelled to file a report on review activities.

We have done it for my committee every year. I do not see why we should impose on committees and more or less force them to employ specialists by forcing them to make the reports.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the chairman of the committee if he knows of any instances when this privilege of providing for a review or not has been abused by any Senate committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the Senator's inquiry addressed to me, or to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma, on this compulsory feature of the provision, have there been abuses on the part of Senate committees?

Mr. MONRONEY. There has been very little action or operation of the legislative oversight function. It was written into the act 20 years ago, and there has been almost a negative response throughout the House and the Senate.

It was to bring that 20-year-old provision more closely into line that this review specialist procedure was instituted. We feel that it will do a great deal toward formalizing and regularizing the function of reporting how the laws passed last year or the year before have been found to operate by the committee generating the legislation, and whether or not it is meeting the objectives the Senate had in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the contention of the Senator from Oklahoma that the failure of Senate committees to take advantage of this review privilege provided in the LaFollette-Monroney Act—

Mr. MONRONEY. Actually, it was not intended to be a privilege. It was a direction which the committees should have followed.

Mr. AIKEN. It is the Senator's con-

tention that the failure of the committees to follow through on this privilege, or duty, if the Senator wishes to call it that, is in itself a failure on the part of our committees.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe this is the one important reason we have gone to recommending a review specialist, because that man will have this as his principal duty, to collect the information from the General Accounting Office reports and other sources, together with complaints, perhaps, from outside sources, or from the industry that may be affected, and call the matter to the attention of the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. AIKEN. What do we do when a review has been made and submitted to the members of the committee? Do the members of the committee then read, analyze, and digest the review, or is there something in this bill which will permit them to hire other staff members to read, analyze, and digest the review? Is there any end to it?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that committee members, once they have the reports of the staffs, would then be ready to issue that report to the Senate for action, or have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or as a separate document.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Oklahoma reasonably sure that all members of committees would read the reviews?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe it would be read, and would be helpful. I am not saying that all 100 Senators would read it. I am saying that many beyond the scope of the committee would read it. Certainly the Appropriations Committee should read it.

Mr. AIKEN. I can tell the Senator one thing: If the review related to transferring the functions of the Department of Agriculture to an urban committee, the Senator from Vermont would certainly read it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think that it would serve to add to the information that Congress otherwise obtains on the workings of the legislation it has passed. I believe that it is an important item, an important detail that we are not carrying out, and the committee feels that by the employment of this mechanism, the information can be reported and made available to Congress, to help to call attention to what Congress had in mind at the time the Act was passed and turned over to the executive departments for administration.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont hits the nail on the head when he states that these reviews will not be read by too many Senators.

If my amendment were adopted, it would simply mean that the committees would keep on reporting as they have in the past, and only if they appoint a specialist would they be required to make this type of report. If the amendment is not adopted, it means we are forcing the committees to make these reports,

and of course, if the reports must be made, they are going to employ a specialist, and probably four or five or six clericals to assist him.

In other words, we are simply giving ourselves more and more work. I should not be a bit surprised, as I heard a Senator state a while ago, if we would be required not only to complete the New Senate Office Building, but build a new and separate additional one. All of this means a great deal more work for the Senate, and more work means more employees. I am trying to prevent that if I can.

Mr. President, I do not see why an amendment of this kind is not acceptable. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the thing Congress needs most in its work and effort is brief, well-chosen, well-organized, concise information on the job being done downtown. We can save millions of dollars by spending a very few dollars in organizing for adequate review, properly prepared and presented, by a committee.

I think this is an important part of the bill, and I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 114) of the Senator from Louisiana [putting the question].

The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask for a rollcall vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the

Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 53 Leg.]		
YEAS—23		
Aiken	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Smith
Carlson	Holland	Talmadge
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Tower
Eastland	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Pearson	
NAYS—55		
Allott	Harris	Moss
Anderson	Hart	Mundt
Baker	Hruska	Murphy
Bennett	Inouye	Nelson
Bible	Jackson	Pastore
Boggs	Javits	Peil
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Percy
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Cannon	Kuchel	Proxmire
Case	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Clark	Mansfield	Scott
Cotton	McClellan	Spong
Dirksen	McGee	Stennis
Dodd	McGovern	Symington
Dominick	Metcalf	Tydings
Fannin	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gore	Morse	
Griffin	Morton	

NOT VOTING—22		
Bartlett	Hartke	Montoya
Bayh	Hatfield	Muskie
Brooke	Hayden	Randolph
Burdick	Hollings	Russell
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Ervin	Long, La.	Yarborough
Gruening	Magnuson	
Hansen	McIntyre	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment (No. 114) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 119

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor to my amendment No. 119.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read, as follows:

On page 118, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

"PART 7—MISCELLANEOUS

"Stationery Allowances of Senators and Representatives

"Sec. 481. (a) The paragraph under the heading 'Stationery (revolving fund)' in the appropriations for the Senate in title IV of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 864; 2 U.S.C. 46a), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The allowance for stationery shall hereafter be available only for (1) purchases made through the Senate stationery room of stationery and other office supplies for use for official business, and (2) reimbursement upon presentation, within thirty days after the close of the fiscal year for which the allowance is provided, of receipted invoices for purchases elsewhere of stationery and other office supplies (excluding items not ordinarily available in the Senate stationery room) for use for official business in an office maintained by a Senator in his home State. Any part of the allowance for stationery which remains unobligated at the end of any fiscal year shall be withdrawn from the revolving fund established by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (71 Stat. 188; 2 U.S.C. 46a-1), and covered into the general fund of the Treasury."

"(b) The stationery allowance, as authorized by law, for each Member of the House of Representatives and each Resident Commissioner shall hereafter be available only for (1) purchases made through the House stationery room of stationery and other office supplies for use for official business, and (2) reimbursement upon presentation, within thirty days after the close of the session for which the allowance is provided, of receipted invoices for purchases elsewhere of stationery and other office supplies (excluding items not ordinarily available in the House stationery room) for use for official business in an office maintained by a Member in his home State. Any part of the stationery allowance which remains unobligated at the end of the session for which it is available shall be withdrawn from the revolving fund established by the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 366; 2 U.S.C. 46b-1), and covered into the general fund of the Treasury."

On page 125, after line 21, add the following:

"(4) Section 481(a) shall take effect with respect to the stationery allowance for the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act. Section 481(b) shall take effect with respect to the stationery allowance for the first session of Congress beginning after the date of enactment of this Act."

On page 4, in the table of contents, below the description of section 471, insert the following:

PART 7—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 481. Stationery Allowances of Senators and Representatives."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret that the last amendment offered by me was rejected. As I recall, about 18 Senators were present during the debate. The amendment was really adopted by standing vote. The Senators who were present in the Chamber and heard the debate were convinced, but then the Senator from Oklahoma requested a rollcall, and it was then rejected. I have three more amendments to offer, but I am not going to offer them. It would be useless. This will be the last one.

This amendment is No. 119. It would provide that the stationery allowances for Members of the House and Senate be used only for stationery and office supplies, and that any part not so used be returned to the Treasury. It is the same in substance as the amendment

which was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on July 28, 1966, to H.R. 15456, 89th Congress, the current Legislative Appropriation Act, and which was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 56 to 25. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] was one of those who voted for it. However, it was omitted in conference.

As Senators know, each year we are allowed so much for telephone expense, so much for telegraph expense, and that part which is not used goes back to the Treasury. Each Senator gets so much for stationery, and the part unused should go to the Treasury. But in many cases it does not.

If the Government makes an allowance of \$2,400 for stationery, that money should be used by the Senators and the House Members for stationery; and if they do not use the money for that purpose, they should not be permitted to withdraw it and keep it as income. We have raised the salaries of Senators two or three times since I have become a Senator, and it strikes me that the way to do it is to do it openly. If Representatives and Senators need additional pay, let us be honest and give it to them. But whenever we make available to Senators and to Members of the House a certain specified amount for stationery, they should not pocket that money if they do not use it to buy stationery.

That is all this amendment would do. It would not cut the stationery allowance at all. I would not want to do that. I understand that some Senators spend more than the amount allowed. I would have no objection to raising the amount. But whatever amount we raise it to, the portion not used by the Senator or the Representative should go back to the Treasury.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Under the terms of the Senator's amendment, if a Senator should purchase from private sources, stationery or other supplies necessary for the operation of his office, this would not apply?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It is not supposed to, unless it is used by the Senator for official business in an office maintained by him in his home State.

Mr. MORTON. In other words, if I get \$2,400 and I say that I am going to spend \$1,000 of it in New Orleans at a printing shop and I am going to spend the rest at the stationery store of the Senate—

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, if the stationery is used in the office of the Senator in Washington it has to be obtained from the Senate stationery room. If it is to be used in his home State it may be purchased elsewhere. In either case it must be used for official business.

Mr. MORTON. That is what I mean. It must be used for my business as a U.S. Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right, for official business.

Mr. MORTON. And anything that remains I must return, as I do with my telephone expense?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORTON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Hampshire complains—I do not blame him—that the amount allotted now is not sufficient. Well, if it is not sufficient, let us give him more. And if he does not use all that is allotted to him, let him give the money back to the Treasury and not pocket it.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? He mentioned my name.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought I would answer the Senator's question before he asked it.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Louisiana answered it by talking about my putting money in my pocket. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question, if it is not too long, because I have only 15 minutes.

Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield some time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire such time as he may require.

Mr. COTTON. I simply wish to bring up what the Senator from New Hampshire has brought up before on the floor of the Senate. I believe that other Senators are in a similar situation, although perhaps not to the same degree.

Up until World War II, in addition to the stationery allowance, each Senator could draw envelopes and offset printing paper which was used for the newsletters and reports which most Senators, and I believe many Representatives, send back to their States.

In the interest of conserving paper during World War II, instead of allowing each Senator an unlimited amount—it was only for his use—this was cut back so that each Senator was allowed 10,000 sheets and 10,000 envelopes a month. For some reason or other, after the war was over, this arrangement was not changed.

In the case of the Senator from New Hampshire, for many years he has maintained a mailing list of a little over 100,000 addresses in his State. Getting the mailing list, which he pays for himself, is expense enough. But he sends two mailings, two newsletters, each month, to over 100,000 addresses. Those newsletters cannot be political for himself, because they are checked by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. They are reports of what takes place in the Senate and are a legitimate use of the frank and a legitimate use of the paper. But by the second month of each fiscal year, this Senator has exhausted his entire stationery allowance, and from then on he has to put in from \$500 to \$700 a month out of his own pocket, in order to maintain this service to his constituents.

I made the complaint several years in succession, and the good minority leader took up the cudgels for me. He came back all smiles and said, "NORRIS, I've succeeded in winning your case." When I was a lawyer and I told someone I had won their case, they said, "What have you done?"

The minority leader said, "I've got you 15,000 sheets instead of 10,000. Each Senator may have these each month."

Fifteen thousand sheets and envelopes, when you are sending out 230,000 each month, is not enough.

Of course, I can be very generous about this, because I have never been able to draw a cent out of the stationery allowance in all the years I have been in the Senate. I have needed the paper.

If you are going to provide that only the stationery allowance that is actually used in official duties as a Senator shall be permitted, and there shall be no refunds, then I believe that coupled with it in this bill should be a provision—I do not ask for an unlimited amount—to allow 50,000, if it is so desired, or 60,000 sheets of offset printing paper and envelopes for the use of Senators. I am willing to pay my share if I am sending more than other Senators are sending—more than this amount.

In other words, let us go both ways. I am perfectly willing to have the stationery allowance revert, but if we are going to do that, I think that something should be done about this need which is, in some cases—and certainly in my case for I am not a man of personal means—very costly and a real hardship.

Mr. President, I wanted to get that plea in. I have made it every year for 12 years. As I have said, I did at one time succeed in getting 5,000 sheets and 5,000 envelopes.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as a cosponsor with the Senator from Louisiana I join in supporting this amendment.

The amendment would not in any way change the existing law as to the stationery allowance of Senators. It would not restrict or expand the right of a Senator to use his stationery allowance.

I appreciate the problem of the Senator from New Hampshire, but if that is to be dealt with we should increase the amount of that type of paper and get an allowance in that category.

The pending amendment merely provides that if there are any funds left over, to the extent that any moneys are not spent for stationery, those moneys revert to the Treasury. Why should they not revert to the Treasury? We have passed laws providing that the businessman must account for his expense allowance; otherwise it is not allowable as a deduction on his income tax return.

This amendment provides that Members of Congress would not be able to pocket a profit on the stationery expense account for operating their offices. I have supported this measure each time there has been a question of increasing the amount. I know that for some of the larger States the amount is not adequate. I would support whatever amount is necessary to pay for the legitimate operation of a Senator's office for official stationery use. That should be paid, but at the same time if there is \$1 left over it should be handled in the same manner as we now handle the allowance for Western Union, telephones, and other allowances whereby if

the amount is not spent it automatically reverts to the Treasury. That is all that is involved in this amendment. Unexpended funds would revert to the Treasury.

Mr. President, I had an experience several years ago in this connection, in which I had not used all of the allowance. This had been going on for 4 or 5 years. The Treasury Department ruled that I would have to pay taxes on that amount even though I had not collected a refund. They said that it was there for me and therefore it was taxable. That matter was straightened out, and the ruling was withdrawn. The Comptroller General ruled in that case that not only would a Member not have to take the unexpended funds but also that he had no right to take it unless it was needed to pay for stationery used to conduct official duties of his office.

Mr. President, the amendment should be adopted. I hope that the Senator from Oklahoma is willing to accept the amendment. If not I would ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment on this amendment because the amendment involves the same principle that we had a while ago in trying to set salaries for the top legislative assistants for the House of Representatives. The same principle applies, in that we have no right under traditional and long adopted comity between the two Houses to fix the allowance or to decide what the House of Representatives shall pay for its stationery or the requirements under which it will be done.

I have voted in the past to eliminate any refunding of the stationery allowance, as far as Senators are concerned.

When we took a proposal that was almost identical to this proposal to conference a couple of years ago, the House of Representatives adamantly refused and broke up the conference under the threat that they would not submit to any deductions by the Senate on their stationery account.

I am afraid, again, that we would endanger the bill by including in it a limitation on the House stationery account, because this matter must be resolved by sitting down and working it out. We have provided in the bill for a joint committee on congressional operation, and I would hope that we can begin to sit down and arrive at some standardized amounts by joint agreement.

I know from past experience the adamant feeling that the House of Representatives has in connection with any attempt by the Senate to limit this account in the House of Representatives. They are sovereign in their right to run their side of the Capitol, and for that reason it would be a mistake to pass any legislation to include a limitation on expenditures over which the House, for a long period of time, has had the right to make its own decision in this matter.

Therefore, I cannot agree with the amendment, although I would agree to all provisions provided for in connection with the Senate. However, I do not feel

that we would foster a reorganization or have any hope of getting a bill through Congress which contains a limitation, such as this does, in connection with the House of Representatives in connection with how they shall handle the matter of their stationery account.

I want to make it clear that I am not speaking in opposition to the merit of the Senator's proposal but only to the form in which it is presented: that is, as an amendment to this reorganization bill.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield such time as the Senator from Florida requires.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that we have no business putting this amendment on the bill. It presents to those in conference the possibility of no bill at all in this sincere effort to reorganize the Congress.

However, I go further than the Senator from Oklahoma does, because I think this amendment, as drawn, does not cover the real purposes now existing for which the stationery account is granted. In the beginning, years ago, when stationery accounts were granted, as such, obviously they were of limited effect because in those days practically the full communication between Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and their constituents, was through correspondence.

The real purpose of this provision in the law was and is to allow for the cost of communication between Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives and their constituents back home.

I fully agree with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] that those who use newsletters, as he has for a long time, are certainly within the provisions of this law, because that is the method that they have adopted for communication with their constituents.

