HUAC: Where Is the Money Going—Let's Review the Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, as the 90th Congress reviews with a fine tooth comb the appropriation requests of Federal agencies, I suggest we also take a hard look at the appropriation request of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

During the 89th Congress I expressed my view that the proper functions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities could and should be transferred to the Judiciary Committee. I continue this stand with an increasing number of my colleagues in supporting legislation to bring about this transfer of functions.

During the 89th Congress, HUAC's appropriation was $845,000—a figure exceeded by only three standing committees of the House—Government Operations, Education and Labor, and Public Works. It is also interesting to note that notwithstanding this extremely high appropriation, only eight original bills were referred to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

An analysis of the bills referred to the House Committee on Un-American Activities reveals that the House Judiciary Committee might have handled these measures with the necessary expertise required by the legislation. I believe the appropriate forum for discussion of these issues is the House Administration Committee which has already cut $50,000 from the $400,000 appropriation requested by the committee.

For these reasons I have joined with a number of colleagues in voting to recommit House Resolution 221 with instructions to hold a public hearing thereon.

The House Administration Committee could conduct hearings on this appropriation request, while HUAC functions with funds on hand, and thereafter pending report of the committee on a month-to-month appropriation. In this way the work of the committee could continue while the House examines the high appropriation request.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of this committee graciously understated the committee's continuation as one that would "only muddy the waters." Further protesting its existence were 90 distinguished law professors who suggested that the committee "is jeopardizing the prestige and public respect for the House of Representatives."

Those who defend the conduct of the House Committee on Un-American Activities should consider the benefits of transferring its proper functions to the Judiciary Committee which is composed of attorneys and whose jurisdiction extends to the protection of constitutional rights of the individual. If a proper balance is to be maintained between the protection of individual rights and the conduct of congressional hearings on legislation relating to the internal security of the United States, what better committee to meet these responsibilities than the Judiciary Committee?

The constitutional arguments against certain practices of HUAC have been raised and will be raised in the courts as well as in the Congress. In addition I believe we should consider the high appropriation request and examine the purposes for which the funds would be spent; hearings dealing with the plans of the committee would certainly provide a forum in which to air these and other problems.

The increasing number of House Members who have sponsored or support legislation to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee and transfer its proper functions to the Judiciary Committee illustrates the need for hearings on this proposal.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We know that in everything God works for good with those who love Him.—Romans 8: 28.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, from whom we come, with whom we live, and unto whom our spirits return, may we feel the tap of Thy finger upon our shoulders and the touch of Thy spirit upon our hearts as we this moment lift ourselves unto Thee in prayer.

Always art Thou with us—always. Help us to become more aware of Thy presence renewing our faith in the goodness of life, restoring our spirits to the comfort of Thy love, and reinvigorating our minds with fresh and positive thoughts.

We do not pray for relief from heavy responsibilities but for a release of Thy power which will help us to meet them with honor; not for fewer burdens but for greater strength to manage them with patience; not for less trouble but for more trust in Thee which will help us to master trouble with confidence. In all of life may we be more than conquerors through Him who loves us. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 623. An act to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2536) entitled "An act to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FANNIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL STABILITY ACHIEVED IN REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years the Republic of Korea has achieved unprecedented political and social stability, accompanied by marked economic progress. The story of what is happening in Korea under the administration of President Chung Hee Park, who was elected to office in 1963, is of great importance to the United States because it proves the success of our foreign policy as exercised in that southeastern Asia nation.

The story is told in a series of articles written by Booth Mooney, who recently visited Korea, and distributed to newspapers in the United States by King Features Syndicate. Under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD the first of these articles:

KOREA: TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Booth Mooney)

SEOUL, KOREA.—President Chung Hee Park of the Republic of Korea is a head of state who has presided over the rebirth of his nation.

Six years ago Korea was torn by internal dissension, beset by violent student uprisings, and threatened by a revolution that would have encouraged the Communists to come pouring in from the north. The nation's economy was in tatters. Its government was corrupt and incompetent.

Today Korea has achieved political and social stability such as the country has never known in its long history.

This achievement has been accompanied by tremendous economic progress. During the last five years the real gross national production, population growth taken into consideration, has shown an average annual increase of nine per cent.

Korea is a nation on the move.

President Park, the army general who led the bloodless revolution of May 16, 1961, and who, after heading a military government for two and one-half years, was elected President Oct. 15, 1963, told a recent visitor from the United States that the forward movement is only getting well started.

In a rare exclusive interview granted to a foreign journalist, President Park said he is continuing to call on the people of Korea to practice diligence, frugality and saving.

"Our nation is faced by three great problems," he declared.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

"We continue to be threatened by Communist aggression. The Korean people know from tragic experience the destructive force of such aggression.

"Korea, as one of the backward nations economically, has to tackle the problem of economic development to eradicate poverty and enhance the standard of living and fulfill the aspirations of the people.

"A third effort must be directed toward continuing to develop democratic institutions for the Korean people."

A few days earlier, in concluding his state of the nation message to the National Assembly, the president had said, "In a distant future, when our grandchildren shall ask what this generation has done for them, we can reply with pride and without hesitation: We have worked and worked, with a faith in the modernization of our country."

President Park, a quiet man of 49 who exudes force and determination, started his career as a school teacher. But, like U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson, he cut that career short—in his case, to embark on a military career.

In 1940 he entered the Manchukuo Military Academy for a two-year elementary course. Graduating from the academy at the head of his class in 1942, he enrolled in the advanced course of the Japanese Imperial Military Academy. After the liberation of Korea from Japan in 1945, he entered the Korean Military Academy and soon received a captain's commission.

Park advanced upward in rank during and after the Korean War of the early 1950's. He was a full general when he left the army in August, 1963, to accept nomination as the presidential candidate of the Democratic Republican Party.

This party has just nominated him as its candidate for a second term. The presidential election will be held in May.

President Park has visited the United States several times.

In 1953–54, as an artillery officer, he attended the U.S. Army Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla. In November, 1961, when he was chairman of the military group in charge of the Korean government, he came to the United States at the invitation of President John F. Kennedy.

Two years later he attended the late president's funeral service, also conferring with President Johnson. He returned, accompanied by Mrs. Park, for a 10-day visit in May, 1965.

Last November, on his Asian tour, President Johnson repaid the visit.

President Park feels that a strong kinship exists between the Republic of Korea and the United States.

"In the Korean War, the United States showed a noble spirit in helping to repel Communist aggression," Park told his American visitor. "Now this leader of the free world is showing the same spirit in Vietnam. We are proud that we can help."

South Korea has sent 45,000 troops and 10,000 technicians to fight and work in Vietnam. Its contribution of manpower there is greater than that of any nation other than the United States.

"We sent our soldiers to fight in Vietnam in fulfillment of our international obligations and in the cause of anti-Communist justice," the president said.

President Park also expressed appreciation for the economic aid his nation has received from the U.S.

More than $3 billion in economic and technical assistance has gone to the Republic of Korea since the armistice that halted the war in mid-1953. Supporting assistance has declined sharply during the last two years. Technical assistance and development loans are still provided in substantial amounts.

President Park is leading his nation in an adventure of economic and social progress. The goals are to improve living conditions, provide more food, build a broad industrial base, create more employment, educate more people, and build sound social institutions to promote the general welfare.

"No country can ultimately succeed in such a tremendous task except by its own efforts," the quiet-voiced man who heads the government declared. "Korea must be able to stand on her own feet."

President Park's greatest achievement perhaps is that his administration has given the people of Korea hope and confidence. They feel they are going somewhere.

"Our nation," Park said in his state of the nation address, "a full century after it first came into contact with the West, and after a period of international isolation and Asiatic stagnation, has finally come to assume a positive role of giving guidance and direction in the Asian-Pacific region."

HELP? SAY IT AIN'T SO

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I have had a few "well-chosen words," to say on the subject of Federal grants for comic-strip studies and other assorted and sundry purposes approved by the National Foundation on Arts and the Humanities.

Predictably, my comments have drawn the wrath of the Washington Post and a colleague from New Jersey. Another Federal grant has now come to my attention, and not wishing to be guilty of "know-nothingism" as alleged by the former, or "McCarthyism" as alleged by the latter, I am asking for nationwide help in tracking down the Federal agency which has seen fit to award a grant in the amount of $121,000 to "find out exactly what it is about the way people speak that makes other people approve or disapprove of them." According to an Associated Press story from East Lansing, Mich., Prof. Roger Shuy, of Michigan State University, is being paid $121,000 to find out why people say "ain't" when they should say "aren't."

But, alas, the wire service story neglected to say which Federal agency is involved. Could it be the National Foundation on Arts and the Humanities, or the National Science Foundation, or perhaps even the CIA?

I have initiated an inquiry with the Office of Higher Education, but knowing what administrative "jungles" lie ahead, I realize the money may all be spent before we find out the source of the funding through the usual channels. Therefore, I call upon all sleuths, detectives, reporters, and all those who would save the Nation from bankruptcy, to lend a hand. The clues are admittedly meager. I can offer no reward, except for the undying gratitude of millions of taxpayers, whose annual settlements with the Internal Revenue Service, a few days hence, are sure to leave them saying, "Say it ain't so."

To paraphrase the article which follows: "I ain't about to stop my effort to restore some sanity to Federal spending, no matter who don't care."

DON'T TALK BAD IF YOU WANT SUCCESS

EAST LANSING, Mich.—If you say "He don't," "They ain't," and "Nobody learned me how to talk good," the grammar books will say you're wrong, but Roger Shuy may not.

The Michigan State University linguist advocates two kinds of English—a comfortable everyday kind for around the house and a more formal kind, to impress the boss, for example.

He aims not to eliminate "ain't," but to make sure you know that to gain social and economic status there are times when you should say "aren't."

Shuy, backed by a $121,540 federal grant, is busy trying to find out exactly what it is about the way people speak that makes other people approve or disapprove of them.

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE EFFICIENCY AND ELIMINATE POLITICAL ACTIVITY IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1967, I introduced H.R. 5877, to increase the efficiency of, and eliminate political activity in, the Post Office Department.