The Senator from Florida has used that method for many years and he agrees entirely with his friend from New Hampshire. But he goes further than that. Many Senators, instead of relying upon newsletters, rely upon radio communications. In the case of the Senator from Florida, the last time he used radio communications they were carried, as a matter of public service, by over 80 radio stations in his State, but the cost of preparing the radio tapes was very considerable. The cost of mailing the radio tapes was very heavy. Later, some of us have gone into the use of television in the same way. The cost of the making of the television films and the mailing of them is heavier than is the cost of radio transcriptions.

So we have improved our methods of communication but I do not think that we have changed at all the original principle that this allowance is to enable the Senator or Representative to communicate with his people, to give them the benefit of information as to what he is doing, and what Congress is doing that affects them vitally in their business and otherwise.

Of course, many of us through the years have decided that one of the means of communication is through the pur-

chase of daily newspapers in our States. In the case of the Senator from Florida, he believes that he buys most of the daily papers in his State—perhaps not all, but certainly most of them, as anyone can see who comes into my office, because they are kept there and are examined as they come through as to editorial comment, favorable or otherwise, relating to what I am doing, and to enable me to make appropriate responses, or to see how contributors to "Letters to the Editor" columns feel on certain subjects and what is going on in the State which demands my attention.

I know that other Senators have spent large sums on this method of communication, to make sure that their people receive the information which they say they want, either through the editorials, or contributors of letters printed in the paper, or otherwise.

I would be very happy to vote for this measure if it applied only to the Senate, and if it included all of these methods of communication between ourselves and our constituents, because all are for the same purpose and are of the same pattern. Long, long ago, when this measure was first enacted, it was called a stationery allowance which does not affect at all the fact that the real purpose of the allowance was to enable Members of Congress to communicate with their people back home.

Thus, I would not vote for this measure in the form in which it is presently drafted, even if it applied only to the Senate, not because I want a dime out of any unexpended balance or because I think any other Senator or House Member, wants to make any profit of any sort, but because it is not drawn up in a form which includes the actual purpose of the allowance to Members of Congress for funds to help them to communicate with the people back home, or elsewhere, either, because we represent the whole Nation, who want to know about our points of view and who write us requesting the reasons for our actions, or requesting our expressions, or requesting help of one kind or another.

Thus, the Senator from Florida would not vote for this matter even if it were reduced to a form where it covered only the Senate's so-called stationery funds.

Of course, I agree completely with the distinguished Senator handling the bill, that to put it in the bill in the form now presented would be an exercise in futility, because we know that the House would not accept it, that they would take it as an effort to control their actions by the Senate in dealing with their own stationery fund, which is set up in accordance with their own desires.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I believe I have 6 minutes remaining; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Chair. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I want to point out that this same amendment was offered several

years ago as applying only to the Senate. At that time the argument was made—most effectively and successfully to defeat it—on the basis that it was not fair to single out the Senate but that if we were going to change the rules we should change them for both the House and the Senate.

Today the amendment as offered is applicable to both the House and the Senate and is offered to a bill which reorganizes both House and Senate.

The amendment would not, in one iota, attempt to tell the House of Representatives how much it should allow for stationery. It would not increase or decrease the amount in any present or future figure.

Under the amendment the House could increase its allowances in the years to come if it thought it necessary. The House could do this without even asking the Senate. The Senate could do likewise. This amendment would not expand or reduce the stationery allowance. The items covered by this allowance are not changed one iota from that which is now permissible under the law.

All the amendment would do is accept the stationery allowance as fixed by the House and Senate at whatever figure they wish and then say that to the extent that there is any left over and not spent for the purpose outlined under the rules of the Senate or the House, it would automatically go back to the Treasury Department.

Why should it not? Why should any Member of Congress be permitted, under any circumstances, to put a part of the stationery allowance into his pocket to defray his campaign expenses or any other kind of living expense which may not be listed and provided for under the rules of either the House or Senate?

I repeat, all the amendment would do, without changing in any way at all the rules of either the House or Senate, would be merely to state that if a House Member or a Senator does not spend all of the money for the purpose for which it is appropriated it will revert to the Treasury Department, as is true in every other expense allowance of the Senate.

I think the amendment should be adopted, and unanimously.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, but first I wish to reiterate that when we start fixing the means of repayment for an allowance made for Members of the House by the House of Representatives, we will be getting into very deep water. We have worked for a longer period of time on this bill than on any bill that I can remember. We have considered in the neighborhood of 100 amendments. Here we are on the last day, apparently, and we want to set a time fuse which could blow us right out of the water.

It has been my experience with the House of Representatives in dealing with an appropriation which would attempt to restrict, by Senate dictation, any House action in the way the House would like to handle its own financial affairs, that we will be accused of absorbing and assuming control over that body, which justly claims to be coequal. I believe that is would be a great mistake to in-

clude them in our individual amendments, and I ask that the pending amendment be rejected.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a very quick question on that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will be happy to yield time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield myself 3 minutes from the time on the bill in order to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let the Senator from Delaware yield the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have the recollection that we had a similar situation in regard to the privilege of the so-called bulk mail.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.
Mr. COTTON. The Senate did not permit itself that privilege and cut it out of the bill. The House retained the privilege. When the conference committee met, the House kept that privilege, but the Senate did not.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. Is there anything to prevent the same thing from happening in this case?

Mr. MONRONEY. Not at all, because we had that case—and one parallel—where we attempted to control the House in the matter of handling its own stationery account, and we were thrown out of the conference the first day. The House would not accept the limitation, not even on an appropriation bill for all legislative affairs.

They were unwilling to accept any limitation whatsoever.

Mr. COTTON. My point is we should go ahead and adopt the amendment. I have always felt disposed to support such a measure. When the conference committee meets, we can give up that privilege easily enough and the House can retain it.

Mr. MONRONEY. But they will not agree to accept an amendment, in my opinion, that would deal with their method of handling anything. They just will not consider it in conference.

Mr. COTTON. My point is that they could reject it in conference.

Mr. MONRONEY. They did.

Mr. COTTON. In the case of the bulk mail, we offered a compromise which permitted the House to govern and restrain its use of money. It would not affect them. The conference committee agreed to it. That is what happened in that case, was it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. But an exactly parallel case on this matter is that they would not consider the bill at all, as long as that was in the bill. It had to be stricken out completely before they would go forward with the conference. That is exactly the point.

Mr. COTTON. It could be stricken out—

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think the

House would permit it as part of the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. What is to prevent our trying it?

Mr. MONRONEY. Nothing, except that I think it would jeopardize the chance of their agreeing to go to conference as long as they were tied into this by Senate dictation. That is what riles the House on legislation requiring them to conform to Senate dictation.

This is the issue that is before us. I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to take just 30 seconds to say that the previous amendment was attached to an appropriation bill, and the argument was made that such legislation should not be attached to an appropriation bill. This is legislation, a reorganization bill, which applies to the practices, rules, and procedures of the House and Senate. It is a most appropriate vehicle on which to attach this amendment since it deals with both Houses.

I yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back or used. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from

Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken	Gore	Murphy
Allott	Griffin	Nelson
Anderson	Hart	Pastore
Baker	Hickenlooper	Pell
Bennett	Hill	Percy
Boggs	Hruska	Prouty
Brewster	Inouye	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Ribicoff
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Case	Kuchel	Spong
Church	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Curtis	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dodd	McClellan	Tower
Dominick	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Morton	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Mundt	

NAYS—18

Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Monroney
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Moss
Clark	McCarthy	Pearson
Eastland	McGee	Scott
Harris	Metcalf	Smathers
Holland	Mondale	Stennis

NOT VOTING—23

Bartlett	Hansen	McIntyre
Bayh	Hartke	Montoya
Brooke	Hatfield	Muskie
Burdick	Hayden	Russell
Cooper	Hollings	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Tydings
Ervin	Long, La.	Yarborough
Gruening	Magnuson	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment (No. 119) was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask our friend, the majority leader, what he plans for the remainder of the day and for tomorrow, and any other pertinent and relevant information he might give us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Colorado call up his amendment, and then yield to me while he has the floor?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to comply with the request of the Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 97

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 97. Since the explanation of it will be full, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment (No. 97) of Mr. ALLOTT is as follows:

At an appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote and encourage the orderly development of science and technology, while seeking to eliminate nonproductive duplication in Government-sponsored or Government-supported research, and to assure that the benefits of science and technology are used most effec-

tively in the interests of national security and the general welfare.

"REPORT ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

"SEC. 2. (a) To aid in the development and assessment of measures designed to carry out the policy enunciated in section 1 of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 20 of each year a Report on Science and Technology (hereinafter referred to as "the science report") setting forth (1) the existing major policies, plans, and programs of science and technology of the various departments, agencies, bureaus, offices, foundations, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and changes proposed to be made in those policies, plans, and programs; (2) major plans and programs of science and technology of non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions so far as the same may be known; (3) the status of coordination of the policies, plans, and programs of the various departments, agencies, bureaus, offices, foundations, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, both among themselves and with non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions, and further steps anticipated or proposed to foster such coordination; (4) the impact of recent major scientific and technical developments and programs, whether developed by the Federal Government or non-Federal agencies, organizations, or institutions, and the anticipated impact of foreseeable, future developments and programs on national policy and the general welfare; (5) major goals of the Federal Government and, to the extent they may be known, of non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions, in the fields of science and technology, major problems foreseen in such fields, and progress anticipated in meeting the problems and achieving the goals so set forth; (6) the level of funding proposed for science and technology in the Federal budget submitted for the fiscal year beginning July 1 of the calendar year such science report is transmitted to the Congress, and the estimated amount which will be invested by non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions in science and technology during such fiscal year; and (7) any recommendations of the President, including any recommendations for legislation which he may deem necessary or desirable, for carrying out the policy declared in section 1 of this Act.

"(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress supplementary reports, each of which shall include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"(c) The science report, and all supplementary reports transmitted under subsection (b) of this section, shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the joint committee created by section 3 of this Act.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Science and Technology (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of eight Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and eight Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each case, the majority party shall be represented by five Members and the minority party shall be represented by three Members.

"(b) The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in place of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and House of Representatives with each Congress. The chairman shall be chosen by the Members from the House which is entitled to the chairmanship, and the vice chairman shall be chosen from

the House other than that of the chairman by the Members from that House.

"(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments thereto are made.

"DUTIES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

"(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the science report and supplements thereto;

"(2) to study means of coordinating policies, plans, and programs of science and technology of the Federal Government, both within the Federal Government and with non-Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions, in order to further the policy of this Act; and

"(3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the science report and supplements thereto, not later than March 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1967) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the science report or supplements thereto, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as the joint committee deems advisable.

"(b) No proposed legislation shall be referred to the joint committee and such committee shall not have the power to report by bill, or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

"POWERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this Act, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Congress as it deems advisable; and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable.

"(b) With the prior consent of the department or agency concerned, the joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Government, and also of private research agencies, and employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any standing select, or special committee of either House of Congress, or any subcommittee thereof, the joint committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the joint committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

"EXPENSES

"SEC. 6. (a) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee, upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The cost of stenographic service to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

"(b) Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint commit-

tee within or outside the United States, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of the Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provide an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

"SECURITY SAFEGUARDS

"SEC. 7. The joint committee may classify information originating within the committee, in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch for classifying restricted data or defense information. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in the offices of the joint committee or such other places as the joint committee may direct under such security safeguards as the joint committee shall determine to be required in the interest of the national defense and security."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished acting minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], it is my understanding that the Senate has completed action on the amendments which will be offered today, except for the pending amendment; that the pending amendment will be the last one to be considered; and that there will be no rollcall vote on the pending amendment, if I am correctly informed.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Therefore, Mr. President, if that be the case—and it is the case so far as the leadership knows—I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before the Senate concludes its business today, the so-called Hruska amendment be laid before the Senate, so that it will be the pending business at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is all the information I have as to the order of business tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the majority leader.

A HISTORY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Democrats throughout the Nation will soon again commemorate the founding of the Democratic Party—the oldest political party in the world—through our traditional Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners. This year has special meaning and significance; we celebrate on these occasions our 175th anniversary of dedicated service, constructive leadership, and progressive accomplishment benefiting generations of our fellow American citizens down through the years.

It was in May 1792, that our founder, Thomas Jefferson, characterized our party in a letter to President Washington. In the years that followed, organizational substance and philosophic alternatives to the prevailing Federalist viewpoints were developed. By 1798 a vigorous party had grown up, which 2 years later elected Jefferson as the first Democratic President of the United States.

Some 20 years later, a vigorous frontier Democrat took his place on the national scene—Andrew Jackson of Tennessee. The hero of the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, Jackson's words and actions caught the imagination of Americans everywhere. Southern farmers, small planters, pioneer farmers of the newly settled Northwest Territory, German and Irish immigrants, countryfolk of New England and New York—all rallied to the Democratic Party. Workers in the cities, in the process of forming the Nation's first labor unions, saw in the Democratic Party principles then—as now—a sympathy for their own aspirations. This new coalition elected Andrew Jackson the seventh President of the United States in 1828.

These two pioneer founders and leaders of the Democratic Party are being honored in Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners in this our 175th anniversary year. We could very well add the illustrious names of other great Democratic Presidents who by their courage, leadership, and dedication to the principles of our Nation and our party have helped make possible the tremendous advancement of our civilization—Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, and our current occupant of the White House, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. President, our party has made a record down through the years of which we can all be proud. The Democratic Party is truly the party of the people. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of an excellent document entitled "A History of the Democratic Party" so that this historic record of accomplishment may be properly commemorated in this 175th anniversary year of its founding.

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

A HISTORY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

CHAPTER 1: THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IS BORN

The year was 1966. Speaking to the people, President Lyndon B. Johnson said:

"Our party has greatly contributed to the American Experiment. We have never represented a single interest; we have never represented a single section of the country. The Democratic Party has endured and prospered because it rested on the belief that a party exists to advance the freedom and the welfare of all the people."

The year was 1962. President John F. Kennedy, delivering his State of the Union Message before a joint session of the Congress said:

"A strong America cannot neglect the aspirations of its citizens—the welfare, of the needy, the health care of the elderly, the education of the young. For we are not developing the nation's wealth for its own sake. Wealth is the means—and people are the ends."

And the year was 1824. Thomas Jefferson, author of our Declaration of Independence, was asked how his new political party differed from its opponents. He said:

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe . . . The appellation of aristocrats and democrats . . . expresses the essence of them both."

In the span of more than a century and a half from Jefferson to Johnson, a great nation, and the world's oldest democracy, has sprung from the waiting lands of a continent and the hearts of a people—and spread across the waters beyond. And across that nation, as in the words of Harry Truman, is inscribed the record of the Democratic Party—its belief in the people.

This belief in the people has shaped Democratic thinking in every field of government. It has meant that government should do what it can to insure the richest, fullest possible life to all the people. It has led to the belief that every citizen should have the chance to take some part in politics. It has commanded the preservation of certain personal liberties, without which man's dignity would be lost. And it has based its foreign policy on a sincere concern for the people of every other nation in the world. Much of the story of the Democratic Party is the story of how these goals were fought for, won, lost, and fought for again in the never ending conflict with those with little trust in the people.

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony of the wisdom and vitality of the principles of the Democratic Party is the fact that it is the oldest political party in the world. It is difficult to fix an exact birthday for the Democratic Party—the most usual date given is May 23, 1792, the date of a letter from Jefferson to Washington giving a name to the party then headed by Washington. But the event primarily responsible for breathing life into the party was the fight for the Bill of Rights. These rights, which insure freedom of religion, speech and press, and guarantee fair trials to the accused, had been left out of the original draft of the Constitution. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention, mostly plantation owners and merchants, had been so concerned with building a government able to keep the peace and protect property rights, that they failed to provide these necessary safeguards. Thomas Jefferson was not at the Convention; but when he saw of the omission, he moved into action. In letters to friends and follow-

ers throughout the country, the author of the Declaration of Independence declared:

"A Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, and what no just government should refuse . . ."