Among other things, the bill provides that the Postmaster General shall be removed from the President's Cabinet and I am pleased to note this proposal has now been endorsed by Postmaster General O'Brien.

In what was described as a major policy address yesterday, the Postmaster General suggested that the Post Office Department be removed from the President's Cabinet and that the Department be converted into a nonprofit Government corporation.

When I introduced H.R. 5877, I had this to say:

The general purpose of this legislation is to create a climate and attitude of independence from political influence among the top echelons of the Post Office Department.

The Postmaster General and his immediate subordinates will be in a position to conduct the affairs of the Department with greater efficiency on a businesslike basis with consideration only for the needs of the American people.

A Government activity as large and as complex as the Post Office Department, with more than 700,000 employees and with a $6.8 billion in annual appropriations, certainly is not the kind of Government establishment which will survive sufficiently and effectively without complete divorcement from political influences, pressures, and demands.

Although Postmaster General O'Brien has not translated his ideas into legislative language, his remarks—at a luncheon meeting of the Magazine Publishers Association and American Society of Magazine Editors—indicate that he supports the general purpose of my bill. I congratulate him and urge that we get on with the job.

We have the vehicle to proceed—H.R. 5877 and the identical bills my colleagues have introduced—and I would hope that early hearings will be scheduled on the legislation. During the hearings, I am

sure every consideration would be given to any constructive amendments the Postmaster General might suggest.

SERIOUS CHOICES THAT FARMERS FACE IN 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, delegates to the National Farmers Union met recently in Oklahoma City at their 65th annual convention. The Oklahoma Farmers Union, largest State unit in the national organization, and headed by Mr. George Stone, served as host to the 3,000 delegates attending.

In a speech before the convention, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman outlined to the delegates the very serious choices that farmers face in 1969, when most of the present voluntary commodity legislation expires. He also gave the results of a professional study conducted by Dr. Walter Wilcox, the Department's Director of Agricultural Economics, on the effect of commodity legislation on farm prices, income, and farmland values.

I believe that Members will be interested in his remarks and under leave to extend my remarks I include the Secretary's speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN

Here in the Sooner State the spirit of Will Rogers still lives, although he has been gone from us for more than 30 years.

I have often asked myself why this man made such an impact on all of us. I suspect that it's because Will Rogers continues to recall for us the frontier experience of meeting and enduring hardship, and doing it with grace and wit and, ultimately, success.

Will Rogers still is close to us in Washington. The Congress was his favorite subject and he especially liked to direct his kindly wit toward the House of Representatives.

On one occasion when he was in the Capitol Building, he noticed the statue of the great Cherokee scholar, Sequoya. His guide pointed out that Oklahoma—like each of the other states—was entitled to have statues of two of its sons in the hall, but that so far, Oklahoma had placed only one.

Someone then said: "Mr. Rogers, perhaps *your* statue will be here someday."

Will answered: "Well, if they ever put my statue in here, stand me where I can keep my eye on the House of Representatives."

And later on, that's just what they did. Will Rogers' statue stands today facing the door to the House Chamber. He's keeping his eye on the House of Representatives.

If Will Rogers were alive today, he would be pleased to know that another great Oklahoman, Carl Albert, also is keeping his eye on that Chamber—as House Majority Leader.

Will Rogers helped us through some dark times in the early 1930's. He was especially concerned about the condition of farmers. If he were around today, he would find a vastly different agriculture—and a vastly more hopeful future for farmers.

Not everything we might have wished for agriculture has been accomplished, of course. But much *has* been achieved, and we are still working hard to improve. One of the tremendous forces in these accomplishments has been the National Farmers Union and the succession of great leaders you have been blessed with over the past 65 years.

Sixty-five years young—but always the forward look, the positive look, the positive action, the dynamic approach. That's been the National Farmers Union for two-thirds of a century. It is for this reason, especially, that I am pleased to have a part in your program once again—just as I have six times before, and as I did a half dozen times before that at your state conventions in Minnesota.

In six years—together—we have worked a change in farm policy and farm programs greater than any since the early New Deal. We have removed the surplus and subsidy label once so firmly pinned to the farmer. We have seen a *basic shift* in the *supply-demand* balance for the key farm products. We have enjoyed the result—better income. We turned an *important corner* this year and pointed our production goals *up* instead of *down* for the first time in many years.

Many of these changes have become apparent only in the past 12 months—since we last met in Denver. But they have been on the horizon since 1961. You had a hand in all of this progress, and it is fitting we discuss it tonight.

But before we consider program directions, I want it on the record, loud and clear, that I am still dissatisfied and unhappy about farm prices and farm income. Farm income is far too low. I won't be satisfied until per capita farm income, now at $1,731, has climbed to non-farm levels, presently at $2,618 per capita.

It is unhealthy to allow such an unfair, uneconomic condition to continue. If we fail to achieve the parity of income that the farmer is entitled to earn, we will lose our best farmers, and this nation and a hungry world will suffer. I pledge to you that I will not quit fighting until we reach our goal—until parity of income for the adequate-sized American family farm is a reality.

I believe we can reach parity of income. We can even do it in this decade. Please note that I say "can"—not that we are certain to do so. But I am encouraged, for our progress has been real. As Ed Christianson pointed out at the Farm Policy Conference last month, 1966 was a good year for American agriculture. Gross farm income reached $49.5 billion—an all-time high. Net farm income at $16.3 billion was also the highest in history except for the post-war year of 1947. And net income per farm averaged $5,024—up 70 percent over 1960 and the highest in history.

This progress shows what we can do. National Farmers Union had a big hand in it. It would not have been possible without the five major commodity laws enacted with your support since 1960.

The elimination of surpluses and improvement in farm income show that our programs are working. The results built new public confidence in our programs. This new confidence is vital—for the public, in 1960, was ready to throw all farm programs in the ash can.

If we make as much progress in the final few years of this decade as we have in the past six, we will be close to our parity of income goal.

This year of 1967 marks the dawn of a new era in American agriculture.

The surpluses that all but suffocated us when I came to Washington in 1961 have been eliminated.

With virtually no government stocks on hand, with resale policies securely insulating the market from the small supplies in CCC hands, the government's role in the market is sharply diminished.

Farmers, operating under largely-voluntary commodity programs, today possess more freedom of choice than they have had since the early Triple-A days of the New Deal.

We have a four year program. In effect, we are operating under this mandate from the Congress: "Instead of changing programs each year, we enacted a four year program. Now that you have the stability you asked for, it's up to you to make it work."

All this means a new ball game for American agriculture.

With agriculture in such an historic period of transition, it is important to analyze carefully where we go from here.

The general public is more aware of the farm and food economy than for many years, both domestically and overseas. There is a greater realization that behind our abundance stands—not a factory or a machine—but a man and his family who farm the land, sustain the nation, and ask in return only the chance to share fairly in the nation's prosperity.

In recent weeks, we have tried to bring a maximum of agricultural wisdom to bear on the question of—"What's Ahead" and "Where Do We Go From Here"?

That was the purpose of last month's National Farm Policy Conference in Washington, to which National Farmers Union contributed so much.

The Conference concerned itself with choice—and fortunately, we live in a nation where people *do* have a choice, one in which popular attitudes and beliefs result in political action and public decision. This is an era in which we all have an opportunity to define alternatives and influence discussion.

Tonight, I would like to spell out what seems to be the broad alternatives available to us in future agricultural policy. There are an infinite variety of opinions on the detailed workings of programs. There are differing judgments on who should administer the programs, and how. But it seems to me that, when we lay out the broad essentials of policy, there are really only three broad alternatives when farm legislation comes up for consideration again in 1969.

The first is a combination of voluntary and mandatory programs to hold supply in line with demand thereby achieving fair prices in the market place.

This is what we have now. We are getting positive and measurable results with this approach. Our income is higher, and we will see still further improvements. We have made good progress in balancing supplies with need in grain, cotton, and tobacco. We have boosted farm exports consistently and sharply.

To keep our farm prices competitive in world markets—so that we can build foreign markets rather than lose them—and to provide the incentives to keep production in line with demand, Congress provided a system of direct payments to farmers. In effect, farmers rent some of their land to the government, in the national interest, when surpluses threaten. In this way, American farmers can tailor-make their output, meet world competition in terms of market price—yet continue to move toward parity returns.

With this voluntary approach, farmers have a maximum of choice in their farming decisions, and the market has a maximum role in determining prices. The market is more independent of government pricing now than in more than 30 years and we're able to maintain a small reserve of productive capacity without demoralizing farm markets and farm income.

The primary alternative to present programs is "no program at all".

The President of another national farm organization pledged his assistance *to this end* at the recent Farm Policy Conference. I believe that this alternative is a very real possibility—especially if we fail to develop unity and understanding among farm people themselves.

This is an ever present risk—not just one we face only in 1969. True, we are in only the second year of the four-year authoriza-

tions passed in 1965. But the laws are always susceptible to crippling amendments, and they can also be destroyed by withholding appropriations.

But the key date is probably just two years from now, when Congress will decide—

To continue and improve programs of the type we have now;

To alter them in basic ways;

Or to get rid of the programs altogether.

Two years is a very short time.

There is no question that the commodity programs will be under severe attack at that time—and between now and then. Already, many columnists and others have suggested that the Congress abolish the programs "because the surpluses are gone."

They overlook the key fact that supplies are down to manageable size largely *because* of the programs. They ignore the fact that in a free-for-all farm economy the hungry nations represent no market at all because they lack the money to buy. They ignore the fact that this nation continues to have a capacity to produce substantially more than effective demand. This excess capacity may not be with us forever, but it remains a real threat to farm prosperity for the years immediately ahead.

With these misunderstandings in mind, I asked Walter Wilcox, the distinguished economist of the Library of Congress, now the Department's Director of Agricultural Economics, for a new study on commodity programs in the years immediately ahead.