Despite opposition, Jefferson rallied enough support to make acceptance of the Bill of Rights a condition of the Constitution's approval. The organization he built up in this fight became the core of Jefferson's new party; and the principle of individual liberty became a guiding star in the Democratic constellation.

Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic Party, was the leading Democrat of his day. Despite his aristocratic upbringing, he shunned powdered wigs and finery, and greeted callers in an old brown coat and breeches. An optimist, he believed in the inevitable improvement of the world and its people. A religious man, he carried his faith into his politics. "I have sworn upon the altar of God," he said, "eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." A respecter of property rights, he nevertheless believed that in any conflict between property and men, the rights of men came first.

But most strongly of all, Jefferson believed in the inherent worth of the common man. "Every man, and every body of men on earth," he wrote, "possess the right of self-government." He was certain that given the facts, the people would use that right correctly. So, to educate the people, Jefferson called for the founding of schools, newspapers and libraries. Especially in the frontier states, his followers reshaped the laws to give every man a vote.

Jefferson's party first sought office in opposition to the governing class of the time, the Federalists. The Federalists had done much to bring the new American nation to life. They had been the driving force behind the Constitution, and, under George Washington, had started the operations of the new Federal Government. But the Federalists' view of government was naturally limited by their own aristocratic backgrounds, and by the administrations of monarchs among the then-great nations of Europe. As their leader, Alexander Hamilton, put it, "Our real disease is democracy." "All communities," Hamilton believed, "divide themselves into the few and the many, the first are rich and the well-born, the other the mass of the people. The people are turbulent and changing, they seldom judge or determine right." Hamilton believed that support of the rich was necessary, and that the Government could not last unless the wealthy people of the country could make money under it. To assure this, the Federalists passed a tariff law, founded a national bank, and made other moves to benefit the creditors, merchants and propertied interests.

Thus, the issue of government for the many versus government for the few was drawn before the United States was 10 years old. Jefferson's party took up the challenge laid down by the Federalists. It was no easy job. The riot and bloodshed of the French Revolution had momentarily discredited the idea of democracy, and the Federalist press interpreted every criticism of the Government as a foreign revolutionary plot. As historian Wilfred Binkley has said, "The Federalists succeeded, to their own satisfaction, in making the terms 'Federalist' and 'patriot' synonymous." But this did not check the Jeffersonians. Through their own newspapers and speeches, they aimed a running fire of criticism at the Federalist government. Small farmers, workers and frontiersmen were urged to use their votes to give themselves a voice in the Government.

By 1798, a vigorous party had grown up. Because the word "democrat" was then in disrepute, Jefferson's party took the name "Republican," to show its determination to

keep the nation a republic. As the strength of the party increased, the Federalists took alarm. Exploiting fear of foreign infiltration, they passed an Alien Law, which eased deportation of political objectionables, and a Sedition Law, which made possible the punishment of anyone who dared criticize the Government. But the laws backfired. They smacked too much of kingly tyranny, against which a Revolutionary War had just been fought. The state legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky denounced them as unconstitutional and called on other states to join in resisting them. Following their example, the common people in other states rose in protest and, in 1800, voted in Thomas Jefferson as the first Democratic President of the United States.

If the Democrats have been the party of strong Presidents, Jefferson was the first. In 1803, he negotiated the Louisiana Purchase, bringing into the nation the most productive river valley in the world. In 1804, he sent Lewis and Clark to blaze a trail through what was to become the Great Northwest. Less daring Presidents might have hesitated before taking these steps, thus holding up development of the Western states. But Jefferson's vision stretched across a continent and through a hundred years of history. Foreseeing the rich returns the Mississippi Valley would someday repay, he proceeded to use the power of the Presidency to its fullest to double America's size.

In 1808, when Jefferson retired to his home in Monticello, he left the Government in the hands of his two trusted lieutenants, James Madison and James Monroe. Madison had been a general in the fight to ratify the Constitution. His faith in the American form of government had been intensified by a lifetime spent studying every other government history had known. Drawing on his vast knowledge, Madison taught the nation the benefits of government through political parties, and the danger of allowing one group to gain control of the Government. The party behind Madison, made up as it was of Southern planters, city workers, small farmers and frontiersmen, was as diverse for a nation its size as is the Democratic Party today. Some thought it hypocritical that conflicting groups should unite to support the same candidate and program. To them, Madison said:

"In the extended republic of the United States and among the great variety of interests, parties and sects which it embraces, a coalition of a majority of the whole society could seldom take place on any other principles than those of justice and the general good."

Madison was elected President twice. His first administration was harassed by war with England, but his second was peaceful and prosperous. The small nation beside the Eastern Seaboard was growing strong, and it was building the Cumberland Road and the Erie Canal to clear its way westward. The frontier, pushing its way across the Appalachian forests toward the Mississippi, acted as a generator of democracy. There were no extremes of wealth or social classes on the frontier. Men were measured by what they could do with their hands. Because everyday life was dangerous every man was needed, and a spirit of cooperation developed between towns and families. Such people were naturally drawn to Jeffersonian democracy, and their votes helped keep it in office from 1800 to 1824.

James Monroe was President for the last eight of these years. He was the last of the "cocked hats"—leaders of the Revolution—to be President. During his Administration, the principles underlying Democratic Party foreign policy were first put into action. Relations with other countries were as important in Monroe's day as they are now—but for a different reason. The United States was a new nation, fighting for respectability

among the world's powers. It could have cut itself off from the world and dealt with other countries only when threatened. But a party and a nation that believed, with Jefferson, that man's worth and his right to self-government were universal, could not close its eyes to world events. So when Europe cast eyes on the new states of South America, President Monroe gave notice that America would protect its neighbors from foreign interference. Designs on the independence of these countries, Monroe said, would be interpreted as designs on America itself. In a sense, this was America's first security pact. It was a daring gamble for a young nation, but it worked. And ever since, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine have been the root and core of American foreign policy. Despite times when the Democratic Party has followed the national trend toward isolationism, it has always come back to the fundamental principle that the safety and rights of the common people cannot long be protected if protection stops at the shores of our oceans.

CHAPTER TWO: OLD HICKORY COMES TO WASHINGTON—PEOPLE VERSUS PRIVILEGE

During Jefferson's and Madison's terms, the Federalist Party was withering away. In Monroe's years, it died. In 1820, Monroe was reelected without opposition. Everyone in public life proclaimed himself a Jeffersonian as the nation embarked on its political "Era of Good Feeling."

But the truce did not last long. Broad as it was, the Democratic Party could not embrace every region and every interest group in the nation. Party unity became increasingly strained until, in 1824, it burst. Four different candidates ran for President of the United States.

Amid this confusion, the Democratic Party temporarily lost sight of its Jeffersonian principles. The men of wealth and privilege, in whose hands Hamilton had unsuccessfully tried to place the reins of government, were quick to seize upon the Democratic split. During the Administration of John Quincy Adams, they regained influence in government. Rallying, as Jefferson had feared, behind the Bank of the United States, they seized control of the nation's credit and used this to try to get control of the nation.

The time was ripe for a new champion of the common people, and in Andrew Jackson the Democratic Party had a man to meet the occasion. A true son of the frontier, Jackson had lived in the backwoods, fought Indians and beaten the British in the War of 1812. He was tall and raw-boned, and his soldiers had nicknamed him "Old Hickory," after the toughest thing they could think of. Stern and upright, Jackson possessed an intense patriotism, a razor-sharp sense of honor, and a burning dedication to the common man.

Entering politics, Jackson and his followers fashioned many of the tools of political democracy. The national convention, the party platform, and the election campaign, were their inventions, and through them, men from all walks of life were given an opportunity to take part in politics. In the election of 1828, three times as many people voted as in any election up to that time, and Jackson was elected President.

Fortified by his victory, Jackson went after the Bank of the United States. As the official depository of the nation's funds, the Bank had become a vast monopoly, controlling all banking transactions and credit in the country. It kept newspapers and Congressmen on its payrolls, and they ruthlessly attacked anyone who interfered with the Bank's activities. Near the end of Jackson's first term, Congress extended the Bank's charter. But Jackson vetoed the bill, and withdrew all government deposits from the Bank. In a veto message which reasserted basic Democratic principles, Jackson said:

"Every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but, when the laws undertake

to add to those natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the powerful more potent, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means to secure like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government."

Jackson's words and actions caught the imagination of common people throughout the country. Southern yeomen and small planters, pioneer farmers in the Northwest, German and Irish immigrants, plain country folk of New England and New York—all rallied to the Democratic Party. City workers, forming their first unions for the improvement of working conditions, saw in Democratic principles a sympathy for their own aspirations. These were the people behind Jacksonian Democracy. Their votes re-elected him President. With Jackson as their leader, they so impressed their spirit upon American life that history marks Jackson's terms as the era of "the rise of the common man."

In 1836, Jackson returned to his beloved home, the Hermitage, in Tennessee. His successor in the White House was Martin Van Buren, former Secretary of State, who had become Jackson's most trusted adviser. Van Buren, a skillful politician, was one of the earliest leaders of the political organizations of the large Northern cities. But he did not inspire the other elements of the Democratic Party as Jackson had. Van Buren's attempts to extend Jacksonian Democracy were thwarted by a financial panic which hit the country in 1837. In the resulting depression, the common people suffered most. Van Buren, in his bid for a second term, became the first President to be punished at the polls because of a depression during his Administration.

The party that ousted Van Buren from office called itself the "Whigs," after a British party of the same name. As historian Roger Butterfield says, "the Whigs . . . took their political technique from the Democrats themselves, improving it as they went along. The Whigs were the new party of business and property, but they carefully suppressed—in public, at least—the old Federalist prejudice against 'the people.' Since Jackson had won his battles by appealing to the common man, the Whigs announced they were common men, too, and their campaign posters showed them with their shirtsleeves rolled up, hammering at a forge or following a "plow." Behind a military hero, William Henry Harrison, the Whigs scored a sweeping victory in the election of 1840. The era of Jacksonian Democracy was ended, but it was to remain as a model for Democratic leaders of the future.

The story of the Democratic Party from 1840 to the Civil War is closely bound up with the breakup of the Union. Although Jackson had declared "Our union—it must be preserved," forces were at work in both North and South to destroy it. Slavery was an issue beyond the reach of politics. The Northern abolitionist and the Southern planter had between them none of the common ground necessary to political compromise. As their anger at each other rose in pitch, their political parties were swept up in the bitterness that led to secession and war. Abolitionist Democrats, unable to gain control of their party, helped form the Free Soil Party, which tried to keep slavery out of the new Western lands. In 1848 they called Van Buren out of retirement to run for President on the Free Soil ticket. Northern Democrats gave him strong support. Thus Democrats were early leaders in the anti-slavery fight, even though the party itself was split over the great issue.

Despite growing sectional divisions, the Democratic Party accomplished three important goals in these years: the acquisition of the remainder of the West, the expansion

of trade, and the suppression of racial and religious intolerance in the Know-Nothing movement.

Much of the credit for the Western expansion goes to James K. Polk, a Democratic President of the 1840s. Polk believed that it was the nation's "manifest destiny" to bring all the land to the Pacific under the American flag—by negotiation if possible, but by war if need be. By settlement with Britain, he won title to the Pacific Northwest. Texas entered the Union peacefully, but a war with Mexico was necessary to gain the California country. Thus, in four years, Polk had added half a million square miles of some of the richest and most spectacular country on the continent, finishing the task that had begun with Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase.

It was in Polk's Administration also that the Democrats passed the Walker Tariff. The Democratic Party has always favored moderating tariff charges on imports from abroad, both to aid the consumer and to improve relations with countries whose economies depend on what we buy from them. The Walker Tariff did both. So sound was it economically, that it remained unchanged until the Civil War.

History credits the Democratic Party with lowering the tariff and gaining the West. But almost forgotten is the strong stand the Party took against the Know-Nothing movement. The Know-Nothings were organized to end the immigration from Europe which, even in the 1850s, had reached 600,000 a year. Since most of the immigrants were of the Catholic faith, the ugly mark of religious bigotry stained Know-Nothing beliefs. Members of the organization burned churches and beat up immigrants on the streets. When questioned about their activities, they replied, "I know nothing."

By 1856, the Know-Nothing Party had elected seven Governors, and was threatening to make a party of intolerance a major political force in America. But the Democratic National Convention unanimously adopted this resolution:

"Resolved, that a political crusade in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America, against Catholics and foreign born, is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit or toleration and enlightened freedom which particularly distinguished the American system of popular government."

This united Democratic opposition broke the back of the Know-Nothing movement. In the spirit of Jefferson and the Bill of Rights, the Democratic Party had spoken up for the rights of minorities. More than this, the defeat of the Know-Nothings showed the common people of Europe that America welcomed them to a new life. Our Western lands would have been of little use without people to fill them. The Democratic sympathy for the immigrant quickened the movement that sent strong men Westward to build a nation.

Towering over all other events of the period was the widening gulf between North and South. Some Democrats, led by the "Little Giant," Stephen A. Douglas, strove to compromise the differences. In his famed doctrine of "squatter sovereignty," Douglas proposed that the people of each new state decide for themselves whether to allow slavery. But it was too late for compromise. By 1860 the Democratic Party had split again, the Northern wing supporting Douglas for President, the Southern behind John T. Breckenridge. The result was a victory for the newly-formed Republican Party, led by Abraham Lincoln.

CHAPTER THREE: WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN—REDEDICATES THE PARTY

From 1860 onward, the newly-born Republican Party was to provide the main opposition for the Democrats. When first formed, the Republicans were a party of free

soil and idealism, attracting many believers in Jefferson's principles. Lincoln himself was a devoted Jeffersonian. It was he who said that "the principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."

But with Lincoln's assassination the founders of the Republican Party were rudely shoved aside. The new leaders, called "Radical Republicans," were men with blood in their eyes. Disregarding Lincoln's plea for "malice toward none," they set up a military dictatorship in the South, and almost impeached a President who would not go along with their wishes. By their Reconstruction Acts and Force Bills, they held up progress in the South for many years.

The Democrats tried to fight these actions, but they were seriously weakened. Republican leaders had disfranchised the Democratic South, and had massed behind their postwar candidate, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, the voting strength of the Grand Army of the Republic. When Democrats criticized Reconstruction measures, their opponents accused them of being rebels and traitors, unfit to govern the country. By waving the "bloody shirt" of the War, historian Charles Beard says, "the Republicans managed . . . to make party loyalty equivalent to national patriotism and voting the opposition ticket identical with sedition."

It was after the Civil War that American big business made its historic alliance with the Republican Party. The need for production and credit during the War had forced the government into measures which greatly profited industrialists and financiers of the North. After the war, the bankers, railroad magnates and the other industrial giants agreed with the party in power, to exchange campaign contributions for beneficial legislation. At first, the people did not mind this. They admired the men who were forging an industrial America, and were dazzled by their show of wealth. They even got the idea that the tremendous amounts of money being amassed at the top would trickle down to improve their own living standards. Events were soon to prove this theory wrong.

Grant's Administration provided the perfect setting for business domination of the Government. Grant himself admired and liked to associate with the millionaires and manipulators of the day—Jay Cooke, Jay Gould, and Jim Fiske, the speculators whose names have survived as symbols of financial piracy. Although personally honest, Grant, as he later admitted, let crooked friends take advantage of his trust. As a result, not only was Grant's Administration run openly and notoriously for the benefit of big business, but corruption flourished on a wide scale. The Vice President, members of the Cabinet and chairman of Congressional committees took bribes and graft. They made money on government contracts and tax frauds. As historian Allen Nevins says, "The Grant era stands unique in the comprehensiveness of its rascality."