He and his associates, after consultations with leading economists at a number of universities, concluded that in the absence of adjustment and price support programs, rising production would drive prices down rapidly. By 1970, corn would fall to around 70 cents a bushel, cotton to 18 or 20 cents a pound. Soybean prices would probably drop to around $1.90 to $2.00 a bushel. Wheat would fall to about $1.00 to $1.10 per bushel.

Within a year or two, livestock supplies would also overburden the market and prices would fall. Prices would drop most heavily in hogs and poultry, less in dairy, with the effect on beef prices somewhere in between.

By 1970 the decline in the price level for livestock would be almost 10 percent. The overall price level for crops would decline more than 20 percent, but farm production expenses would continue to rise.

Without programs, net farm income might well fall by one-third, some $5 billion *below* the 1966 figure of $16.3 billion, or back to about 1957 levels.

In short, farmers would lose all of the income gains of a decade—and then some! Coupled with this would be the decline in farmers' net worth from dropping land values.

Earlier studies indicated that if commodity programs were abolished, farmers' net income would go down by about 50 percent. The new study predicts roughly a 30 percent decline. The difference between those "potentials for disaster" is in the fact that carryovers have been largely eliminated, and that our exports are establishing new records each year. If programs *had been* eliminated while those large stocks overhung the market, the magnitude of disaster would have been even worse than it would be now.

But I am sure everyone here agrees that a one-third drop in net income would be more than sufficient to close up the average family farm.

I repeat that this careful study—prepared with the advice and counsel of nationally recognized economists at nine major universities—indicates that the commodity programs will be needed if we are to continue our traditional system of family farming and move on toward a parity of income in the years immediately ahead.

A third alternative is high price supports and mandatory programs.

With this approach, the Government would guarantee high price supports all the way up and down the line—but with strict controls on bushels, bales, and poundage, rather than an acreage basis. The government could not long maintain a system of rigid high price supports *without* such controls—and at the same time avoid surpluses, high costs to the Treasury, and a certain demise for farm programs at the end of the road.

With mandatory programs, the government would be more deeply involved in agriculture and in market and commodity management than it is now.

Mandatory programs might work very well in maintaining farm income and in holding supplies in balance. But in order to sell overseas, we would again require large export subsidies. Even so, the cost to the Treasury of well-designed mandatory programs would be less than the present largely voluntary programs.

However, in order for mandatory, high-support programs to work—or even to be put into effect—they would have to have the support of farmers and the Congress, a support heretofore lacking.

In 1962, Congress rejected legislation that would have provided mandatory programs for feed grains. And in the 1963 referendum, wheat growers sharply rejected the mandatory wheat certificate program that Congress had passed. There is no reason to believe the Congress is more receptive now than it was then.

To sum up, then, these are the choices open to us:

A continuation of voluntary programs with price supports at realistic levels near the world market and direct payments to farmers who cooperate by taking land out of production when oversupply threatens,

A termination of commodity programs, or

Mandatory programs with strict Government controls on marketings.

We have to make a choice by 1969, and may be forced to fight for our choice at any time.

We are making progress in the course we are on. At the same time, the Secretary of Agriculture and many farmers are worried about the future. Sincere and searching questions are being raised.

Should we continue to perfect and improve upon what we have? Can we continue to improve farm income with current voluntary programs? Why have farm prices dropped each month for the last six months until today they are 9 percent below where they were 20 years ago? Can we overcome the cost-price squeeze? Should we instead move toward higher price support levels—recognizing that this would involve mandatory programs with a good deal of government control? Will farmers support tight controls?

Or should we be prepared to accept a termination of the program and go it alone in the free market?

Whatever course we follow in the future, the fact is that in 1967 we have a law to administer and programs to carry out. All of us, whether we like the programs or not, have a duty to carry them forward as well as we can—to seek ways of making them more effective in meeting their objectives.

Our mutual opportunity is to make these programs work to strengthen farm income. There are things the Farmers Union can do. There are things the USDA can do. There are things we can do together.

I have been deeply concerned with the decline of farm prices in recent months. The Department of Agriculture has taken these actions, among others, to continue our progress in improving farm income:

Price support rates on feed grains were increased by 5 percent for 1967. The upward adjustment in farm yields will have the effect of making price support payments 4 percent higher than without the yield adjustment.

Last year's increases in dairy support price from $3.24 to $4.00 have been continued through March 1968. Farmers will receive more for manufacturing milk in 1967 than they did in 1966 because of the higher support price. Government purchases of dairy products in recent months have been above a year earlier. Butter is back in the School Lunch Program.

We are preparing to take action to deal with the recent sharp increase in dairy imports.

CCC sales prices for grain are now at least 15 percent above support levels, and sales are virtually suspended since stocks are low.

The Department has acted within recent weeks to make soybeans from the 1966 crop eligible for resale, and to raise the minimum at which CCC will sell any soybeans it acquires. Price support on soybeans is now at $2.50, compared with $1.80 in 1960.

We look forward to a second successful year under the new cotton program. Farmer income under the 1966 program was about 25 percent above what it would have been had the 1965 program remained in effect. Meanwhile, surpluses are being cut by 5 million bales in one year. The future for cotton farmers is much brighter than it has been for a long time. We are, of course, concerned about the recent increase in textile imports. That question is getting a great deal of attention.

The Department is stepping up purchases of meat this spring, following a pattern which was so effective in 1964, when cattle prices were low. We are reactivating the purchase program for Choice beef roasts and ground beef to buy ahead for future use. We are extending purchases of canned chopped meat—which normally would have come to an end last month—for the same reasons. Since March 1, we have bought 7.2 million pounds of chopped meat for $3.1 million—with new offers being received this week.

For rice growers, the Department again announced a temporary increase of 10 percent in the national rice acreage allotment in 1967.

Wheat prices are off from the speculative high of last summer and fall. But wheat prices still are running well above last year and far above the 1966 loan rate. Cash receipts for the 1966–67 (July 1) marketing year are expected to be the highest in 20 years.

Returns per bushel of 1966 crop wheat will average about $2.13—that's market price plus certificate payments on 500 million bushels. Wheat farmers in Canada received an average (in U.S. dollars) of about $1.60 last year and will get just a little more this year through higher world market prices.

USDA will continue to seize every opportunity to improve farm prices. Operating as we are in a reasonably-balanced market, we are geared up to use of Section 32 purchases, P.L. 480 purchases, and various marketing helps as effectively as possible to strengthen prices.

We will continue to move aggressively in building farm exports, which in this marketing year will set a new record for the third straight year—around $7.1 billion. At least $5.5 billion of that will be for dollars. This is a new record as well, and one which is all-too-often overlooked when we're discussing farm income and what the Department is doing to improve it.

A decade ago, domestic farm policy was largely out of tune with exports—and our exports showed it. One of the important changes since 1960 has been to design and administer wheat, feed grain, and cotton programs to encourage a maximum flow into world trade.

We are pursuing overseas markets through unprecedented development efforts involving both Government and private enterprise. We are negotiating vigorously to get access

to markets closed to us by tariffs and trade restrictions.

During the past fiscal year we exported the produce of one acre out of every four harvested . . . over 60 percent of our wheat . . . the equivalent of 47 percent of our cash receipts from the feed grains . . . 42 percent of our soybean and bean-equivalent-of-oil, 20 percent of our cotton. We now have some 37 percent of the world wheat trade . . . almost half the world feed grain trade and over 90 percent of the world soybean trade.

None of this happened in a vacuum. Without it . . . without this giant, $7 billion market that American farmers have tapped, farm income would suffer severely. So let's not overlook it, and let's take a cold, hard look at any domestic farm proposals which would have the effect of crippling our race for this market.

Expansion of this export market, along with the domestic price support, adjustment, and purchase programs, is a basic Administration effort on behalf of American farmers.

These are some of the things USDA and this Administration are doing to bolster farm income. In the few minutes remaining, permit me to turn this around a little and ask *you* what *you* are doing to insure the best possible results from the program the Farmers Union fought so hard to enact.

I urge the National Farmers Union and other farm organizations to ask themselves whether they can do more to help farmers, and to help farmers help themselves.

I urge you to ask yourself the question: "How can the National Farmers Union—and your state organizations—do more to advise your members on marketing?"

Can you do more to interest farmers in their cooperatives and to help those co-ops build greater bargaining power? Farmers need it, and never before has this idea been so well accepted by the general public as it is today. Certainly the Department of Agriculture is supporting the co-op concept vigorously through strengthening the Farmer Cooperative Service.

But the important question is whether farmers themselves are willing and able to make strong use of cooperatives. Government can help. The leadership of the National Farmers Union can help. But no one can grant cooperative bargaining power to farmers. They must win it.

The first question for your cooperatives to ask themselves and their members is this: What do you really want, and how strongly do you want it? Do you really want bargaining power—and are you willing to go all the way in doing what it takes to get it? For example, are you ready to own your own packing plant, your own canning operation, your own marketing facility—if that's what it takes to obtain bargaining power capable of standing up to the major companies with whom you deal?

Have your cooperatives gone far enough in examining the marketing system for each of their products—so that they really know where the power is? Who and what determine prices? Where are the margins—and how much are they? These are key questions.

Are your cooperatives geared up for the agriculture of the 1970's? Are they up to the task in the years ahead? How about taking a hard look at the old bargaining techniques and asking ourselves if these are adequate for the future? Many farmers may feel they can accomplish more by owning their own packing and processing plants, merchandising facilities, and their own brand names. If so—the choice is theirs.

Farmers have power—if they act together. What can be done to awaken your members and their neighbors to the effectiveness of joint action? Half measures won't do. Casual attitudes won't do. If farmers are to win for themselves *real* bargaining power in relation to meat packers, food chains, and processing companies they must be willing to move aggressively and in unison.

The National Commission on Food Marketing pointed out that: "Farmers do not yet fully appreciate the importance of cooperative action in marketing their products." We must make sure they do.

The times call for boldness in planning. They call for new ideas. They call for aggressive action to get every co-op member to take an active role in the business of his organization. Members must be prepared to accept a higher degree of self-discipline in marketing in order to put greater bargaining strength in the hands of their co-ops.