This stealing did not stop with money, but extended to national elections. In 1876, the Democrats nominated for President Samuel J. Tilden, the brilliant reform Governor of New York. He had broken the Tweed Ring in New York City, and was pledged to break the ring of thieves around Grant. With the people aroused to Republican corruption, Tilden's integrity was a welcome change. He appeared to have won the election, 4,300,590 votes to 4,026,298 and 196 electoral votes to 173. But through bribery and forgery, the Republicans changed the totals in three Southern states, where Federal troops still were stationed under the Reconstruction Acts. A Republican Electoral Commission ratified the changes. It was the only stolen election in American Presidential history. More impulsive Democrats were ready to don their war uniforms and take the White House by force, but the calm hand of Samuel Tilden restrained them. Putting his respect for orderly government above both party and

personal advantage, Tilden acquiesced in the decision of the Electoral Commission and retired to private life.

By 1884, the Republicans had been in power for 24 years. The "bloody shirt" of the "rebellion" was being waved more and more feebly, and people were becoming tired of men who looked upon government service simply as a road to personal profit. So they elected to the White House another Democratic reformer from New York, Grover Cleveland. A big, gruff man whose honesty was unshakable, Cleveland devoted his two terms to raising the moral standard of government. His motto was: "A public office is a public trust." Where Presidents before him had allowed raids on the Treasury for private pensions and pork-barrel appropriations, Cleveland used the Presidential veto to prevent them. He relaxed the demands of patronage and put more workers under the Civil Service system. Officials who had a stake in the old system, including some Democrats, resented Cleveland's reforms. But the voters agreed with his nominator, Daniel Dougherty, when he said of Cleveland: "We love him for the enemies he has made."

But honest and devoted as he was, Cleveland did not fully sense the needs of the common people. In fact, a large segment of the Democratic Party had fallen under the influence of the big industrialists and their retainers. There followed a period of years in which, from the standpoint of party program, the average voter could not tell one major party from the other.

The Democratic Party needed a transfusion of new leadership and spirit. And in the agrarian movements of the Middle West, this was found. Between 1870 and 1895, the nation witnessed a series of depressions, the historic price of unrestrained industrial development. True, the small businessman of the East had suffered. Twenty-three thousand small firms had failed in one 3-year period alone. True, the workingman was putting in 12 to 14 hours a day, and his attempts to organize unions were being frustrated by unsympathetic legislatures and courts. But the farmers were destitute. Crop prices had fallen 40 to 50 per cent under the impact of Republican high tariff laws. Farms were mortgaged to Eastern bankers to the sum of a billion dollars. The cost of selling farm produce was steadily rising as the trusts and railroad monopolies levied their annual tribute upon the plain people of America.

So, organizing for political action, the men of the Midwest brought new blood and spirit into the Democratic Party. Their wants, by our standards, were not radical: they desired a graduated income tax, regulation of railroad rates, popular election of Senators, and relaxation of the Gold Standard, which held them in perpetual debt to the financiers of the East. But their opponents called these measures "the dreams and fantasies of Karl Marx," and cried to the voters to "stop this communist march on private property."

Out of the Midwest came these agrarian reformers, and into the Democratic Convention of 1896. Their leader was William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska, and the speech he made at that convention stands as perhaps the greatest in American political history. Picture Bryan, with his enormous head, strong, flashing eyes, and vibrant voice, 20,000 delegates and spectators hanging on his words:

"When you come before us and tell us that we are about to disturb your business interests, we reply that you have distributed our business interests by your course. We say to you that you have made the definition of a businessman too limited in its application. The man who is employed for wages is as much a businessman as his employer. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, and by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of his country creates wealth, is as much a busi-

nessman as the man who goes upon the Board of Trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go a thousand feet into the earth to bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured in the channels of trade are as much businessmen as the few financial magnates who in the back room corner the money of the world. We come to speak for this broader class of businessmen. . . . We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came. We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them. . . . Having behind us the producing masses of this country and the world, supported by the commercial interests, the laboring interests and the toilers everywhere, we will answer their demand for gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

Jefferson or Jackson would have felt at ease delivering this speech.

In Bryan, the Democratic Party had found its voice. With a great shout, the convention nominated him for President, and he went forth to wage one of the most exciting campaigns in American history. Bryan was the first modern Presidential candidate. He traveled 18,000 miles and addressed more than 5 million people—a remarkable feat for the days before radio and television.

Alarmed by Bryan's strength, the Republicans got busy. Their leader, Mark Hanna, shook down insurance companies, railroad and trusts for an estimated \$16 million, the biggest campaign fund yet collected. Fourteen hundred speakers were sent out to answer Bryan. Contracts were made contingent on his defeat. Workers were told that if Bryan won on Tuesday, they need not show up for work on Wednesday. The pressure paid off: Bryan lost the election. But in so doing, he rededicated the Democratic Party to the common people.

CHAPTER FOUR: WOODROW WILSON MAKES AMERICA A WORLD LEADER—REFORM AT HOME AND WAR ABROAD

For the 16 years following his first race for the Presidency in 1896, William Jennings Bryan was his party's acknowledged leader. And though he lost three times for the Presidency, the influence of his cause spread beyond his own party. In the opposition ranks, it inspired a new breed of Republican, which called itself, at various times, Bull Moose or Progressive. Its aims as expressed by Republican William Allen White, included "cleaning up local politics, ending the wholesale buying of state legislatures, and giving a new chance to the economic underdog." The names of their leaders are well known: Robert LaFollette of Wisconsin, George W. Norris of Nebraska, and, of course, the leader of the Bull Moose Party, Theodore Roosevelt. These men were true followers of Lincoln, but the rest of the Republican leadership, known as the Old Guard, fought them as much as they did the Democrats.

Under Bryan's leadership in foreign affairs, the Democrats opposed much of the imperialism arising from the war with Spain. Many Americans thought it great sport to shake "the big stick" at the small nations of South America. Republican foreign policy reversed the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine by declaring that, although Europe could not interfere in South American affairs, the United States could. These actions caused a resentment among our Latin American neighbors that still colors their view of the United States. But the basic sympathies of the Democrats were opposed to taking this advantage of the people of weaker nations.

The Democrats worked on more than just the national level during these years. The

campaign of 1896 had invigorated the party on the state and local level as well. In the West and South, Democrats listened to stump speakers, voted in primary elections, and burned bonfires on election night. Democratic state administrations served as testing grounds for railroad regulation, minimum wages, and many other programs later to be adopted by the Federal Government.

With the quickening of immigration, the Democratic organizations of the large cities had a special task: to cast new citizens in the mold of the Republic. Millions of immigrants were streaming into America each year. Democratic ward leaders found them living space, helped them secure their citizenship, brought them food and coal when times were hard. True, the immigrants gave their votes in return. But there were other reasons for these services. The ward leaders had been immigrants themselves, not too long ago. They knew that, with a little help, these "foreigners" could become worthy Americans. One of the marvels of America is how these different ethnic groups, whose countrymen were fighting each other so bitterly in Europe, could live beside each other in the great cities in peace. Much of the credit must go to the understanding help of the politicians.

The tireless work of Bryan and his followers bore fruit in 1912. A split in the Republican Party between the Old Guard and Progressives allowed an easy Democratic Presidential victory. The President-elect, Woodrow Wilson, pledged himself to remedy the evils exposed by earlier Democrats. As he said in his inaugural speech:

"We have been proud of our industrial achievements, but we have not hitherto stopped thoughtfully enough to count the human cost, the cost of lives snuffed out, of energies overtaxed and broken, the fearful physical and spiritual cost to the men and women and children upon whom the dead weight and burden of it all has fallen . . . There can be no equality of opportunity, the first essential of justice in the body politics, if men and women and children are not shielded from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they cannot alter, control, or singly cope with."

As President, Wilson put the strength of the Federal Government behind improvement of the life of the common man. He believed, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, that "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves."

Applying this philosophy, Wilson's Democratic Administration built an impressive record of achievement. The Federal Reserve Act took the control of the nation's currency, which had been centered in Wall Street, and dispersed it among 12 regional Federal Banks. The Clayton Act attacked monopolistic trade practices, and expressly declared that "the labor of human beings is not a commodity or an article of commerce." An income tax law was passed, to distribute equitably the burden of running the Government.

The dreams of the reformers of the 1890s had been realized.

Also during Wilson's Administration, women won the right to vote. This doubled the size of the electorate and destroyed the last artificial barrier on the road to full citizen participation in government.

But impressive as were Wilson's achievements, history will remember him as a leader of the world. For in this broader task, his idealism and eloquence, his ability to plumb the moral reserves of the people, found fullest expression. America had been lucky. An ocean had isolated her from the continual strife in Europe, allowing her to develop in peace. But now that she had grown large and powerful, as the world's most success-

ful democracy, she was destined to lead the cause of democracy in the world.

Wilson did not want to enter the First World War. But with the German forces overrunning peaceful nations and sinking American shipping, the time came when, in his words, "the right was more precious than the peace."

To achieve victory, the country equipped a large army, mobilized the home front, and greatly enlarged government services to coordinate the war effort. But, according to historian Mark Sullivan, "the largest single factor in the war was the mind of Woodrow Wilson." Wilson's thoughts and words were weapons. In the most discouraging days of the war, they gave the Allied nations fresh awareness of a reason for their sacrifices.

During this period, Wilson gave classic expression to the principles of Democratic Party foreign policy. The national interest would best be served, he said, by the attainment and preservation of world peace. He knew that just as war arose out of ill-feeling between nations, peace could only be based on mutual understanding and mutual respect. To achieve this, he proposed a League of Nations, where each country would have a voice in settling international differences.

But beyond the elimination of war, Wilson had the vision of the world becoming more democratic—not by force, not by economic coercion and "dollar diplomacy," but by the strength of the American example. This was the hope behind Wilson's Fourteen Points, a series of peace aims which not only shortened the War, but made Wilson the greatest leader for peace in the world.

To make his vision a reality, Wilson went to Europe at the close of the war to help construct the League of Nations. But when he returned, he found Congress, controlled by isolationist forces, unwilling to accept his plans. So Wilson toured the nation, carrying his fight for the League to the people. If the League were not approved, he warned, "I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war." But too many people would not listen, Wilson lost his fight, and in the process, his health and strength as well. He returned to Washington a broken man, comforted only by the pioneer's knowledge that history would show him to be right.

CHAPTER FIVE: F.D.R. LEADS AMERICA TO NEW FRONTIERS—FROM "NORMALCY" TO THE NEW DEAL

When the Republicans took over the national Government in 1921, back into control came the men representing the same groups that were the favored interests of Hamilton's day. They moved more carefully now. They hired high-priced publicity men to dress up their schemes in fine-sounding slogans like "normalcy" and "rugged individualism." Instead of openly opposing laws which regulated big business in the public interest, they sabotaged their administration.

But the results were the same: The tariff went up; speculation and credit schemes increased, creating an illusion of prosperity. There was a series of scandals and a long farm depression. Then the whole economy came toppling down in the greatest depression in history.

Deprived of Wilson's leadership, Democrats became confused once again. The party became tangled up in the prohibition issue. But although the party lost three consecutive elections, some victories were achieved. Led by Sen. Thomas Walsh of Montana, Democrats in Congress exposed the corruption of Teapot Dome, a plot to rob the people of hundreds of millions in oil reserves. These were the years of bitter struggle for farm relief legislation. Though the McNary-Haugen farm bill was vetoed by Coolidge, and again by Hoover, and though the farm program which was written into law in 1929 was an inadequate stop-gap, the champions

of farm parity in this period laid solid groundwork for the constructive measures for agricultural recovery which came in the New Deal years.

One of the Democratic leaders of this time deserves special mention. His career shows how, in the Democratic Party, men from the humblest beginnings have been able to make important contributions to good government. Al Smith was an orphan boy. He grew up in a tenement house in New York's lower East Side, where lived Irish, Italians, Poles and other new Americans. Al Smith never had a formal education. But he had a deeper understanding of the common people, of which he was surely one, than any leader of the time. He started in politics at the bottom: poll watching for his ward organization. Through native brilliance and hard effort, he worked his way through every level of government to become four times the Governor of New York. In his administrations were nurtured many of the programs later to be adopted on a national scale. Nominated for President by the Democratic Convention of 1928, Smith was beaten in a campaign in which religious bigotry was callously exploited for political advantage. But, like Bryan before him, he had awakened a new spirit which was to contribute enormously to the party's future success.

What ultimately brought victory, setting the stage for the longest continuous period of Democratic Government the nation had seen, was 1) the inability of the Republican Hoover Administration to deal with the Great Depression, and 2), the Democratic response to that challenge. Volumes have been written trying to explain the causes of the national catastrophe which struck the country in 1929 and deepened through the next three years. But whatever the cause, the Republicans had no cure. Trapped by their own philosophy of negative government, they waited vainly for the stricken business community to right itself. At the depth of the depression, unemployment stood at 14 million persons. Wages were down 60 per cent, business income down 50 per cent. One of every four farms was bankrupt, and two thirds of the nation's banks were closed. Without jobs, often without food, millions saw their savings disappear and their years of work and education go for nothing.

In this crisis, the people turned once again to the Democratic Party. They elected as President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who had pledged them a "New Deal" and fresh opportunity in their economic life. From that day and for the next 20 years, under Roosevelt and later under Harry S. Truman, the Democratic Party worked to make good on these promises. The story of the Democratic Party during these years is partly the story of how a party helped a country convert economic disaster into unparalleled prosperity, partly the story of how a great leader turned the country away from isolationism to undertake tasks which made it the foremost nation in world affairs.

Few need to be reminded of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The confident smile, the jauntily-tilted cigarette holder, the magnetic personality are deeply etched into the American memory. Roosevelt combined Jefferson's philosophy and Jackson's courage with Wilson's ability to tap the moral reserves of the people.

When he took office, Roosevelt frankly surveyed the desperate conditions about him, but he did not despair. "The only thing we have to fear," he said, "is fear itself." He regarded the crisis as an opportunity for a modern application of Jefferson's faith in the people and the pioneers' faith in themselves. He said:

"These unhappy times call for plans that build from the bottom up instead of from the top down . . . that put their faith once more in the forgotten man at the bottom

of the economic pyramid . . . I, for one, do not believe that the era of the pioneer is at an end; I only believe that the area for pioneering has changed. The period of geographical pioneering is largely finished. But, my friends, the period of social pioneering is only at its beginning. And make no mistake about it—the same qualities of heroism and faith and vision that were required to bring the forces of nature into subjection will be required—in even greater measure—to bring under proper control the forces of modern society."

With these words, the Roosevelt Administration set in motion a program that reached to every major source of economic distress.

In retrospect, the speed and the orderliness of the New Deal achievements seem almost equally as remarkable as their magnitude. These features of the Roosevelt leadership are emblazoned on the record of F.D.R.'s "first hundred days."

In that relatively brief period, the main structure of the New Deal was built. All of that was done without any semblance of Executive dictation. Measures were submitted to the full test of unfettered debate in Congress and the other public forums. Action resulted not from the cracking of Executive or Legislative whips, but from general recognition that the proposals constituted urgently needed reforms. This represented Executive leadership and governmental teamwork in their finest sense.

From the White House came a series of Presidential messages dealing with emergency banking legislation, economy in government, repeal of prohibition, agricultural and unemployment relief, a new farm program, safeguards on stockmarket trading, mortgage relief, railroad coordination, government reorganization, industrial recovery, world disarmament and other major questions.

From Congress came legislative enactments which set the nation on the high road to recovery and expansion—the Emergency Banking Act, Agricultural Adjustment Act, Civilian Conservation Corps, National Recovery Administration, Public Works Administration, Securities and Exchange Act, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Home Owners Loan Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Farm Credit Act, among others.