The truth is that we are in a new era in American agriculture. The challenge is clear. Now that we have the tools to prevent surpluses, can we reach parity of income for the farmer in a market economy supplemented by payment programs? It is still too early to answer that question. We have made progress. But we are worried about recent price drops. We are all inclined to be a bit nervous and jumpy. After all, farmers have not had much recent experience in a market relieved of the pressure of surpluses.

No one can be sure what will happen. We all have a lot to learn. What we all need to do is to combine new-fashioned ideas with a little old-fashioned missionary zeal—a little "Farmers Union spirit."

The National Farmers Union has this zeal in abundant quantities. On the national scene, your organization has been a prime mover in getting the kind of agricultural programs that farmers need to succeed. Within your own organization this zeal has built a giant potash development on the plains of Carlsbad. Your members form the solid core of a score of giant supply and marketing cooperatives.

You have the organization, the spirit, the leadership and the membership to make our programs work, and to improve upon them in the future. That is our challenge, that is our goal. I know we can do it.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON HAS SERVED WITH COURAGE, CREATIVITY, AND UNQUESTIONABLE SUCCESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Duncan Banner, Duncan, Okla., which quotes a Bob Considine column on President Lyndon Baines Johnson. Duncan is a part of the new Third Congressional District, one of nine new counties added to my constituency under Oklahoma's recently enacted reapportionment law. I am proud to have Duncan in my district and proud to have its outstanding newspaper editor, Mr. Harrington Wimberley, publish this piece which shows realistic thinking on the accomplishments, abilities, and difficulties, of the President. Mr. Considine calls for an end to carping and takes a down-to-earth look at the fact that President Johnson has served in one of the most challenging periods in our history with courage, creativity, and unquestionable success. The editorial follows:

COME ON, LAY OFF

There are few finer writers than Bob Considine, be he reporting at a fisticuff ringside or about the queen's court after calling for a cup of tea. One of his recent contributions is testimony to his columnist ability—and also to a complete grasp of a situation that is getting out of hand.

From here on, consider Considine:

Let's everybody lay off LBJ this weekend.

He didn't start the war in Vietnam. All he's trying to do is stop it.

He didn't raise the cost of living. You did.

He is abundantly aware—being an ardent pollwatcher—that his popularity quotient isn't what it used to be. But why must he be reminded of this every time he reads a pundit or tunes in a fresh channel?

He didn't defer George Hamilton and Cassius Clay. Their draft boards did.

He didn't make money tight. He's trying to stretch it.

He knows what they said about him in the unedited copy of William Manchester's book. So why must the "leaks" be phrased if he were the last to know?

He didn't drive Bill Moyers and Jack Valenti out of the White House. They simply got better jobs.

He never turned down a peace feeler, as Adlai Stevenson charged posthumously via Eric Sevareid.

He'd leap at any fair proposition. There's only one American more disgusted with the war in Vietnam than you are. Him.

He hasn't lost his clutch on Congress. Some of his best friends are Republicans.

He didn't drive his car too fast. The company put too much en-jine in it.

So he doesn't dig Brahms' Piano Quintet in F Minor. But what's really wrong with the Yellow Rose of Texas?

So he's sensitive to criticism. Look who's talking.

So he may have to raise taxes. That's been done before.

So he doesn't come across on TV like Perry Como. Lincoln's critics called him a baboon.

Have a heart. Here's a man who can count on distressing or alienating the affections of tens of millions of fellow Americans every time he makes a move that pleases other tens of millions. Here's a man who must say yes or no and put a positive end to 10,000 arguments pro and con. The yes or no can make or break the country he loves, preserve the man himself as a titan among the great Presidents, or consign him to the limbo of Harding.

Give the man a chance. Destiny decreed that he be saddled with the hardest job in the world. He wasn't the one who wanted to go to Dallas. He loathed Dallas. Dallas insulted him and his wife when they campaigned there in 1960. A rightist mob which included a congressman virtually laid siege to the hotel where the Johnsons were staying.

He's the first to admit he doesn't have all the answers. But he keeps looking around for somebody who does. Maybe you're the guy he's been searching for. Drop everything and offer your services.

They say he might just chuck it all in '68, hang up his gloves, cash in his chips. That's about as likely to happen as a blizzard on July 4th. It's as improbable as it would have been for Babe Ruth to quit the year he hit 60 home runs.

They say that physically the prez ain't what he used to be. Who is?

They say he's becoming a loner, even prefers to swim by himself in the White House pool. He tried it with a crowd once and they all wanted a post office.

They say he's got no style cause he prefers fried apple pie to crepes suzette.

William Jennings Bryan spread butter on his radishes.

They say he works too hard. That's one rap nobody ever hung on Ike.

They say he's anti-Harvard. So is Yale.

They say he "took charge" immediately after the death of his wonderful predecessor. Who else could have?

They say . . . but, aw, lay off him. For a day or two, at least. He's the only President we've got.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1574) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOHN T. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1528) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1528

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim of John T. Knight, of New Orleans, Louisiana, arising out of his claim against the United States for disability retirement pay for a disability allegedly incurred or aggravated while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 2. Suit upon any such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment or judgments thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. HOWARD H. ADELBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1536) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Adelberger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1536

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Howard H. Adelberger and Nola A. Adelberger, his wife, against the United States for damages and loss of value with reference to the following described real property:

situated on the north side of State Routes 4 and 69 and west of Bath Road in Bath Township, Fairborn School District, section 8, town 2, range 8, M.R.s., Greene County, Ohio, and consisting of 32.76 acres, more or less, and is approximately 7 miles east of Dayton, Ohio,

due to the lowering of the water table in the above-described property and the lowering of the level of a lake on that property due to the dredging of the Mad River and the lowering of the level of that river north of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Notwithstanding any principle or rule of law, the court in the exercise of the jurisdiction provided in this Act is authorized to render judgment in behalf of the owners of the property described herein if it shall find that the value of the property has been reduced by reason of the dredging and stream improvement work performed by the United States. The action authorized by the provisions of this Act shall be instituted within one year of the effective date of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. A. E. HOUSLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1646) for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1646

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. A. E. Housley, of Annapolis, Maryland, the sum of $467.69 in full settlement of all her claims against the United States arising out of the failure of the Post Office Department to pay Mr. A. E. Housley at the overtime rate for services in excess of eight hours in a day during the period October 15, 1962, through March 27, 1963. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERALD LEVINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1880) for the relief of Gerald Levine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1880

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gerald Levine, of Oneonta, New York, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Gerald Levine against the United States for injuries sustained while participating in civilian pilot training in a program known as war training service as an Army reservist at Utica Aviation School, Utica, New York, on October 1, 1942. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARLINE AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1971) for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLIAM JOHN MASTERTON, GEORGE SAMUEL KONIK, AND LOUIS VINCENT NANNE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2048) for the relief of William John Masterton, George Samuel Konik, and Louis Vincent Nanne.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

E. F. FORT, CORA LEE FORT CORBETT, AND W. R. FORT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HARRY LEROY JONES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3403) for the relief of Harry LeRoy Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3403

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251–2268), the service of Harry LeRoy Jones as Director of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure from January 1, 1960, until June 30, 1965, shall be deemed creditable

full-time service of a reemployed annuitant, and the annuity payable to Mr. Jones shall be redetermined in accordance with the fourth sentence of section 13(b) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2263(b)) on the basis of such service as if it had been compensated at a salary equivalent to Civil Service General Schedule 18: *Provided*, That the amount of the deposit required to support the annuity redetermination shall be recovered by withholdings from monthly annuity installments in an amount equal to the difference between the monthly rate of the annuity before and after redetermination.

(b) Any recomputed annuity payments authorized by this Act shall be effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to make annuity payments authorized by this Act from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON S. LEVADI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3887) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3887

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches or any prior judgment of the United States Court of Claims, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim of Solomon S. Levadi arising out of his service with the United States Armed Forces from the years 1942 to 1946.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment or judgments thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY F. THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4566) for the relief of Mary F. Thomas.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MRS. WILLIFRED S. SHIRLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4809) for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4809

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley, of Casselberry, Florida, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $1,283.20, the amount of an overpayment between April 29, 1962, and July 4, 1964, of salary and salary retention payments, as the result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by her, or withheld from sums otherwise due her, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT L. MILLER AND MILDRED M. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5677) for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5677

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any period of limitations or lapse of time, claims for credit or refund of any overpayment of income taxes for the taxable years 1952 and 1953 made by Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller of Sublette County, Wyoming, including claims for erroneous overpayments of estimated taxes for those years made in 1953 and 1954 may be filed at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The provisions of section 322(b), 3774, and 3775 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall not apply to the credit or refund of any overpayment of tax with respect to which a claim is filed pursuant to this Act within such one-year period. No interest on an overpayment credit or refund which is permitted by this Act shall be allowed or paid for any period.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMETRIOS KONSTANTINOS GEORGARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1596) for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as James K. Georgaras).

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MRS. RAISLA STEIN AND HER TWO MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1629) for the relief of Mrs. Raisla Stein and her two minor children.

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

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1630) for the relief of Rose Minutillo.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DR. GEORGE H. EDLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1670) for the relief of Dr. George H. Edler.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MRS. M. M. RICHWINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3717) for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Richwine.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AGNES C. STOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PUGET SOUND PLYWOOD, INC., OF TACOMA, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4949) for the relief of Puget Sound Plywood, Inc., of Tacoma, Wash.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unani-

mous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5970) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DINO J. CATERINI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6445) for the relief of Dino J. Caterini.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ROBERT M. GILKEY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6446) for the relief of Robert M. Gilkey, Jr.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PATTERSON, EAGLE, GREENOUGH & DAY, ESQS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1885) for the relief of Patterson, Eagle, Greenough & Day, Esqs.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

POSTMASTER GENERAL O'BRIEN'S BOLD AND IMAGINATIVE PROPOSAL

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and endorse the bold and imaginative proposal of Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien that the Post Office Department be taken over by a Government nonprofit corporation.