None of these programs passed without opposition. Roosevelt's New Deal was accused of subverting the American system of free enterprise. Actually, it was designed to save it. The New Deal was based on a concept it took America five depressions to learn: that the roots of free enterprise are in a prosperity that is broadly shared by all elements of the population. The soundness of these programs show up in the fact that, 25 years later, they are an accepted part of American life.

At the same time that it combatted the depression, the Democratic New Deal had vision enough to make longer range plans for the prosperity of the country. America's soil and forests had become depleted through reckless use. A large-scale conservation program was instituted, so that Americans in the future could have the full benefit of this natural wealth.

The potentialities of another resource, water power, had long been neglected. But in programs like the Tennessee Valley Authority, it was used to bring the comforts of modern civilization to people who had never seen an electric light.

Under President Truman's leadership, the major New Deal programs were broadened and extended. The fight against monopoly was stepped up, and slum clearance projects were started to give decent housing to those whom large-city life had crowded together. At the end of 20 Democratic years, the nation could look with pride at this record:

Unemployment:		
1932 (million)-----	14	
1952 (million)-----	1.9	
National income:		
1932 (billion)-----	\$87.8	
1952 (billion)-----	\$328	
National product:		
1932 (billion)-----	\$110	
1952 (billion)-----	\$328	
Worker's weekly paycheck:		
1932-----	\$17	
1952-----	\$65	
Net farm income:		
1932 (billion)-----	\$1.9	
1952 (billion)-----	\$14.1	
Corporation income (after tax):		
1932 (billion)-----	-\$3.4	
1952 (billion)-----	\$18.3	

CHAPTER SIX: DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL IN WAR AND IN PEACE—COMBATING THE FASCISTS AND THE COMMUNISTS

The Democratic Party rolled up victory after victory in the elections of the 20 years, 1932-52. The biggest vote-getter was Roosevelt, four times the unbeaten champion of American politics. In 1936, he topped his opponent by 11 million popular votes and 523 electoral votes—the biggest majority in American history.

President Truman, also undefeated, had a political style all his own. With his simple, direct approach to the voters, he was able, in 1948, to score an amazing political upset.

Harry Truman did not mind being called a politician. "Politics," he once said, "is public service." The tarnish that clung to the word could be removed if enough citizens, through their parties, took part in politics. So, working behind Roosevelt and Truman, were countless Democrats of lesser fame but equal dedication. They manned sound trucks, rang doorbells, watched polls and cheered speeches, in that great turmoil of democracy that is an American campaign.

It was important for the people of the world that the faith of Americans in democratic government had been restored by the Roosevelt Administration's battle against the depression. For history had chosen America to lead the democratic countries in the historic struggles of the 20th century, against Fascism and Soviet Communism. These twin dictatorships, to whom popular government and individual liberty meant nothing, were to challenge the democracies first in a global hot war, then in a cold war. The stakes were to be no less than the freedom of every person on earth. It was a fight that was to test all the nerve and strength America could muster.

For a democracy to meet this challenge first involved a great risk of popular education. During the 1920s, the United States had become increasingly isolationist. Minds had to be changed, people convinced that the world had become so small as to make events in other lands bound to affect the well-being of America itself. President Roosevelt pointed up the evils of the Fascist dictatorships. He also took action to strengthen the bastions of freedom. A reciprocal trade program was passed to promote friendship through increased trade. In South America, the "big stick" was replaced by the policy of the Good Neighbor. Over bitter opposition from isolationist forces, a Democratic Congress approved, in 1940-41, a peacetime draft. This provided at least partial preparation for the war launched by the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

Pearl Harbor changed minds quickly. It unified America as never before. The mighty story of victory over Germany and Japan is too recent to need retelling. No political party can take credit for winning that struggle and ending the war. To do so would be to disparage the work of the Armed Forces and the performance of the great industrial machine on the home front. But directing the entire effort was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Despite his concern with the fighting, he never ceased to plan for permanent peace. His declaration of the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter were eloquent statements of the peace aims of democracy. The entire allied world hailed him as the supreme spokesman in the struggle for the preservation of liberty. But on the eve of victory, exhausted by his labors, he died. Although an entire world poured out its grief, the most fitting epitaph was that on his tombstone: "Died in Action."

But victory over the Axis meant the end of only one form of dictatorship. Russia, America's wartime ally, also had designs on the freedom of the people of the world. The free world scarcely had time to catch its breath before the well-organized forces of world Communism moved into the power vacuums Fascism had left.

After four years of sacrifice and war, many in America wanted to relax. But the Truman Administration kept a close eye on Russian actions. One of the earliest and most important examples of President Truman's alertness to Russian tactics occurred in 1946, when the Russians failed to live up to their agreement to evacuate their troops from strategic, oil-rich Iran. As a result of President Truman's forceful insistence, the Russians finally backed down and withdrew their troops.

In February, 1947, with Communist guerrilla activities gaining in intensity in Greece, Britain advised the U.S. that it could no longer maintain its forces in Greece and Turkey, and would be forced to withdraw them in a matter of weeks. President Truman made a quick, bold decision. On March 12, before a joint session of Congress, he enunciated the now famous Truman Doctrine—a policy of U.S. intervention where necessary to save nations in danger of being taken over by a dictatorship—and asked Congress to authorize a \$400 million program of economic and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

The Truman Doctrine is now regarded as a major turning point in the cold war with the Communists, for it told the world that America was determined to lead the free world in the fight against Communism and its causes. It was followed by a series of dramatic programs that literally saved Western Europe from the grip of Communism: an emergency aid program that helped Europe survive the cold winter of 1947-48; the historic Marshall Plan (a long-range coordinated aid program to take the place of previous piecemeal programs) and the Berlin Airlift another dramatic example of U.S. determination to resist every Russian pressure.

As the economic strength of the free world began to grow, the Truman Administration turned to the task of shoring up its military strength. The North Atlantic Treaty became the first in a series of collective security pacts, designed to prevent Communist aggression by making it plain that any attacker of free nations would have to contend with the armed might of the U.S. This treaty was supplemented by a program of U.S. military aid to the member nations.

While building these safeguards, the Truman Administration did not neglect the United Nations, the dream of Franklin Roosevelt as the right institution for lasting peace. The crucial test of the UN came in Korea in 1950, where troops from UN countries turned back a naked act of aggression on the part of Soviet and Chinese Communism. The heavy sacrifices made by the American people in this combat put a brake to Communist expansion in the Far East, paving the way for a relaxation of world tensions in the following years.

Thus, in 20 years, the American people, under Democratic leadership, had revolutionized their thinking about world affairs. They had accepted the responsibilities of being

the greatest nation on earth. They had defeated Fascism and built up a strong network of defense against Communism. The entire economy had adjusted to the fact that, as long as aggressors exist, the only sure way to keep peace was to keep strength. Democratic foreign policy was so well-grounded in the realities of the world situation, that the Republican Party, despite its criticisms, found it could not do away with a single major program when it came to power.

As the cold war progressed, defenses against Communists also had to be raised within the United States. The Communist Party in America was at peak strength during the Hoover Administration, when 103,000 persons voted the Communist ticket for President. During World War II, some of these Communists had taken advantage of the spirit of wartime friendship to try to infiltrate government and industry. But as soon as the postwar aggression became evident, the Democratic Party began to dig them out.

When the Democrats left office in 1952, there was only one-fourth as many Communists in the country as 20 years earlier. The top leadership of the Communist Party had been wiped out—prosecuted and imprisoned by Democratic Administrations. New laws were added to the statute books, a loyalty program was set up in the Government, and the protective strength of the Federal Bureau of Investigation greatly increased.

To administer a successful internal security program required a delicate balancing between the dangers of subversion and the importance of individual freedom. The disloyal had to be separated from the dissenter, and the old-style progressive not confused with the Communist. The Democratic Party opposed those who tried to use fear of Communist infiltration to check social progress and defame minority groups. In fashioning its internal security programs, it tried to be guided by the warning of President Roosevelt: that "if the fires of freedom and civil liberties burn low in other lands, they must be made brighter in our own."

The program to extend the New Deal and defend democracy from Communism occupied most of Harry Truman's terms in office. After seven of the most eventful years in history, he retired, and in 1952 the Democratic Convention selected Adlai Stevenson as its Presidential candidate. Stevenson, despite his distinguished record as Governor of Illinois, was not well known nationally at the time of his nomination. But beginning with his famous acceptance speech, in which he sounded the keynote for the Democratic campaign—"Let's talk sense to the American people"—the eloquence and forthrightness of Stevenson's campaign speeches made a quick and deep impression on the voters in the short period between the convention and the election. Although defeated by a military hero who had been in the public eye for a full decade before Stevenson appeared on the national scene, the Illinois Governor received more votes than any other Presidential candidate in history except two: Franklin Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower's victory was not a victory for the Republican Party. Notwithstanding his personal popularity, the party won the Congress by the narrowest of margins, and quickly lost it two years later. Nor was the Eisenhower victory a repudiation of the Democratic legislation of the previous 20 years. Public pressure forced Eisenhower to embrace the New Deal in his campaign to keep the basic domestic and foreign programs intact during his terms in office.

Not content merely to oppose, Democratic-controlled Congresses from 1953 to 1960 fashioned constructive programs of their own. They passed the first civil rights leg-

islation in 85 years. They launched a massive program of research into the prevention of cancer and heart disease. They provided the funds through which America reached out into the exploration of space.

But direction from the Republican Administration was badly lacking in the 1950s. New problems, new needs, challenged the nation, at home and abroad. Without positive, assertive Administration leadership, America drifted. People's hopes for better futures were clouded by spreading slums, crowded schools, high medical costs, technological changes that eliminated jobs. Three recessions in seven years wracked the economy, the final one leaving almost seven million unemployed. Abroad, communism found new ways to encroach upon the free world through subversion and guerrilla warfare. Among friends, allies and uncommitted peoples of the world, who looked vainly to America to lead the way to peace and progress, American prestige hit bottom.

Among millions of those increasingly disturbed by America's drift in such perilous times was Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, who looked forward and saw a New Frontier of "uncharted areas of science and space, unsolved problems of peace and war, unconquered pockets of ignorance and prejudice, unanswered questions of poverty and surplus." As the 1960 Democratic Presidential nominee, Kennedy asked all Americans to join as "new pioneers on that New Frontier"—and in a close, hardfought campaign marked by four precedent-shattering television confrontations between him and his Republican opponent, Richard M. Nixon, Kennedy was elected 35th President of the United States.

In his first words as Chief Executive, President Kennedy made it clear "that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans" and that America would pay any price, bear any burden, "to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Once again the Democratic Party had provided a leader to summon the Nation to greatness.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, with his incisive sense of history, will be remembered as the man who fought for peace in a turbulent, diversified world. He will be remembered for his leadership in obtaining the nuclear test-ban treaty, the first tentative step toward lasting peace.

President Johnson has eloquently summarized the Kennedy legacy this way:

"The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic—and across the Pacific as well—the dream of a Peace Corps in less-developed nations—the dream of education for all our children—the dream of jobs for all who seek them and need them—the dream of care for our elderly—the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans whatever their race or color—these and other American dreams have been vitalized by his drive and by his dedication."

President Kennedy, after taking office, moved swiftly to implement his programs.

Acting in the Democratic tradition that produced the Good Neighbor Policy, Lend Lease, Point Four and the Marshall Plan, he moved to recapture the initiative in foreign affairs.

The Peace Corps was initiated to give young Americans a chance to help underdeveloped countries help themselves. This program captured the imagination of the world and enhanced the prestige of America.

Programs like the Alliance for Progress for Latin America were developed to give peoples of the world's underdeveloped nations new hope for a better life, stable governments and social justice.

Above all, President Kennedy sought to blaze a trail to lasting peace, realizing that

such a peace could only be negotiated from a position of strength. Our Defense establishment was streamlined, strengthened and readied to meet any of the diverse challenges of the nuclear age.

The United States stood ready to meet any threat to its security and freedom—from a guerrilla uprising to a nuclear confrontation.

The Communist tide of expansion was repelled in the Congo, blocked in Berlin, held in Vietnam, stalemated in Laos.

In October 1962 the Soviet Union attempted to establish offensive missile bases on the island of Cuba, precipitating the first direct confrontation between two nuclear powers.

The iron will of President Kennedy, backed by our vast military strength, forced a humiliating Soviet backdown and removal of offensive missiles and bombers. President Kennedy had acted judiciously and with restraint. A situation that might have ended in a nuclear holocaust was resolved without violence.

The Cuban confrontation was a turning point in the cold war. It convinced the Soviet Union of the determination of the United States to protect its interests and drove home the horrors of possible nuclear destruction.

It was only after Cuba that the Soviets reversed a long-standing policy and agreed to sign a test-ban treaty with the United States. The treaty, forbidding atmospheric nuclear testing, was hailed around the world as a first step in the long, hard journey toward a lasting peace in the nuclear age. More than a hundred nations signed the treaty.

In the critical area of space exploration President Kennedy fought to help the United States achieve supremacy. He named Vice President Johnson to head a newly-created National Aeronautics and Space Council to coordinate this national effort. More than 130 vehicles were placed in orbit. The United States assumed a position of pre-eminence as it met man's great new challenge—space.

While he was reasserting United States leadership abroad and in space, President Kennedy did not forget the importance of meeting our problems at home, nor did he forget the heritage and traditions of the Party of the People.

In the crucial area of Civil Rights, he became the architect of a comprehensive program to insure all Americans an equal opportunity to develop and utilize their talents. The government was mobilized to fight segregation in housing, employment, transportation and voting. An executive order forbade any discrimination in the Federal government. Qualified Negroes were appointed to key posts in the Administration. The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission was established and, under the energetic leadership of Vice President Johnson, worked to eliminate discrimination both in Federal Service and in companies doing business with the Federal government. A civil rights bill to guarantee all citizens full participation in American life, a bill to enable men of good will to work out their problems within the framework of law and order, was drawn up and submitted to Congress.

The President also moved to strengthen our economy and improve the lot of our people.

His first executive order released surplus food to the families of the unemployed; steps were taken to extend unemployment benefits to the victims of the recession which held the country in its grip when President Kennedy took office.

Area redevelopment was initiated to help communities eroded by economic change diversify their economies and provide more jobs. Accelerated public works were initiated to create more job opportunities as well as provide needed public facilities. The Man-

power Development and Training program was started to teach workers new skills that would enable them to gain employment in our increasingly more complex societies.

Incentives were provided to encourage greater business investment, strengthening the economy and providing more jobs. The development of small business was encouraged.

The Kennedy programs to increase the Nation's educational opportunities were the most comprehensive since the land grant college act was passed almost a century ago. Existing programs were expanded and new programs were begun—such as the comprehensive bill to aid medical education and the \$1.2 billion college facilities construction act.

The first extension in the history of the minimum wage act was secured, and the minimum wage was raised. The Nation's first Equal Pay Act was passed to protect the rights of working women. New programs to aid rural development were begun while agricultural surpluses were cut and food prices stabilized.

Under these programs the number of employed rose to record heights, while the number of unemployed was reduced. The Gross National Product climbed to a record \$600 billion, factory wages topped \$100 per week for the first time in history, and industrial production, profits and personal income went up.

Despite these gains our economic growth rate remained below its potential and close to 4 million Americans remained unemployed. To counter this situation, to attack the waste of resources and the human suffering President Kennedy proposed a tax cut. The tax cut was designed to stimulate the economy by generating increased activity in the private sector of the economy, rather than through increased government spending.

President Kennedy moved the Nation ahead on other fronts too. He focused attention on the problems of our rapidly expanding cities, mapped a bold new approach to the problems of mental illness and mental retardation, increased consumer protection and undertook many other important programs.

On November 22, 1963, President Kennedy was tragically assassinated. His Presidency had lasted scarcely more than a thousand days, yet, in that time, he left his stamp indelibly on the Nation. He brought a standard of excellence to everything he did—whether it was the appointment of an Ambassador or the encouragement of American culture. He renewed America's faith in itself, its tradition and its future.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE PRESIDENCY OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON—"LET US CONTINUE . . ."