I am sure that newsmen would call Larry O'Brien's proposal a man-bites-dog type of story. In this era of bureaucratic empire building you just do not hear of a Presidential Cabinet member talking himself out of a job. But this is exactly what Larry O'Brien is suggesting.

He made his far-reaching proposal only after a long and serious study of the Post Office Department which has 700,000 employees and is bigger than U.S. Steel.

I urge the Congress to act quickly on this proposal. If we do not move in this direction promptly, the postal service will collapse and we will be buried by a mountain of undelivered mail.

We must stop running a big business like a country grocery store with jobs for Cousins Charlie and Tillie, and free candy for the kids—not to mention that roll-top desk, high stool, and quill pen used by the bookkeeper.

As a member of the Madden-Monroney Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, I have strongly pressed for taking the Post Office Department out of politics and for taking away from the Congress the power of appointment of postmasters and rural mail carriers.

I am sponsoring legislation to require third-class mail to pay its own way. Third-class rates now pay only about 60 percent of their delivery costs. Congressman MORRIS UDALL said yesterday—and I agree with him—that postal rates are all determined in a setting where powerful pressure groups operate to protect their own interests.

The Postmaster General is right when he says that in fixing postal rates there must be a clear mandate on cost coverage on a fixed formula basis.

In the past, the people's interests have suffered while the lobbyists swarmed over Capitol Hill and dictated postal rates which force the taxpayers to subsidize profitmaking companies.

I hope this situation will be corrected by the adoption of the Postmaster General's proposal.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from West Virginia in calling the attention of the House to the very fine and capable statement made by the Postmaster General. I suggest to all Members that his proposal is one which deserves very careful study. It may not only relieve the country of this tremendous deficit, which continues to grow, but it could conceivably also relieve some of us of some slight problems in our districts.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Georgia.

THE TANKER DISASTER ACT

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am filing legislation, entitled "The Tanker Disaster Act," to help alleviate the danger of an occurrence off our shores, similar to the tragedy experienced in England as a result of the grounding of the tanker *Torrey Canyon*.

In England no one seemed to know who should act to minimize the danger of oil pollution from the grounded tanker, until the time for effective and appropriate action had passed. The same thing could easily happen off the shores of the United States. In my own district, which includes Cape Cod and the port of New Bedford, the effect of such an event on tourism and fishing, our two principal industries, would be catastrophic. As the New Bedford Standard-Times very clearly pointed out in an editorial dated March 30, the appropriate authority and the appropriate technology must be established ahead of time to preclude the possibility of such a disaster.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there does not seem to be any clear authority in the Government to deal with this situation. My bill would give the President authority to take immediate steps to alleviate the danger created by the escape of oil or other substances from vessels incapacitated by grounding or other marine disaster. The Commandant of the Coast Guard, who is responsible for maritime safety, and the Secretary of Interior, who is responsible for the preservation of marine resources, would have the power to determine that a marine disaster was threatening maritime safety or marine resources and inform the President of that fact. The President would then be authorized to alleviate the danger by measures such as removal of cargo, scavenging or entrapping escaping oil, or even by destroying the vessel and its cargo.

The final section of my bill, Mr. Speaker, calls on the President to join in a conference with other nations to alleviate the dangers of hazardous substances being released on the high seas in marine disasters. There is now an international convention dealing with the intentional release of oil from vessels cleaning their tanks on the high seas, but there is no convention or agreement dealing with the accidental release of such substances.

In 1959, Mr. Speaker, I joined with the late President Kennedy and the distinguished Senator Leverett Saltonstall in sponsoring the legislation which culminated in the creation of the Cape Cod National Seashore. It would be a tragic monument to our efforts if these miles and miles of beautiful beaches and waters were to be blackened by another tanker disaster. I hope that the House will give speedy consideration to this bill I am offering today.

ONE AMERICAN LIFE

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Vietnam has gotten plain out of hand. Last week's news report that 275 Americans were killed in action in tiny Vietnam is a shocking thing—no matter how many Vietcong were reported killed during the same period.

Ten thousand Vietcong lives are not worth the life of one single American boy. There is no adequate measurement for an American life.

It is no solace to hear that Vietcong casualties may have been ten times our own.

Americans should not be dying in Vietnam.

What is our President and this administration thinking of—to allow Americans to continue to die when we have the capability to end this war? Even the Joint Chiefs of Staff, if freed from civilian political gag rule, will tell you that the American Air Force has the present capability to destroy all targets of military significance in Haiphong and Hanoi and all existing enemy air fields, without the use of atomic weapons of any kind, virtually overnight.

In Japan in World War II the U.S. Government did what it had to do to save a million American lives that would have been lost in an invasion of the mainland. Not one American life was lost, except in the air.

In Vietnam at this hour I believe it is the solemn responsibility of President Johnson and the present American Government to warn North Vietnam that unless its aggression is stopped now, this country will have no choice but to unleash the American Air Force. This will end this war. This will stop this senseless slaughter of Americans. This is what we should have done 8,500 dead American boys ago.

On television cameras via satellite and around the world, let our President tell Communist North Vietnam that we will no longer endure such American casualties, that we have exercised every restraint, made every conciliatory offer in good faith, all to no avail and that if after a reasonable period to evidence their decision, North Vietnam continues its aggression, the American military will be authorized to end this war, and military targets in North Vietnam, whenever they may be located, will be eliminated.

There is, in bitter truth, no other choice.

Surrender on the installment plan, such as has been urged recently by men who should know better, is only a temporary appeasement that insures eventual dishonorable defeat for the forces of freedom at a later date. In fact, it makes it more probably sooner than later.

Let us get this war over with—this war that is in a place we should not be in, but we are there. Let us get it over with in honor and with independence and freedom for South Vietnam.

This is our commitment. This is our word to South Vietnam. We have the capability. This we owe to our men who fight in Vietnam.

The world is watching and wondering.

LAND FREEZE IN ALASKA

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a most serious situation that exists in the State of Alaska. It is particularly important since Congress will ultimately be called on to provide a solution.

Just 9 years ago Congress enacted legislation granting statehood to Alaska. This act added to the Union of States its largest political subdivision and one with great promise of hidden wealth. Despite the promise of the future, it was realized by the Congress that the new and sparsely populated State could not control this future or stand on its own feet unless it had control of a large portion of the land. At statehood, over 99 percent of Alaska was owned by the Federal Government. Congress therefore gave the new State the right to select over 100 million acres from Federal land, or almost one-third of Alaska's area. Under this grant the State has been in the process of selecting the best land for its use. It is agreed by all that the State has been wise and orderly in the selection process and in the use of the land selected. Alaska has justified the trust placed in it by Congress.

Today, however, the State faces a crisis not contemplated by Congress in 1958. The entire selection process is in danger. Indeed, all Alaska is in danger. This crisis is the result of the actions of the Department of the Interior, and specifically the Secretary of that Department.

Last year the Secretary halted the issuance of patents to virtually all State-selected lands after only 5 million acres had been patented. The reason given for this halt is the existence of land claims by Alaska's native citizens covering nearly three-quarters of the total land area of the State. The action of the Secretary even goes beyond the State selection patents. Virtually all other land disposals have been stopped, including the Federal oil and gas leases from which the State derives a substantial income. No homesteads are being patented in the claim areas, nor are any small tracts being allowed. The same holds true of power sites, airport sites, townsites, timber and gravel sales, roads and rights of way, trade and manufacturing sites, and any other land transactions. This is a true "land freeze" covering almost the entire State and surely must be unprecedented in history.

One can imagine the effect of this freeze on the future of Alaska. Should it continue, the bright promise so evident in 1958 will fade into disaster. Our future is in the proper utilization of the land and its resources. Unless this freeze is lifted there can be no utilization at all.

Alaskans are understandably concerned and increasingly angry over the actions of the Department of the Interior. They remember too well the neglect of the territory when the Interior had full responsibility for it. Now that the State has the responsibility, Alaskans cannot understand why Interior should withhold from it the means to exercise that responsibility. The State maintains, and I concur, that the Secretary has no authority to withhold patents to lands selected by the State. This is contrary to the wishes of Congress as expressed in the Statehood Act. Alaska is entitled to the patents and cannot be deprived of them by administrative fiat. The situation is so extreme that the State has been forced to sue in Federal court to achieve its rights.

Few deny the justice of the native land claims. Few say that there should be no remedy. The solution to these claims, however, rests with Congress. To halt the progress of the State is no solution at all.

I have requested the Secretary on two occasions to meet with the interested parties to discuss interim and permanent solutions to this critical problem. To date the only answer I have received is that the Department is working on it. Unfortunately it has been lying on the Secretary's desk for 4½ years and nothing has happened.

Last week the Fairbanks News-Miner pointed out the seriousness of the situation. The editorial reflects the growing anger and frustration Alaskans feel toward the actions of the Secretary of the Interior. They feel that they are no longer a territory subject to the whims or inaction of the Federal bureaucracy. It is unfortunate that such misunderstanding and antipathy should exist between the Federal Government and the people of Alaska. The fault, I am afraid, lies with the Department of the Interior.

For the information of Congress the News-Miner editorial follows. A letter printed in the same issue of the paper from the State's special counsel to the minority leader of the State house of representatives on the subject of political partisanship in such an important matter is included in the daily RECORD. This is not matter which should be treated in a partisan manner. It is too serious to be made a political football. Unfortunately it has been made to appear this way. The problem has existed for some time; yet no action was taken until the change of the State administration from the Secretary's party to the Republican Party. The lack of cooperation from the Department has reinforced the belief that partisan considerations prevailed. I sincerely hope that this is not so and that this problem can be worked out in an agreeable manner and with satisfactory solutions for all concerned.

The editorial follows:

UDALL'S "LAND FREEZE" WILL BE ECONOMIC SUICIDE

Alaska's economic present and future are in jeopardy.

If Alaskans, singly and collectively, are to avoid bankruptcy, we must unite strongly and quickly behind Gov. Walter A. Hickel in the "David vs. Goliath" battle he has started with Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and other entrenched "do-nothing bureaucrats" of the United States federal government.

Secretary Udall, recognizing belatedly that the Department of the Interior has a long-unresolved problem of native land claims, has issued instructions to freeze all federal lands (roughly 90 per cent of Alaska's 586,400 square miles) in our 49th State while he and other federal officials think about what should be done. Or, to be more precise, think about what corrective steps should have been initiated by the United States federal government many decades past.

While the freeze is in effect, no oil or gas leases can be issued on federal lands, no homestead titles, no road rights of way, no industrial sites, no power sites—and so on. Neither can the state receive title to lands stipulated under the Alaska statehood act.

All basic wealth lies on or under our lands and waters. It is money in the bank to finance building of a great state in our largest state—but now the Secretary of the Interior has closed and locked the bank and declared a bank holiday.

Secretary Udall's freeze order came about after the Secretary recognized—belatedly—that claims and rights of our native citizens are worthy of consideration. This is basically a responsibility of the United States of America (not our new state of Alaska). The obligation was assumed a century ago when the federal government purchased the Territory of Alaska.

The late B. Frank Heintzleman, before, during and after his tenure as governor of the Territory of Alaska, repeatedly pointed out that aboriginal rights (i.e.: native land claims) constituted the single most important barrier to development of Alaska. Recognizing the sagacity of Governor Heintzleman, former Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton initiated study and possible formulative remedial legislation back in 1958 and 1959. A catalytic force in attacking the problem at that time was Alaskan Theodore F. Stevens, who was then legal counsel and later Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, and is now Majority Leader in our House of Representatives.

Any remedial legislation to solve the problem of native land claims should most logically originate with the Department of the Interior. The department is entrusted with the responsibility of administering all federal lands in all states by its Bureau of Land Management, and its Bureau of Indian Affairs is the federal agency designated by Congress to safeguard the interests of all Americans of American origin. It appears that action to solve this crucial aboriginal rights problem originated in the proper place nine years ago.

However, the importance of the problem—crucial insofar as Alaska is concerned—was ignored when the New Frontier administration swept into office in 1960, and Stewart Udall took over the helm of the Department of the Interior from Fred Seaton.

Secretary Udall was finally moved to action—negative action—only recently when the united voice of our Alaska native people grew to such volume that it could no longer be ignored. Incidentally, that a united voice came into being is due in no small part to Howard Rock and his influential Tundra Times weekly paper which was established in 1962 to serve native Alaskans.

Far more than any other state under the American flag, Alaska is controlled by the United States government; and the majority of that control is concentrated in the Interior Department under Secretary Udall. As far as Alaska is concerned, Secretary Udall's administration has been almost completely characterized by non-feasance. Unlike his predecessors, he has not bothered to find an Alaskan—or even an individual really familiar with Alaska's problems—to fill one of the numerous top level posts in his department. Nor has he bothered to spend any amount of time in Alaska himself. Mr. Udall bottled up the Rampart dam feasibility report of Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and companion reports from subdivisions of his own department for years. Finally he announced recently that our market was insufficient, and that construction of a dam would be harmful to wild life. As far as Alaska is concerned, Secretary Udall's obvious policy is, "Ignore any and all problems, and maybe they disappear."

Now that the native land claims problem has arrived at a period of crisis, a crisis arising largely because of failure of his own office to face up to its own problems, his solution appears to be: "Cut Alaska off at the pockets."

Alaskans should be aware that Secretary Udall's land freeze order will shortly choke off our economic life stream. If all of us, particularly Alaska's congressional delegation, work with Governor Hickel we will get this problem resolved—either through the courts as result of litigation initiated by the governor, or by congressional action.

Our economic existence is in jeopardy. The issue to be resolved is far more important than petty partisan political bickering.

Now is the time for all good Alaskans to come to aid of Alaska . . . not their respective political parties.

(See daily RECORD insertion for comment by Edgar Paul Boyko, special counsel for our State of Alaska in this matter.)

THE LATE ANTHONY CAVALCANTE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Congress was in adjournment when a former colleague, the Honorable Anthony Cavalcante, of Uniontown, Pa., passed away last October 29. In consequence, news of his untimely death may have escaped notice of some of his many friends who served with him in the House during the 81st Congress.

Tony Cavalcante was a remarkable individual. At the age of 13 he went to work in a coal mine at night while continuing to attend school during the day. At 20, less than a month after the United States entered World War I, he enlisted in Company D of the 110th Infantry. He fought for the Stars and Stripes in France and was severely wounded in the summer of 1918. After the armistice he returned home with a determination and zeal that destined him to become a leader in county, State, and national affairs.

There was no GI education bill to help veterans of World War I, so Tony Cavalcante went back to the mines at night while resuming his studies. He also found time to star on his high school football team. His college work was taken at Bucknell University and Penn State College, after which he was graduated from Dickinson Law School.

Meanwhile, Mr. Cavalcante never lost interest in his fellow coal miners. He took part in efforts to unionize the industry in southwestern Pennsylvania and was a lifetime member of the United Mine Workers of America. For many years he served as legal adviser to District 4 of the UMWA.

Mr. Cavalcante served two terms in the Pennsylvania State Senate. He was elected to Congress in 1948. At the time of his death he was a Fayette County commissioner.

A man who did not hesitate to express his opinions no matter how controversial the subject, he was admired by everyone who followed his outstanding career. Among the many newspaper tributes that followed the shocking news of his death, an excerpt from a column in the Uniontown Evening Standard offered this brief but fitting description of his unforgettable personality and character:

> Whether you agreed or disagreed with him, Tony Cavalcante was an independent spirit who glorified in standing up against the ruling powers to fight waste and corruption. He was a battler for his convictions. The county will long miss him.

So will the Nation, Mr. Speaker. He was in Congress a relatively short time, but he made a deep impression on his colleagues and on all Americans who admire a man with the enthusiasm and patriotism of Anthony Cavalcante.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 312

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported the following privileged report (H. Res. 364, Rept. No. 168) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

POSTMASTER GENERAL O'BRIEN'S PROPOSAL MERITS SERIOUS STUDY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it cannot be denied that by its very nature, Government bureaucracy resists change. I say this as an observed fact, not in derogatory criticism, for I think that we have proved in America that despite its inherent faults, government, working through the bureaucracy it inevitably creates, can serve the general welfare—can serve the general welfare without sacrificing the principles of democracy or free enterprise.

But the fact that established Government bureaucracies do resist change makes it that much more startling and refreshing when the head of a huge Government department calls for sweeping changes in his own domain. The public dialog was nourished with just such refreshment only yesterday.

Postmaster General O'Brien revealed at a luncheon meeting of the Magazine

Publishers Association and the American Society of Magazine Editors that he has proposed to the President that the postal service be recast as a nonprofit Government corporation. Under his proposal, the Post Office no longer would be a Cabinet agency. It would still be an arm of the Government, responsive more to the needs of the people than to the dictates of the balance sheet, but it would have much more operational freedom to manage its own affairs in a manner in keeping with the nature and scope of its responsibilities.

It has become increasingly clear in recent years that in its present structure the postal service does not, and cannot, respond adequately and efficiently to the changing and growing demands made upon it by our society. A proposal as far reaching as that made by the Postmaster General must, of course, be studied carefully—by the Congress, by the public, by everyone with a stake in our mail delivery system.

But I think the Postmaster General's plan offers more real hope of producing the kind of postal service the Nation needs than any of the half measures that have been tried or suggested in the past. I applaud his vision and his courage and I pledge him my full support in seeing that his proposal gets the attention and study it so richly merits.

A REMOTE WAR STRIKES HOME

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a brief but poignant commentary on the Vietnam war and its impact on country Illinois was published in the Pike County Republican, a weekly newspaper published in Pittsfield, Ill., in its issue of March 15. The editorial, written by Editor Allan A. Seiler, follows:

A REMOTE WAR STRIKES HOME

(By Allan A. Seiler)

The afternoon was warm and springlike. The doors of the Nebo Baptist church were left open. Inside, the hushed stillness made it easy to hear the birds singing outside. The red and white carnations and other flowers at the front of the church blended beautifully with the bright red, white and blue of the American flag that covered the casket.

Again, a Pike county youth had given his life in the service of his country—as others have in a Civil War, in two World wars, in other conflicts. This time, in a war far away—little understood by many—the most mystifying and perplexing war in this country's long history.

To many of us the war in Viet Nam is remote, impersonal, hardly disturbing to our normal pattern of living, our business-as-usual routine. But last week, in a small community of our county that war struck home in a direct and personal way. It meant more than a repetitious newspaper story or television newscast, reporting casualties of impersonal numbers. It brought the grief of loss to a family, to relatives, friends, neighbors, past schoolmates.

It's easy to forget that elsewhere in this land it is bringing the same tragedy to others. We'd do well to remember that as we yawn at the evening newscast, empty our can of beer, and scratch our well-filled belly.

NEWSMAN COMMENTS ON QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, satire has always been one of the best forms of political writing. No other field of endeavor lends itself more readily to satire. This form of reporting not only gives us a chuckle, but drives home a point often lost when a writer uses a more serious vein.

In my hometown of Memphis, we are fortunate in having one of the Nation's outstanding writers of satire. He is Eldon Roark and his widely read column appears daily in the Memphis Press-Scimitar. Mr. Roark found occasion to mention the questionnaire I recently sent to the people of the Ninth District of Tennessee. I include the Roark remarks because I think all the Members of Congress will get a smile out of them and will recognize how well he has hit the nail on the head in his analysis of a Congressman's responsibility.

UNFAIR

(By Eldon Roark)

An open letter to Dan Kuykendall, Congressman from the Ninth Tennessee District—

Dear Dan—You aren't playing fair! You're putting me on the spot.

I, along with thousands of other Memphians, have received your questionnaire in regard to some of the big problems facing Congress—the war in Viet Nam, the national debt, taxes, the war on poverty, lowering the voting age, pensions. You ask us to advise you how to vote on those questions.