Lyndon B. Johnson became the 36th President of the United States upon the death of John F. Kennedy. His energy, skill and knowledge were quickly evident as he moved to carry on the work begun by the late President. And the dignity and strength with which he grasped the reins of government reassured the Nation and the world.

In a special message to Congress delivered just three days after he took office, and again in his State of the Union message, President Johnson reviewed his philosophy and outlined his programs.

Not surprisingly, his concerns were those that had always been at the core of the Democratic Party's philosophy—the vision of American greatness and the desire that the United States play its rightful role of leadership in world affairs; the desire that the national interest be placed above all else; the concern for the welfare of the common man; the desire to see all Americans—regardless of their economic background or their race or their religion—receive an equal opportunity for full participation in our society.

President Johnson began his political career as an ardent supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt. As a government administrator and a young Congressman he gave his full

support to the Roosevelt programs. President Roosevelt, in turn, took an interest in young Johnson and helped further his career. Lyndon Johnson never forgot the lessons he learned from F.D.R. President Johnson's interest in the common man, his concern that the U.S. maintain its greatness as a nation and assume its responsibilities in Foreign affairs are a part of this heritage.

"Our principles, our programs, our achievements represent the hopes and needs of the great majority of the American people—in every walk of life and in every part of the country," Lyndon Johnson has said of the Democratic Party.

As a good Democrat, Lyndon Johnson was above narrow partisanship. As Vice President he had explained, "We are partisans not merely for the fact of partisanship, but because through the Democratic Party we have found a way of organizing ourselves to do for the Nation those things we feel must be done."

The President of the United States, regardless of Party, knew that Lyndon Johnson would give his full support to those programs and policies which were genuinely in the national interest, regardless of any political reaction his position might cause. For almost eight years he was the leader of the opposition party in the United States Senate. Never during that period did he allow the Democratic Party to fall into a pattern of negativism. When, in a matter of vital importance to national security, the President needed the support of the Democrats, he received it.

And as Vice President Lyndon Johnson fought for the principles of equal opportunity that are the foundation of the Democratic Party. As head of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission he was in the vanguard of the fight to obtain equal opportunity for all Americans (just as he had been in the Senate where he guided the first Civil Rights legislation since the Civil War to passage). He fought to maintain United States leadership in world affairs, carrying the message of his government to 33 countries in more than 150 speeches.

President Johnson sensed while a Senator the implications of a Russian Sputnik derisively circling the globe. The Preparedness Subcommittee which he headed investigated the nation's space and missile activities and recommended a 17-point program to revitalize them.

His interest played a key role in the drive by American technology to surpass the Russian space effort.

As Vice President he became head of the National Aeronautics and Space Council where he continued to preach the importance of supremacy in space.

So Lyndon Johnson came to the Presidency well grounded in the principles of the Democratic Party, skilled in the art of politics, and tempered by the responsibilities of national leadership.

Two of the hallmarks of Lyndon Johnson's career had been his tremendous capacity for work and his ability to "get things done." President Johnson threw himself into the Presidency with characteristic energy.

For example, he pushed for passage of the tax cut bill and signed it into law. In the short run the new tax cut will increase the take home pay and improve the living conditions of every American wage earner. In the long run it will give the economy a needed boost and provide the increased revenues that will lead the way ultimately to a balanced budget.

While cutting taxes, the President initiated a strenuous drive to cut government costs and maintain economy in government. The American taxpayer, he said, deserved "a dollar of value for a dollar spent."

The President explained his approach this way in his Budget Message to Congress:

"When vigorous pruning of old programs and procedures releases the funds to meet

new challenges and opportunities, economy becomes the companion of progress . . .

"This, is, I believe, a budget of economy and progress."

So the new President reaffirmed by word and action his party's interest in people, in seeing that all Americans shared in the American dream.

One of his first acts was to declare his unequivocal support of the Civil Rights bill before Congress. President Johnson pledged to do all he could to secure the bill's passage and dedicated his Administration to the principles that underlie the bill.

President Johnson also moved to help the Nation's poor and underprivileged. Declaring all-out war on poverty, he outlined a comprehensive plan, national in scope but geared to local initiative, to give the Nation's poor a chance to help themselves. The President's anti-poverty program was designed to help those who have been forced into poverty by circumstance and who cannot escape without outside help.

In 1964 President Johnson and Democratic candidates for Congress campaigned on a platform of precise, forthright proposals designed to answer the Nation's need in the mid-1960's. The American people responded with overwhelming approval at the polls, returning Lyndon Johnson—with Vice President Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota—to the White House with the largest plurality ever accorded a candidate. The President and the Democratic 89th Congress turned to the task of enacting the 1964 Democratic platform, keeping the promise to the voters. The result was the greatest record of creative legislation in the Nation's history, surpassing both the 63rd Congress under Woodrow Wilson and the historic 73rd under Franklin Roosevelt.

More than 90% of the President's 170 major recommendations were enacted by the 89th Congress. But statistics tell only a small part of the story, for the achievements of the 89th were registered by breaking through obstacles that had blocked earlier efforts—and passing legislation that answered the needs of all Americans.

This historic partnership between the White House and Congress overcame the barriers that had held up federal funds so vital to insuring every child the best possible education. Landmark actions were the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provided federal grants administered under local control and specialized aids for school districts with a high concentration of poor families, and a Higher Education Bill authorizing scholarship grants and loans to college students.

With the passage of Medicare legislation in 1965, a two-decades old controversy was resolved in favor of 19 million older Americans who now receive the medical attention they need—and often cannot afford. Medicare provides a basic hospital insurance program under Social Security, a voluntary health insurance program, and expanded Social Security benefits.

Meeting the President's challenge to build the Great Society, Congress expanded the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, to bring new weapons into the arsenal to defeat poverty—rent supplements, Teachers Corps, the Model Cities program, an economic development program for the depressed 11-state Appalachia region, and expanded manpower retraining programs.

In other important legislation the President was supported in his call for a new cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development to administer federal housing and urban development programs, a new Department of Transportation, a Voting Right of Act to insure against local discrimination, major steps to combat water and air pollution, the beautification program, a minimum wage increase and extension of coverage, excise tax reductions to stimulate the economy, immigration law re-

form, and the long-awaited Truth in Packaging bill to protect consumers.

There can be little doubt that historians, reviewing the achievements of the Democratic 89th Congress, will agree with President Johnson's assessment: "An inspired group of Americans, representing a sense of national purpose, has written for the United States a new chapter in greatness."

The world has changed in the 175 years that have passed since the beginning of the Democratic Party, but the principles and ideals that are the foundation of the Party are still valid. Proud of its traditions, secure in its heritage, the Democratic Party welcomes the challenge of the future. The Party of the architect of this Nation's beginnings is today the Party that maintains the vision of American greatness in the nuclear age. The mantle of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman and Kennedy has passed to Lyndon Johnson. President Johnson set the tone of his Administration in his first address to Congress.

"Let us continue," he said.

CHAPTER SEVEN: DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OUTSTANDING DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Thomas Jefferson, third President of the United States

Life: born April 13, 1743, in Albemarle County, Virginia . . . educated, William and Mary College . . . married Martha Skelton . . . six children, four of whom died in infancy. . . died July 4, 1826 at Monticello, Virginia.

Career: lawyer, writer, scientist and architect . . . Justice of the Peace, member of the Virginia Legislature, Governor of Virginia . . . member of the Continental Congress . . . minister to France and Secretary of State in Washington's cabinet . . . President from 1801 to 1808 . . . close advisor to Presidents from 1808 to 1826.

Achievements: wrote the Declaration of Independence . . . wrote the Virginia Declaration of Religious Freedom . . . Founded the University of Virginia and planned its architecture . . . wrote the Northwest Ordinance . . . As President, negotiated the Louisiana Purchase—800,000 square miles for 15 million dollars; initiated Lewis and Clark Expedition; fought Alien and Sedition laws, sent armed forces to Tripoli to protect American trade from Mediterranean pirates.

Jefferson on the future of democracy: "Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied upon to set them to rights . . . I have no fear, but that the result of our experiment will be, that men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master. Could the contrary of this be proved, I should conclude, either that there is no God, or that he is a malevolent being."

James Madison, Fourth President of the United States

Life: born March 16, 1751, at Port Conway, Virginia . . . educated at the College of New Jersey (now Princeton) . . . married Dorothy Payne Todd . . . died June 28, 1836, at Montpelier, Virginia.

Career: lawyer and political scientist . . . member of the Virginia legislature . . . delegate to the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention . . . member of the House of Representatives from Virginia . . . Secretary of State under Jefferson . . . President from 1809 to 1817.

Achievements: "Father of the Constitution" and leader in the fight for its ratification . . . helped write the Bill of Rights . . . As President, fought the War of 1812 and strengthened the permanent military and naval forces.

Madison on the separation of powers: "The great security against a concentration

of powers . . . consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others . . . It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, controls on government would not be necessary . . . In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and then oblige it to control itself."

James Monroe, Fifth President of the United States

Life: born in Westmoreland County, Virginia, April 28, 1758, educated at William and Mary College . . . married Elizabeth Kortwright . . . two children . . . died July 4, 1831, in New York City.

Career: soldier in the Revolution . . . member of the Virginia legislature . . . Governor of and U.S. Senator from Virginia . . . minister to France and England . . . Secretary of State under Madison . . . President from 1817 to 1825.

Achievements: as President, fought Seminole Indian War; acquired Florida Territory from Spain; announced Monroe Doctrine, basis of American foreign policy for 100 years.

Monroe on equal rights for all: "If all enjoy rights, merit is rewarded, and punishment inflicted only on those who have committed crimes; the number of discontinued and disorderly will be inconsiderable, the great mass will cling to and cherish the government which is strictly their own."

John Quincy Adams, Sixth President of the United States

Life: born July 11, 1767, in Quincy, Massachusetts . . . educated at Harvard . . . married Louisa Catherine Johnson . . . died in Washington, D.C., February 23, 1848.

Career: lawyer and professor . . . member of the Massachusetts Legislature and U.S. Senator from Massachusetts . . . minister to Portugal, the Netherlands, Russia and Great Britain . . . Secretary of State under Monroe . . . President from 1825 to 1829 . . . after leaving the Presidency, served in Congress for many years until his death.

Achievements: wrote Monroe Doctrine . . . helped acquire Florida from Spain . . . advocated roads and canals, a national university, and national aid to scientific enterprise.

Adams on national preparedness: "The firmest security of peace is the preparation during peace of the defenses of war."

Andrew Jackson, seventh President of the United States

Life: born March 15, 1767, in Union County, South Carolina . . . no formal education . . . married Rachel Donelson . . . died at Hermitage, Tennessee, June 8, 1845.

Career: soldier and lawyer . . . judge of Tennessee Supreme Court . . . Congressman and Senator from Tennessee . . . President from 1829 to 1837.

Achievements: fought the Seminole and Creek Indians . . . led American forces in Battle of New Orleans . . . helped write the Constitution of Tennessee . . . as President, vetoed the re-chartering of the United States Bank, and withdrew public deposits from the Bank . . . prevented state nullification of national tariff law . . . paid off the entire United States debt.

Jackson on the dangers of special privilege: "Many of our rich men have not been content with equal protection and equal benefits, but have besought us to make them richer by Act of Congress. By attempting to gratify their desires we have in the results

of our legislation arrayed section against section, interest against interest, and man against man . . . There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as Heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing."

Martin Van Buren, eighth President of the United States

Life: born at Kinderhook, Columbia County, New York, December 5, 1782 . . . no formal education . . . married Hannah Hoes . . . 4 children . . . died at Kinderhook, July 24, 1862.

Career: lawyer . . . member of New York State Senate . . . Attorney-General and Governor of New York . . . United States Senator from New York . . . Secretary of State under Jackson . . . Vice President, 1833 to 1837 . . . President, 1837 to 1841.

Achievements: widened the suffrage in New York . . . fought to end imprisonment for debt . . . helped to kill the Bank of the United States . . . as President, initiated independent treasury plan; opposed speculation in public lands; and instituted a maximum 10-hour working day in all Federal public works.

Van Buren on public opinion: "The sober, second thought of the people is never wrong, and always efficient."

James Knox Polk, 11th President of the United States

Life: born November 2, 1795, at Mecklenburg County, North Carolina . . . educated at the University of North Carolina . . . married Sarah Childress . . . no children . . . died June 15, 1849, in Nashville, Tennessee.

Career: lawyer . . . Congressman from Tennessee . . . Speaker of the House of Representatives . . . Governor of Tennessee . . . first "dark horse" candidate for the Presidency . . . President from 1845 to 1849.

Achievements: as President, annexed the Oregon territory . . . won the Mexican War . . . re-established an independent treasury system . . . reduced the tariff . . . acquired territory comprising California, Utah and New Mexico.

Polk reaffirms the Monroe Doctrine: "The nations on the continent of America have interests peculiar to themselves. Their free forms of government are altogether different from the monarchical institutions of Europe . . . To tolerate any interference on the part of European sovereigns with controversies in America, or to suffer them to establish new colonies of their own, would be to make, to some extent, a voluntary sacrifice of our independence. . . Liberty here must be allowed to work out its natural results, and these will, ere long, astonish the world."

Franklin Pierce, fourteenth President of the United States

Life: born November 23, 1804, at Hillsboro, New Hampshire . . . educated at Bowdoin College . . . married Jane Means Appleton . . . two children . . . died October 8, 1869, at Concord, New Hampshire.

Career: lawyer . . . member of New Hampshire legislature . . . Congressman and Senator from New Hampshire . . . Federal District Attorney . . . fought and wounded in Mexican War . . . President from 1853 to 1857.

Achievements: sent Commodore Perry to open up Japan . . . reorganized diplomatic service . . . paved way for transcontinental railroad to Northwest . . . acquired 50,000 square miles of Southwest Territory in Gadsden Purchase.

Pierce's political creed: "Our forefathers of the thirteen united colonies in acquiring their independence and founding this Republic, have devolved upon us, their de-

scendants, the greatest and the most noble trust ever committed to the hands of man. . . . We have to maintain inviolate the great doctrine of the inherent right of popular self-government; to harmonize a sincere and ardent devotion to the institutions of religious faiths with the most universal religious toleration; to carry forward every social improvement to the uttermost limit of human perfectibility, by the free action of mind upon mind, not by the obtrusive intervention of misapplied force; and to cherish with loyal fealty and devoted affection this Union, as the only sure foundation on which the hopes of civil liberty rest."

James Buchanan, fifteenth President of the United States

Life: born April 23, 1791, in Franklin County, Pennsylvania . . . educated at Dickinson College . . . unmarried . . . died in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, June 1, 1868.

Career: lawyer . . . member of Pennsylvania Legislature . . . Congressman and Senator from Pennsylvania . . . Ambassador to Great Britain and Russia . . . Secretary of State under Polk . . . President from 1857 to 1861.

Achievements: as Secretary of State, wrote the peace treaty with Mexico . . . as President, lowered the tariff; opposed secession; tried to prevent civil war by enforcing the Fugitive Slave Act and advocating popular sovereignty.

Buchanan on economy in government: "We ought never to forget that true public economy consists, not in withholding the means necessary to accomplish important national objects . . . but in taking care that the money appropriated for these purposes shall be faithfully and frugally expended."

Grover Cleveland, twenty-second and twenty-fourth President of the United States

Life: born in Caldwell, New Jersey, March 18, 1837 . . . one of nine children . . . married Frances Folsom while President . . . five children . . . died at Princeton, New Jersey, June 24, 1908.

Career: lawyer . . . Sheriff and Mayor of Buffalo, New York . . . Governor of New York . . . President from 1885 to 1889 and again from 1893 to 1897.