Well, I like to shoot off my mouth from time to time about what Congressmen ought to do, the dumbclucks! But now that you turn on me, list problems and ask me what to do about them, I am taken aback. That's hardly fair.

I might as well be honest with you, Dan. I don't any more know what to do about some of these things than you do. Take the war in Viet Nam. I am as puzzled about just what course to pursue as a lot of the top brass in Washington. So, I guess you'll just have to use your own judgment, Dan. Then if things don't turn out well, we can blame you and not ourselves. That's what Congressmen are for. We're paying you a good salary, ain't we?

But generally speaking Dan, my advice is that you get in there and fight, fight, fight to cut out monkey business and extravagance; make the government live within its income, and reduce the national debt; educate us blockheads to the fact that federal funds that come to our area are not pie from the sky, but money from our own pockets; put brakes on the trend towards strong, centralized, autocratic government; decrease crime and make it safe for Americans to walk the streets at night once more.

And, of course, Dan, when you have a few hours away from the front lines in those battles, we'll expect you to get us several new bridges, a government project for the study of the life cycle of the pollyglog, 12 missile sites, and a submarine base.

Well, good luck, Dan. I don't envy you your job.

ELDON.

WATCH OUT AMERICA

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Richard G. Capen, Jr., director of public affairs for the Copley newspapers of La Jolla, Calif., made a series of addresses, and I am sure excerpts from these addresses will be of interest to every Congressman and certainly should be of interest to every parent in the United States, because he covers the whole gamut of our problems in his series of addresses, entitled "Watch Out America."

The excerpts follow:

WATCH OUT AMERICA

(Excerpts from an address series by Richard G. Capen, Jr.)

Today there is an uneasiness in America. Our problems range from Southeast Asia to inflation—from declining morality to increased reliance on government for personal security.

Our cities are burdened by greed, hate, violence, apathy and lawlessness.

Many Americans have drifted away from self-reliance, believing that, for every problem, there must exist a political solution.

Established authority is scorned, whether it be the policeman, our Constitution, or the Word of God.

In the area of law enforcement, there is undue leniency in the courts. Some place more emphasis on the conduct of the policeman than on the conduct of the criminal. Pity is shown to the murderer, but not to the family of the murdered.

Only a few weeks ago, the National Crime Commission issued a disturbing report which pointed out that crime increased 58 percent in the past seven years—six times as fast as our population rate.

Included were the following statistics: In any one day there are more than 400,000 Americans in jail. The number of persons in prison or on probation will exceed two million this year.

One-third of all arrests are for drunkenness. One boy in six will be referred to juvenile courts this year.

Forty percent of all male children will be arrested for a non-traffic offense during their lives. Crime is highest among 15-year-olds.

In the United States there is a robbery every 30 seconds, an auto is stolen every minute, and a murder is perpetrated every hour. In the past year alone, serious crimes increased 11 percent.

The very fear of crime has eroded our daily lives. One recent survey found that a third of all Americans say it is unsafe to walk alone at night in their neighborhoods.

In some urban areas, nearly half of all residents stay off the streets at night for

fear of attack. All of us have read the stories of neighbors idly standing by as fellow residents are beaten or murdered.

A third of our population is afraid to speak with strangers. More and more people keep firearms and watch dogs at home for self-protection.

There are those who have claimed that crime is the result of poverty. It is interesting to note that the growth of crime in America was least during the depression. However, in the past five years—a period of our greatest affluence—the crime rate has surpassed all previous records.

Study the statistics on illegitimate births (300,000 per year), broken marriages or dope addiction. All such figures are higher than ever.

Crime, apathy, moral decay. Don't these trends tell us something? Shouldn't we be concerned? Shouldn't each of us be demanding, "Watch Out America!" "Watch out, we're in trouble!" I think so.

Perhaps the theory of obeying only those laws which a person happens to like has contributed to this trend. Also responsible is the uncaring attitude of many parents who are overly-permissive.

What has happened to parental authority? Where is the strong guidance from a devoted father?

Today, more than ever, parental guidance is required. How else can young people expect to be prepared for our increasingly complex society?

In another problem area, religious faith has been challenged as obsolete. Some clergymen and educators even speak out in favor of free love and lecture young men on ways to avoid the draft.

Only 44 percent of all citizens attend church services weekly, and only 27 percent consider themselves to be deeply religious. In our schools, we permit children to take the Lord's name in vain, but not in prayer.

Too many have forgotten that religious faith is fundamental to our entire American Way of Life. Religious freedom was the very reason the pilgrims came to this land more than 300 years ago.

Today, our nation's proud heritage is challenged by beatnik demonstrators.

Bearded pickets demand something for everyone whether it is deserved or whether it can be afforded. It used to be that when a person wanted something, he worked to earn it. Today he stages a riot, insisting that it be given at someone else's expense.

They demand a better world, but what is their contribution to it? Nothing more than four-letter words, LSD, and some second-rate art!

These critics prefer to sit comfortably with their hands out, demanding the fruits of harvests which they have not reaped.

Unfortunately, there are too many who are quick to criticize our society, but unwilling to assume any meaningful responsibility to improve it. Many of these individuals blame their own weaknesses on our country. They speak of charity and love for their fellow man, but direct those qualities only to themselves.

Most of us want to see genuine progress for all Americans, including minority and underprivileged groups. However, too many believe that our racial, campus and poverty problems can be settled in the streets; and that, in the process, there is some "right to riot."

Unfortunately, many government handouts and welfare programs have discouraged self-reliance and personal responsibility.

Perhaps welfare provides a few temporary necessities of life, but in the long-run, it adds very little to a man's stature nor does it automatically give birth to hope.

Welfare should aim, not at adding people to its rolls, but at making them self-supporting. Give a man a fish and he eats today, but is back for more tomorrow. Teach him how to fish, and he eats for a lifetime.

When government makes it more profitable not to work than to work, it is time for a reappraisal of our welfare spending programs.

Unfortunately, any of these serious domestic problems must be considered in the backdrop of mounting threats to freedom around the globe.

Today, Viet Nam is the current battleground in a continuing struggle to protect Free Men.

This is not an isolated war against a little country thousands of miles from home. The struggle is one step in Red China's Master Plan of world conquest.

In the past twenty years, the United States has been involved in twelve major confrontations against the communists. Each time the enemy moved out, testing our willingness to draw the line. Each time the enemy drew back, in effect saying they only wanted to see if they could get away with it.

Each time in the past we proved that our willingness to risk war led to de-escalation, and ultimately to the reduction in the likelihood of all-out war.

Long before the Viet Nam aggression, other free nations had to confront the thrust of communism. Perhaps we should recall what happened in Iran, Greece, Berlin, South Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan, and Malaya.

These countries are free today because America, and its allies, were willing to resist aggression in these lands.

Considering the nature of communism, it is only prudent to be leery of getting along with any Chinese Reds. By the same token, we should be prepared to see the present thaw in Soviet-American relations evaporate at a moment's notice.

There is not the slightest indication that the enemy will be any less dedicated to their goals, despite the internal chaos in Red China's leadership.

If Hanoi was sincerely interested in peace, why hasn't it decreased infiltration into South Viet Nam?

Why has it ignored our various bombing pauses?

Why hasn't it denounced Lin Piao's statement of world conquest?

And yet, despite the enemy's obvious determination, we hear constant pleas at home for conciliation, concession and compromise.

There are those who have stated that we should give Red China second base, and that it would then be satisfied—that by giving them second base, they would not then want third base, or home plate.

Consistently, the communists' goals have proved otherwise. Once one objective is achieved, the next one is sought as they move one step closer to world control.

Lasting peace in the world will only be achieved through our own strength, not by negotiating from a position of weakness. Whenever we have been prepared to use nuclear weapons, we have never had to do so.

In this time of crises, we must fully support the young men in Viet Nam who are risking their lives to defend our heritage.

To date there have been more than 50,000 casualties in this war, including more than 7,000 killed and 40,000 wounded.

We have no right to send even one young man to risk his life in Viet Nam unless we are willing to give him our complete support at home. We have no right to be apathetic about the principles we are asking these men to defend.

By the same token, any cause that is worth dying for is a cause worth winning. Thus, we should take whatever steps are necessary to bring this war to an honorable conclusion. If we fail in Southeast Asia, we fail all those who have died before us so that we may exist as free Americans.

We have heard much about the dedication and heroism of these young men in Viet Nam. They are fighting more bravely, more capably and more patriotically than any U.S. combat force in history.

Thus, it is our responsibility—our citizenship obligation—to make sure that they come home to the kind of country and society in which they can take everlasting pride.

Many of these young men will soon be leaders of America. They know the price of freedom. They will respect the dedication of their forefathers, particularly the more than 960,000 who have died defending our heritage since the revoluntionary days.

They will also be better prepared to accept the dramatic changes which are occurring in America. However, what kind of future can this young generation look forward to?

First, our young people will live in an age of relative affluence, job security and high standards of education.

Our population will be the youngest in the Free World. In 1960 our mid age was 33—in only a few months, this mid age will drop to 25. By 1975 there will be 40 percent more teenagers than there are today.

With advanced technology and improved education there is a hundred times as much to know today as there was in 1900. By the year 2000 there will be a thousand times as much to be learned as today.

Our scientific knowledge alone is doubling every ten years. In fact, our technology has advanced more rapidly in the past 50 years than in the previous 5,000.

With such ingenuity, Americans generate more than 6,000 new products each year.

There may be drugs capable of raising man's intelligence or of producing major personality changes. Nuclear power may even be used to raise threatening weather fronts in Chicago or the smog in Los Angeles.

Doctors will be routinely transplanting hearts. Medical diagnoses will be made by computers and man's life span may reach 120 by the year 2000.

There will be an exploding population, with increased urbanization. More than 80 percent of all Americans will live in super cities. To meet this change, one planner has suggested that we must construct 100 new cities—each with a potential population of one million inhabitants.