Achievements: greatly enlarged the Civil Service . . . vetoed "pension grab" bills . . . built a Treasury surplus . . . fought for a lower tariff . . . encouraged arbitration of disputes between Europe and South American countries.

Cleveland on the forms of communism: "Communism is a hateful thing. But the communism of combined wealth and capital is not less dangerous than the communism of oppressed poverty and toil."

Woodrow Wilson, twenty-eighth President of the United States

Life: born December 28, 1856, in Staunton, Virginia . . . educated at Princeton University . . . married Ellen Louise Axson and after her death Married Edith Bolling Galt . . . three children . . . died in Washington, D.C., February 3, 1924.

Career: historian and political scientist . . . President of Princeton University . . . reform Governor of New Jersey . . . President from 1913 to 1921.

Achievements: led American participation in World War I . . . enunciated the Fourteen Points for lasting peace . . . fought for the establishment of the League of Nations. His domestic policy, the "New Freedom," initiated the Federal Reserve Act, Federal Trade Commission Act, Clayton Anti-Trust Act, Railway Hours Bill, National War Labor Board, United States Employment Service, Espionage Act . . . settled differences with Mexico and prepared the Philippines for self-government.

Wilson on the importance of liberty: "A patriotic American is a man who is not selfish in the things that he enjoys that make

for human liberty and the rights of man. He wants to share them with the whole world, and he is never so proud of the great flag under which he lives as when it comes to mean to other people as well as to himself a symbol of hope and liberty . . . I would rather belong to a poor nation that was free than to a rich nation that had ceased to be in love with liberty. We shall not be poor if we love liberty."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-second President of the United States

Life: born January 30, 1882, at Hyde Park, New York . . . educated at Harvard University . . . married Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, a sixth cousin . . . five children . . . died at Warm Springs, Georgia, April 12, 1945.

Career: lawyer . . . New York State Senator . . . Assistant Secretary of the Navy under Wilson . . . candidate for Vice President in 1920 . . . Governor of New York . . . President from 1933 to 1945.

Achievements of his Administrations

Recovery measures: bank holiday, Gold Embargo, Relief, WPA and CCC Act, Agricultural Production and Marketing laws, Home Owner's Loan Corporation, Securities and Exchange Act.

Welfare and resource development measures: Tennessee Valley Authority, Wagner Act, Social Security Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Farm-Tenant Act.

Anti-monopoly legislation: Robinson-Patman Act, Public Utility Holding Company Act, Rural Electrification Act.

Foreign policy: Reciprocal Tariff Act, Good Neighbor Policy, Lend-Lease Act, Four Freedoms, Atlantic Charter, laid groundwork for United Nations Organization.

Roosevelt on the bases of world peace: "Today we seek a moral basis for peace. It cannot be a real peace if it fails to recognize brotherhood. It cannot be a lasting peace if the fruit of it is oppression, or starvation, or cruelty, or human life dominated by armed camps. It cannot be a sound peace if small nations must live in fear of powerful neighbors. It cannot be a moral peace if freedom from invasion is sold for tribute. It cannot be an intelligent peace if it denies free passage to that knowledge of those ideals which permit men to find common ground. It cannot be a righteous peace if worship of God is denied. . . . We must as a united people keep ablaze on this continent the flames of human liberty, of reason, of democracy, and of fair play as living things to be preserved for the better world that is to come."

Harry S. Truman, thirty-third President of the United States

Life: born May 8, 1884, in Lamar, Missouri . . . no college education . . . married Bess Wallace . . . one daughter.

Career: drug clerk, bank clerk, farmer and haberdasher . . . artilleryman in World War I . . . county judge . . . Senator from Missouri . . . Vice President under Franklin D. Roosevelt . . . President from 1945 to 1953.

Achievements: Marshall Plan, Truman Doctrine, breaking of Berlin Blockade, North Atlantic Treaty . . . halting of Communist aggression in Korea, Greece, Turkey, Iran . . . re-armament programs . . . Point Four program . . . raised minimum wage, extended Social Security, extended farm price-support program . . . established housing and slum-clearance programs . . . recognized new State of Israel . . . fought for Civil Rights program . . . Atomic Energy Act . . . unified the Armed Services . . . established National Science Foundation.

Truman on equal rights for all: "Eventually, we are going to have an America in which freedom and opportunity are the same for everyone. There is only one way to accomplish that great purpose; that is to keep working for it and never to take a backward step . . . We know that our de-

mocracy is not perfect. But we do know that it offers a fuller, freer, happier life to our people than any totalitarian nation has ever offered."

John F. Kennedy, thirty-fifth President of the United States

Life: born May 29, 1917, Brookline, Massachusetts, first President born in the 20th Century . . . educated at Harvard University . . . married Jacqueline Lee Bouvier . . . two children . . . died in Dallas, Texas, Nov. 22, 1963.

Career: decorated by the Navy for "courage, endurance and excellent leadership" demonstrated when he towed injured crew members to safety and brought them through enemy lines after his PT boat was rammed and sunk in World War II . . . newspaper correspondent at San Francisco Founding United Nations Conference, the Potsdam Conference and the British election of 1945 . . . author of *Why England Slept*, the Pulitzer Prize winning *Profiles in Courage*, and *The Strategy of Peace* . . . Congressman and Senator from Massachusetts . . . Inaugurated President January 20, 1961.

Achievements and goals of his administration: President Kennedy gave the Nation a program for greatness in the nuclear age . . . achieved a treaty enacting a ban on atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons—an historic first step in the long journey toward peace . . . captured the imagination of the world by initiating the Peace Corps to help under-developed nations to help themselves . . . initiated programs like the Alliance for Progress to give peoples of the world new hope for a better life . . . strengthened and increased the flexibility of our military establishment, thus fashioning the weapons to halt the spread of Communism and cause a humiliating Soviet defeat in Cuba by forcing the Communists to remove all offensive missiles . . . initiated programs like Area Redevelopment, Accelerated Public Works and Manpower Development and Training to help communities eroded by economic change and teach workers new skills for and increasingly more complex society . . . led the drive to obtain equal opportunity for all Americans—fighting against discrimination in education, employment and voting . . . architect of the tax cut and the civil rights bill.

Kennedy on the role of Americans today: "In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

"And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

—Inaugural Address
January 20, 1961

Lyndon B. Johnson, thirty-sixth President of the United States

Life: born in Johnson City, Texas, August 27, 1908 . . . educated at Southwest Texas State Teachers College . . . married Claudia Alta Taylor . . . two children . . .

Career: Administrator of the National Youth Administration for State of Texas . . . United States Congressman . . . Lt. Cmdr., U.S. Navy . . . United States Senator . . . Senate Majority Whip and Leader . . . Vice President of the United States . . . Inaugurated President November 22, 1963 . . . and won 1964 Presidential election with largest plurality ever accorded a candidate.

Accomplishment and goals: set up and headed the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which uncovered military waste and in-

efficiency in the 1950's . . . outlined program for U.S. to gain supremacy in space following the first Sputnik . . . secured passage of the Civil Rights bills of 1957 and 1960—the first civil rights legislation to win Congressional approval since the Civil War . . . as Vice-President headed the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and the National Aeronautics and Space Council . . . As President, he led the fight to obtain equal opportunity for all Americans—the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, secured passage of the tax cut, Department of Housing and Urban Development, rent supplements, Model Cities program, Department of Transportation, Beautification program, Elementary and Secondary Education measure . . . other historic legislation enacted by the 89th Congress under his leadership included air and water pollution control measures, water resources, Medicare and social security improvements, reform of the immigration laws, health and consumer protection measures, highway safety, expansion of the minimum wage law, extension of the GI Bill of Rights . . . also the Appalachia program, Federal and postal employees pay raises, mine safety, Manpower Development and Training expansion, the anti-poverty program, farm program, improvements, and an expansion of Food for Peace . . . our economic and military commitments to preserve freedom in Vietnam and other parts of the world have been courageously honored.

Johnson's faith in America: "The treasure of America today as always is its young people. We must not permit that treasure to be lost or wasted."—Feb. 22, 1963.

"I happen to believe that a strong, vibrant economy is as essential to our leadership of the free world as the military hardware."—Dec. 13, 1963.

"This nation is going to be solvent, because this Administration believes that you can be frugal and thrifty without being reactionary."—Jan. 28, 1964.

" . . . we do not intend to allow the tempo of America's unprecedented prosperity to ever muffle the cries of those who are denied a fair share of it."—Apr. 24, 1964

"If a nation is to keep its freedom it must be prepared to risk war. When necessary, we will take that risk. But as long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace."—June 20, 1964

"The task of achieving a life of quality and dignity in rural as well as in urban America is one that will engage our minds and our energies for a lifetime . . . the unparalleled harvest of today's rural America has been achieved because our ancestors said this too was a reasonable goal."—Feb. 4, 1965

"Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit."—Feb. 8, 1965

"America has become a highly urbanized nation, and we must face the many meanings of this new America . . . in the next 35 years, we must literally build a second America—putting in place as many houses, schools, apartments, parks and offices as we have built through all the time since the Pilgrims arrived on these shores. . . ."—Sept. 9, 1965

"Our beautiful America was built by a nation of strangers. From a hundred different places or more, they have poured forth into an empty land, joining and blending into one mighty and irresistible tide."—Oct. 3, 1965

"The . . . most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions. For a peaceful world order will be possible only when each country walks the way

that it has chosen to walk for itself."—Jan. 12, 1966

"We have threatened no one, and we will not. We seek the end of no regime, and we will not. Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack we will reply. We have measured the strength and weakness of others, and we think we know our own. . . . We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy and we are too young to be tired. We are too strong for fear and too determined for retreat."—Feb. 23, 1966

"Our goal is not just a job for every worker. Our goal is to place every worker in a job where he utilizes his full productive potential, for his own and for society's benefit."—Mar. 8, 1966

"This Administration has pledged that as long as racial discrimination denies opportunity and equal rights in America, we will honor our Constitutional and moral responsibility to restore the balance of justice."—Apr. 28, 1966

"Let us start here and now to build a new ideal of what ought to be the meaning of growing old. Let us here proclaim a bill of rights for older Americans. Let us make it our guide in the years ahead. . . ."—June 3, 1966

"Our Nation is stronger today than ever before. We need not, indeed we dare not, forsake our basic goals of peace, prosperity, and progress. The pursuit of peace is essential for the continued advancement of our Nation and all mankind. Prosperity and progress will lead us toward a society where all can share in the bounty of nature and the products of man's ingenuity and creativity. . . ."—Jan. 24, 1967

Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States

Life: born in Wallace, South Dakota, May 27, 1911 . . . education at Denver College of Pharmacy, University of Minnesota, Louisiana State University . . . married Muriel Buck . . . four children.

Career: Mayor of Minneapolis, Minn. United States Senator . . . Senate Majority Whip . . . elected Vice President, 1964 . . . serves as Chairman, President's Council on Equal Opportunity, Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, National Aeronautics and Space Council, Council on Youth Fitness, Economic Opportunity Council, and the National Security Council

Accomplishments and goals: authored legislation that created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Peace Corps, Food Stamp Program, Food for Peace Program, National Defense Education Act, Drug Regulation Act, International Health Act . . . as Majority Whip he played leading role in the enactment of every major bill during the Kennedy-Johnson Administration.

Humphrey on America's future: "I am one who believes this nation is as strong, not as the Chase National Bank, not as the stock market, not even as the great powerful corporations, but the nation is only as strong as the productivity, the intelligence, the health, and the education of its people."

"We do not seek to make America strong for purposes of aggression, but actually to safeguard freedom. We do not want America's wealth just for the purpose of luxury, but rather for the enrichment of life; yes, the beautification of our country and the betterment of our education, the improvement of our cultural standards and cultural institutions, so that the wealth, the economic wealth of an economic system is in a sense partially used to bring about the spiritual wealth of a social structure."

"I believe the people of America . . .

Desire a safer more peaceful world for themselves and their children;

Support the efforts of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration to expand the full rights of citizenship everywhere in this country;

Seek an end to poverty and deprivation for all peoples everywhere;

Want to provide security and dignity to our elderly;

Desire to improve and expand our educational system to prepare every child for a wholesome and productive life;

Seek to transform our cities into pleasant, stimulating and decent communities.

"The hard facts of life are simply these: we cannot afford to be anything but a prosperous, booming America. We must have increased productivity, rising sales, increased employment, higher wages and bigger profits. Only under these conditions does the Great Society have meaning. These goals are clearly within reach. Our free-enterprise economy still possesses an enormous capacity to grow—and thereby to contribute to greater economic and social justice for every citizen."

Adlai E. Stevenson

Life: Born in Los Angeles, California, February 5, 1900 . . . educated at Princeton University . . . married Ellen Borden . . . three sons . . . died July 14, 1965, in London.

Career: reporter and lawyer . . . Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy during World War II . . . Assistant to the Secretary of State . . . delegate to the United Nations Governor of Illinois . . . Democratic candidate for President in 1952 and 1956 . . . U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. from 1961 to 1965.

Achievements: helped rebuild Italian economy after World War II . . . helped get United Nations Organization under way . . . as Governor of Illinois, built new roads and schools, reorganized the Mental Health Program, strengthened the civil service, achieved Constitutional reforms, and effected numerous economies to balance the budget . . . as Democratic spokesman and United Nations Ambassador, Stevenson won worldwide admiration for his integrity, eloquence, and humanitarian vision.

Stevenson on the struggle against communism: "The preservation of the free world hangs upon our ability to win the allegiance of those millions and millions of people throughout the world who have not yet made their choice between our democratic system, on the one hand, and the promises which Communism offers, on the other. That choice will be mainly shaped by our own performance. It will turn upon such things as our ability to avoid the disruptions of depression, to guarantee equality of opportunity, to narrow the gulfs separating economic status, to preserve freedom of thought and action, to make democracy accord in practice with its premise and professions of faith . . . No one can be certain about the meaning of peace. But we all can be certain about the meaning of war. The future is still open—open for disaster, if we seek peace cheaply or meanly, but open for real peace if we seek it bravely and nobly."

Alfred E. Smith

Life: born in New York City, December 30, 1873 . . . no formal education . . . married Catherine Dunn . . . five children . . . died October 4, 1944, in New York City.

Career: trucking hand and fish peddler . . . member of New York State Assembly . . . Sheriff of New York County . . . Governor of New York, 1918 to 1920 and 1922 to 1928 . . . Democratic candidate for President in 1928.

Achievements: as Governor: factory safety laws, child welfare programs, housing and mental institutions, veteran's bonus . . . revised New York State Constitution and reorganized the State Government.

Al Smith on religion in politics: "I can think of no greater disaster to this country than to have the voters of it divide upon religious lines. Nothing could be so out of

line with the spirit of America . . . I do not wish any member of my faith in any part of the United States to vote for me on any religious grounds. I want them to vote for me only when in their hearts and consciences they become convinced that my election will promote the best interests of our country. By the same token, any person who votes against me simply because of my religion is not, to my way of thinking, a good citizen . . . The absolute separation of State and Church is part of the fundamental basis of our Constitution. I believe in that separation, and in all that it implies. That belief must be a part of the fundamental faith of every true American."

James M. Cox

Life: born March 31, 1870, at Jacksonburg, Ohio . . . married Margaretta Blair . . . four children . . . died July 15, 1957.

Career: school teacher, reporter, newspaper publisher, author . . . Congressman . . . Governor of Ohio, 1913-15, 1917-21 . . . Democratic candidate for President in 1920.

Achievements: as Governor of Ohio, achieved workmen's compensation, budget reform, school reorganization, public utility regulation and state banking code.

Cox on democratic progress: "Some people have been saying of late: 'We are tired of progress, we want to go back to where we were before; to go about our business; to restore "normal" conditions.' They are wrong. This is not the wish of America. We can never go back . . . For our eyes are trained ahead—forward to better new days . . . We cannot anchor our ship of state in this world tempest, nor can we return to the placid harbor of long years ago. We must go forward or founder."

Williams Jennings Bryan

Life: born in Salem, Illinois, March 19, 1860 . . . married Mary Elizabeth Baird . . . three children . . . died at Dayton, Tennessee, July 26, 1925.

Career: editor, orator, reporter and lawyer . . . Colonel in the Spanish-American War . . . Congressman from Nebraska . . . Secretary of State under Wilson . . . Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1896, 1900 and 1908.

Achievements: fought the gold standard and protection in trade . . . foe of imperialism and trusts . . . as Secretary of State, worked for arbitration as method for peaceful settlement of international dispute . . . instrumental in establishment of popular election of Senators, the Income Tax, Woman Suffrage and the Department of Labor.

Bryan on the importance of agriculture: "Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow on the streets of every city in the country."

Samuel J. Tilden

Life: born in New Lebanon, New York, February 9, 1814 . . . educated at University of New York City . . . unmarried . . . died in Yonkers, New York, August 4, 1886.

Career: lawyer and essayist . . . chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee . . . member of the New York Assembly . . . reform Governor of New York . . . Democratic candidate for President in 1876.

Achievements: exposed the Tweed Ring in New York City . . . fought corruption in State and in the Grant Administration.

Tilden on the dangers of corrupt government: "Eliminating corruption does not alone effect the saving of dollars and cents. You cannot preserve your present system of government unless you purify administration and purify legislation. The evils of corrupt government are not confined to the taking of money from the people to enrich those who are not entitled to its enjoyment, but the growth of such a system saps all pub-

lic virtue and all public morality; and at last 'a government of the people, and for the people' will cease to exist."

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Florida for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding. My inquiry is, what is the time allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement that will bind the Senate in the morning for the consideration of the so-called Hruska amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two hours, one hour to each side.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I propound another parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the time agreed upon for the debate upon final passage of the bill, and how much of that time remains?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may answer that question, there was 2 hours on the bill, the great majority of which, if not all of it, is still remaining.

It is anticipated, barring the offer of further amendments, that it is quite likely we will be able to finish within a 4-hour period after morning business is concluded.

However, the distinguished minority leader, on Friday last, did make a statement to the Senate that if further time was needed, it would be forthcoming; and I am sure that the Senator from Florida would agree to that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the majority leader and the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, by this amendment I am proposing the establishment in the Congress of a Joint Committee on Science and Technology because I feel strongly that the time is overdue for the Congress to organize itself in a manner enabling it to respond more adequately and intelligently to the challenge posed by the phenomenal growth of science and technology in this Nation in the past 25 years, and to take a greater lead in developing and guiding our national science policy.

It is now commonplace to recognize that we are living in the midst of a scientific revolution, the impact of which affects the lives of each and every citizen in profound and often unpredictable ways. This revolution is manifested particularly by developments in the military sciences, agriculture, medicine, biology, transportation, communications, new systems for the accumulation and retrieval of information, by the introduction of atomic power, and by the opening up of whole new areas of sci-

entific endeavor aimed toward the exploration and conquest of outer space.

The Federal Government has become deeply committed to and heavily involved in research and development programs in all these and many other areas. A recent National Science Foundation publication lists 35 departments and agencies supporting or engaged in scientific and technical research and development.¹

This involvement increasingly has become a major factor of our political life since the Second World War, when there first developed a national awareness of the essential relationship between the utilization of science and technology and the national welfare. According to figures compiled by the National Science Foundation, Federal expenditures for research and development in 1940 amounted to only \$74 million,² or less than 1 percent of the total Federal budget.³ By 1945 Federal R. & D. expenditures amounted to \$1,591 million, a little less than 2 percent of the Federal budget; by 1960 to \$7,738 million or 10 percent of the budget and by 1965 to \$14,875 million, or 15 percent—a level at which such expenditures have been fairly consistently maintained.⁴

Concomitant with the growth of Federal support has been a great expansion on the body of related knowledge and information. However, because of our highly compartmentalized congressional committee structure, with its dispersed legislative authorities and jurisdictions, I find it difficult to obtain the comprehensive information describing the total Federal, scientific, and technical effort. And, although the Appropriations Committees of both Houses review all Federal spending, I have found it impossible, even as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to gain an overall picture of our research and development programs because the enormity of the Federal budget necessitates its apportionment among the various appropriations subcommittees.

In the Congress as a whole, scientific and technical programs are reviewed in a fragmented manner by various committees and subcommittees, according to their jurisdiction over specific departments or agencies. As revealed in a survey made in 1965 by the Science Policy Research Division of the Legislative Reference Service, there are in the House and Senate combined a total of 32 committees and 109 subcommittees having jurisdictional interest in scientific and technological activities.⁵ These in-

¹ National Science Foundation. *Federal Funds for Research, Development and Other Scientific Activities*. Vol. XV, NSF 66-25. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, pp. 82-83. (The Departments of Defense, Army, Navy and Air Force are counted separately.)

² *Loc cit.*, p. 4.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Donnelly, Warren H. and Brezina, Dennis W. *Listing of Congressional Committees and Subcommittees Indicating Jurisdictional Interests in Scientific and Technological Activities*. Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, 89th Congress, 1st session, 1965, 28 pages.

clude a number of subcommittees in each House which exercise oversight of the Government's research and development activities. The problem is not, therefore, one of a lack of review, but a lack of coordination of reviews.

For this reason, I am advocating the establishment within the Congress of a Joint Committee on Science and Technology which, although lacking in legislative authority and jurisdiction, would be empowered to review Federal scientific and technical programs on a continuing basis, and could make recommendations to the appropriate committees having jurisdiction over specific agency programs, to the Congress as a whole, and to the executive agencies and departments.

What is perhaps most important, it would provide a congressional focal point for the gathering of relevant, significant, and detailed information on all governmental and nongovernmental scientific and technical plans and programs. Thus centralized, this information would become more readily accessible to all the Members. This is essential to our purposes as the number of pressing bills dealing with science and technology grows with each congressional session. A very significant indicator of this legislative activity is contained in a recent bibliography of congressional publications prepared in the Legislative Reference Service entitled "An Inventory of Congressional Concern With Research and Development."⁶ Although it deals only with the 88th Congress and the first session of the 89th, it is 120 pages long and contains approximately 1,400 entries.

We of the Congress will increasingly be called upon to make major decisions with respect to our support of science and technology. These will be among the most significant we have ever faced, for, not only are vast expenditures involved, but the scientists have warned us that our very survival on this earth has become more completely dependent than ever before on the wise use of scientific knowledge.

The most politically sophisticated of the scientists recognize that many problems are created by technological developments that they alone cannot solve; that there are social, economic, and political considerations involved in the decisions that have to be taken; and that the Members of Congress, who daily make decisions in which all these considerations have to be weighed, must bring their practical experience to bear upon them.

Certainly we of the Congress do not wish to hamper our national scientific progress in any way, but I consider it our duty to see to it that our Federal scientific programs are more thoroughly coordinated, systematically prosecuted, and economically administered; to help formulate national goals and objectives;

⁶ U.S. Congress, Senate. Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Government Research. Committee Print: *An Inventory of Congressional Concern with Research and Development: a Bibliography*. 89th Congress, 2d session. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, 120 pages.

and to clarify the scope of Government involvement in scientific activities.

More specifically, we shall have to consider such problems as the establishment of priorities in terms of our national goals for support of programs in space, agriculture, health services, education, oceanography, and so forth. We shall have to determine how best to allocate our resources in terms of scientific manpower, money, facilities, and natural resources. These are not unlimited, and choices will have to be made as to how best they are to be utilized for maximum public benefit.

We should examine the relationship between governmental and nongovernmental organizations engaged in scientific and technical pursuits to find what measure of cooperation exists between them.

There is the problem of distributing Federal research grants and contracts in a manner that will be geographically equitable without sacrificing the quality of research obtained.

All these problems and issues can be considered adequately and responsibly only if the Congress provides itself with such machinery as I propose in the form of a Joint Committee on Science and Technology where a proper perspective can be achieved by viewing them in the context of total governmental and nongovernmental involvement.

It is frequently said in the Congress that too much power has shifted to the executive branch of the Government. I believe that we have been somewhat at fault, because in the past we have been prone to accept programs which are conceived in and proposed by the executive branch with too little question, and this is especially true of programs having major scientific and technical content. Furthermore, we must realize that the executive branch perhaps responded to the challenge of modern science and technology with more foresight than we. Within the Executive Office of the President there is a Special Assistant for Science and Technology, the President's Science Advisory Committee, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Through these bodies the Executive has immeasurably strengthened its hand both with respect to shaping national science policy and to drafting legislation designed to implement that policy.

However, despite the establishment of the above-mentioned offices, the executive branch has not demonstrated that it is able to guarantee the efficient management of Federal programs or their effective intergovernmental coordination. For example in a recent case study of Federal laboratory resources, significant management deficiencies were revealed. I quote from the report:

The Federal Government appears to know only approximately how many laboratories it has, where they are, what kinds of people work there, and what they are doing. Equipment is purchased, capitalized, and often forgotten. It seldom appears to reenter the management purview as a cost of laboratory operation. The laboratories themselves appear to be eternal. As national goals change, as agency missions shift to meet new public needs, and as the public becomes aware of these needs, new laboratories are created and

present laboratories expand. Rarely are existing laboratories cut back or terminated. There is little evidence to suggest that Federal laboratories are treated as a national resource to be continuously challenged by the assignment of important problems, requiring a continuing appraisal of capabilities and alternative courses of action.⁷

With specific reference to laboratories working on environmental pollution the report states:

It was learned that well in excess of 1,000 projects related to research and development on environmental pollution are being conducted in from 100 to 200 installations in at least 9 agencies and departments. In many instances this work was indicated as being unrelated to the primary missions of either the laboratories or the agencies.⁸

And suggested that—

This situation may prevail for many multi-agency programs of the Federal Government.⁹

It becomes apparent, therefore, that the Congress must assume greater responsibility for the thorough surveillance of Federal scientific and technical programs, and for suggesting new courses of action and fresh approaches to problems. We shall also have to demand more adequate accounting from the executive branch with regard to its conduct of its research and development programs. That it has been deficient in this respect has been acknowledged within the executive branch itself. In the words of Mr. William D. Carey:

If the Congress feels starved for facts, if it is baffled at finding science behind every bureaucratic rock, if it fails to see intrinsic merit in the more arcane nooks of basic science, if it hunts vainly for signs of a broad strategy for science, if it cannot identify priorities for scientific choice, we have ourselves to blame.¹⁰

The bill I propose would require submission by the President of an annual report, similar in nature to the Economic Report now rendered periodically to the Joint Economic Committee. This report would be reviewed by means of hearings to be held by the Joint Committee on Science and Technology. It should describe all relevant plans and programs and the steps being taken to insure their efficient management, such as the extent of the application of cost-benefit analyses; outline the methods being used to effect coordination within the Government and between the Government and nongovernmental organizations; account for expenditures each fiscal year; and estimate anticipated future expenditures.

With respect to the latter, I feel it especially important that the executive branch be required to provide information to Congress on its long-range scientific and technical planning in order that we may get a more definite idea of the

⁷ U.S. Congress, House. Committee on Government Operations, Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee. Committee Print: *A Case Study of the Utilization of Federal Laboratory Resources*. 89th Congress, 2d session. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, p. 56.

⁸ *loc. cit.*, p. 59.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Carey, William D. *A Proposal for a Yearly Presidential Report on Science*. Saturday Review of Literature, November 6, 1965, p. 57.

extent of the commitment of public funds and resources that may be involved in future plans and programs which we will be asked to support. The executive branch has been reluctant to inform us along these lines, but I think it altogether necessary that we receive such information if Congress is to fulfill the responsibilities imposed upon it by the Constitution to promote the general welfare of the American people. And, as a consequence, I should hope to see a more creative relationship develop between the executive and legislative branches of Government in the interest of obtaining the greatest public good and healthy economic growth through wiser utilization of all our resources.

Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the manager of the bill, the Senator from Oklahoma, and he has informed me that although he thought this might pertain somewhat to the bill, he did not feel that he could accept this amendment. I should like to inquire of him at this time if he is still of that mind, or if he has yet seen the great light.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague, the Senator from Colorado, for the opportunity of hearing his address on this very much needed joint committee operation which he has so clearly outlined. He has made a very important proposal.

Had we had the advantage of this matter prior to the last day of the discussion on the bill, which has taken some 3 or 4 weeks of the Senate's time, I believe that would have been very helpful to the Senate. However, as the Senator knows, we have just about com-

pleted the actions on the bill. I wish the distinguished Senator would present this matter to the legislative committee, the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I am sure would be glad to hear and consider it. Without any testimony having been given in the joint committee, the House would be completely oblivious to the reasons given by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado for the establishment of this committee, and therefore I would appreciate his withholding action on it at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator. He has been completely frank, and I am not surprised at his remarks, but I appreciate them, anyway.

Mr. President, this being the situation, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If this amendment is introduced as a bill, will it go to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would have to study that matter.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am prepared to discuss the matter privately, with the Parliamentarian and with the Chair, at the conclusion of the session.

I will withdraw the amendment at this time.

I should like to announce for the benefit of the Senate that this bill was introduced last summer. It is a matter on which I have been working a long time, and, much to my surprise, I found a very great and wide interest in it all over the United States.

Therefore, in view of the present situation, parliamentary and otherwise, I will withdraw the amendment. But I also wish to announce that I will introduce this amendment as a bill on

Wednesday, March 15, and I would be happy to have such Senators who are interested and would desire to cosponsor it contact my office in the meantime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 120

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the clerk will report the Hruska amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 4, in the table of contents, strike out all matter relating to title V of the bill.

On page 4, in the table of contents, strike out "TITLE VI" and insert in lieu thereof "TITLE V".

On page 4, in the table of contents, strike out "SEC. 601." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 501."

Beginning with line 8, page 118, strike out all to and including line 18, page 124.

On page 125, line 1, strike out "TITLE VI" and insert in lieu thereof "TITLE V".

On page 125, line 3, strike out "SEC. 601" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 501".

On page 125, line 8, immediately after the words "title III," insert "and".

On page 125, line 9, strike out ", and title V."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 7, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mrs. Katie Callaham's 100th Birthday
March 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, March 11, marks the 100th birthday anniversary of Mrs. Katie Callaham, who now resides at Hillhaven Convalescent Home, 2210 East First Street, Santa Ana, Calif.

Mrs. Callaham lived in Orange County for over 40 years, and her sons, daughters, grandchildren, and great grandchildren all live near her. A reception will be held in her honor on Sunday, March 12.

It is a great accomplishment to reach such an age, and particularly when one considers the comparative hardships which Mrs. Callaham's generation experienced in their younger years.

President Johnson will join me in sending a congratulatory message to pay tribute to my constituent on that special occasion.

Society for Nondestructive Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year, the western New York section of the Society for Nondestructive Testing will hold its first symposium, at Erie County Technical Institute in Williamsville, N.Y.

I believe that this group—first organized a quarter century ago at Canisius College in Buffalo, N.Y.—deserves national recognition at this time.

Its first symposium comes in a day when the entire Nation is concerned about air and water pollution and the dangerous results of jet-radiated energy. And its 25-year history has placed it in high regard as a national pioneering group.

Founded after the college offered a training program in X-ray inspection of war materials during World War II, its members are highly trained and respected scientists. I feel that their pres-

ence in western New York is a boon to those associated with the many industrial and technical activities of the area, as well as to the Nation at large.

Salute to Morocco, America's Longtime
Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our Nation's history there are several sovereign States which have bonded with us since our inception and kept that alliance and friendship.

Morocco is one of those nations. So on this, the Moroccan National Day, I would like to join other Americans in extending a hand of gratitude for this friendship and alliance.

The bonds that have been welded between our two nations is not a new one. Nor one formed out of expediency.