As to the impact on higher education, the number of college graduates in America will be double today's figures by 1985. To meet this need we will be founding new colleges at the rate of one per week ten years from now.

To meet the challenges which these changes imply, we need to ask ourselves how we can guide these young people.

What principles must they learn as the future guardians of our American Way of Life?

First, young Americans should set their sights on the challenge of opportunity rather than the false hope of security.

They should not accept the theory that the best way to build a better world for tomorrow is to start out by tearing down every institution in it today. The procedure for making good laws is not to break the bad ones in the streets but to seek redress in our courts or legislatures.

The sidewalk demagogues should help others to help themselves rather than to idly rip up our society by rioting.

Responsible youth must realize that their future cannot be based on endless government handouts. They should learn that political stability and economic growth will depend largely on our ability to preserve an environment that rewards individual initiative, that encourages enterprise, innovation and investment.

The younger generation must respect the fact that government is financed by taxes—taxes raised from our personal income and corporate profits.

Thus, we must guide them to respect and understand the principles of our Free Enter-

prise system, basic to the success of our Heritage.

The joint leadership of business and local government will be required to develop effective local solutions to local problems.

At the federal level, we should strive for a government that lectures less and listens more. We should restore belief in the people's ability to govern themselves, to make their own decisions, to plan their lives, and to control their destinies.

This does not mean that we should close our eyes to the domestic problems around us, hoping they will fade away. Nor does it imply that we abdicate such problems of local responsibility to the federal level.

A priority of federal spending, particularly on domestic programs, is essential. Personally, I am concerned about the Administration's belief that we can wage a war in Viet Nam and add to a seemingly endless list of domestic programs.

In January, 52 promises were made during the one-hour-and-ten-minute State of the Union address. Only in the closing 15 minutes was Viet Nam significantly discussed.

I just don't feel Americans are prepared for continued deficit spending to support non-essential domestic efforts at a time of deep military involvement.

All of these challenges of change, crime, corruption and communism will require renewed dedication, renamed Americanism in the finest sense of the word.

Our responsible citizens are capable of thinking for themselves. They are willing to accept the responsibilities of citizenship. Some of them have seen, first-hand on the battlefield, the sacrifices sometimes required to support our heritage.

Most young people appreciate that freedom and justice are secured by law and order. They will refuse to coddle criminals and will demand justice for law-abiding citizens. They are opposed to freeing killers on technicalities.

On the positive side, there appears to be a rebirth in family life, hard work, and religious faith. Voluntary contributions to charity are at all-time highs.

While we should be concerned about the 11 percent of our young people who have crime records, we should praise the 89 percent who are upstanding citizens.

While we should be concerned about the one out of four families riddled by divorce, we should be proud of the 75 percent that have made a success of family life.

While we should be unhappy with the beatnik demonstrators, we should be thankful for the patriotism of our young GIs, Americans who are proud to wear their U.S. uniforms.

Let's be thankful for the millions of young people who are studying hard, who are learning to become responsible citizens.

Let's respect the millions of men who are working long hours, in perhaps not very interesting jobs, to provide better lives for their families.

Let's be proud of the fact that church and Sunday School memberships are at all-time highs. This is important because with America's religious heritage, we can no more afford to be part-time citizens than we can afford to be part-time church goers.

The Communists have had their "gods" too—from Trotsky to Lin Piao. For a time, it was Stalin, and even the Russians managed to de-Stalinize Stalin.

Then Khrushchev became their god for several years. Today, however, the Communists don't even know where Nikita lives!

Their gods and principles rise and fall at the whim of expediency.

Today, Communism is in trouble if we just don't lose faith in ourselves, so let me conclude with this thought.

Almost every recent public opinion poll has shown overwhelming support of our commitment in Viet Nam. Americans are fed up with crime. They have little patience with the demonstrators, and are disturbed about our moral decay.

They are responsive and are willing to face up to the challenges which our problems imply.

For such dedication we can be thankful because America is its people. Our country can be no stronger than the determination of its individual citizens. However, in looking to the future, we can only hope to preserve the American Way of Life and our Free Enterprise system, if we respect and defend three essentials:

First, our religious and constitutional heritage.

Secondly, the strength of our economic system.

And thirdly, the principle that America is great today, not because of what government has done for the people, but what the people have done for themselves.

THE PEOPLE SPEAK—RESULTS OF 1967 OPINION POLL, 22D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, each year through my annual opinion poll, the residents of the 22d Congressional District of Ohio are given a special opportunity to express their views on some of the major issues facing the current session of the Congress. Over 20,000 replies to this poll have just been tabulated. It is stimulating and heartening to have this fine response from the people who have again elected me to represent this very diversified metropolitan area of Greater Cleveland.

The people of the 22d District of Ohio have expressed through their replies to this questionnaire and the many letters accompanying their replies, a deep concern over the direction in which our Federal Government is moving. This concern was expressed in dramatic fashion in the 1966 congressional elections, and it is reaffirmed in the large majority of comments received in reply to this poll.

The armed conflict in Vietnam is of overriding importance in the minds of all Americans. It is clearly apparent that the people of my district are convinced that a solution to this conflict will require the application of even greater military effort than is presently being exerted. They favor by over a 4-to-1 majority a naval blockade of the port of Haiphong in an effort to reduce the flow of supplies to the Vietcong.

An increase in nonnuclear conventional bombing of selective targets in North Vietnam is also favored by over a 3-to-1 majority. By a majority of almost 4 to 1 they oppose an unconditional ending of the bombing of North Vietnam.

On certain domestic issues before the Congress, the people of my district have also expressed very clear-cut opinions. By a majority of 4½ to 1 they oppose legislation for a 6-percent increase in Federal income taxes for individuals and corporations. Instead, they express by a 2½-to-1 majority their opinion that domestic spending programs should be cut back to offset any need for such a tax increase.

There is strong support—3½ to 1—for legislation to permit the Federal Government to return to the States a portion of the Federal taxes collected within each State. By more than a 3-to-1 majority my constituents also believe the Congress should allow tax credits to parents and others who pay the cost of college educations for their children.

Legislation presently being considered in the Congress for a 20-percent overall average increase in social security benefits to be paid through increased social security taxes is opposed by a 2-to-1 majority. However, by a similar 2-to-1 majority there is support for an 8-percent increase in social security benefits with a future automatic increase whenever the cost of living rises 3 percent or more, with no increase in social security taxes.

Although there has been much publicity throughout the country on lowering the voting age from 21 years to 18 years, 60 percent of the people of my district oppose such legislation, 36 percent favor it, and 4 percent express no opinion.

There appears to be a growing sentiment in favor of legislation to provide more 3-day weekends by changing all nonreligious holidays to a Monday or Friday, with 61 percent of my constituents favoring such legislation, 32 percent opposed, and 7 percent having no opinion.

The complete percentage results of this poll follow:

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Do you favor or oppose—			
Vietnam:			
1. Present administration policy of increasing American ground forces to bring about negotiations in Vietnam?	57	32	11
2. An increase of the level of conventional bombing of selective targets in North Vietnam?	67	22	11
3. A naval blockade around the port of Haiphong to substantially reduce the flow of supplies to the Communist Vietcong?	73	17	10
4. An unconditional stop of the bombing of North Vietnam?	18	68	14
5. An immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam under the best terms possible?	26	63	11
Foreign affairs:			
6. Increased authority to the President to negotiate trade agreements with the Soviet Union and East European Communist bloc countries?	42	49	9

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Do you favor or oppose—			
Social security:			
7. A 20-percent overall average increase in social security benefits with a corresponding increase in social security taxes?	30	59	11
8. An 8-percent increase in social security benefits with an automatic future increase whenever the cost of living rises 3 percent or more, with no increase in social security taxes?	57	29	14
Taxes:			
9. A 6-percent increase in the Federal income taxes paid by individuals and corporations?	16	74	10
10. A cutback in domestic spending programs to offset the need for a tax increase?	66	27	7
11. Legislation to permit the Federal Government to return to the States a portion of the Federal taxes collected within each State?	71	20	9
12. Tax credits for parents and others who pay the cost of college educations for their children?	73	22	5
13. The Human Investment Act to allow a tax credit to business for the expenses incurred in training or retraining workers?	52	37	11
General government:			
14. 4-year terms for Congressmen instead of the present 2-year terms?	55	39	6
15. An amendment to the U.S. Constitution to lower the voting age from 21 to 18 years?	36	60	4
16. Legislation to provide more 3-day weekends by changing all nonreligious holidays to a Monday or Friday?	61	32	7
17. A Federal fair housing law?	35	56	9
18. A revision in the present draft law to require all 18-year-old youths to serve 2 years of military or nonmilitary duty?	59	32	9

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD H. POFF, CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON CRIME

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, prompted by the nationwide concern over law and order in our country, a House Republican task force on crime has been created and will be chaired by the Honorable RICHARD H. POFF, of Virginia.

FBI Director Hoover reports that major crimes have increased by 11 percent in the last year alone, and not only are the big cities affected, but so are the suburbs, the small towns, and even rural America. The problem is of such national concern that it has been chosen as the high school debate topic for the coming year.

Congressman POFF has carefully detailed his views on the problems of law enforcement and the solutions to these problems which will provide a work paper for the task force study.

Since this succinct analysis is so topical, I insert it herewith in its entirety:

Immediately following release of the report of the President's Crime Commission, I spoke on the Floor of the House to pay tribute to the Commission, its staff, its advisers and consultants. I want to reaffirm that tribute and to renew the compliment I paid the contribution the report made to the cause of law enforcement. It illuminated many dark corners in our system of criminal justice and laid the predicate for wholesome, productive dialogue.

However, the Commission members themselves did not always agree. Criminologists, like legislators, often agree on ultimate goals but disagree on methodology. The President, who named the Commissioners, agreed with them in part and disagreed with them in part. I must assume the same posture. Yet, when I disagree, I am concerned not with goals but with methodology.

For purposes of this discussion, I am dividing the subject matter into three categories. The first includes those proposals made by the Commission and adopted by the President which I feel should be modified. The second includes those proposals made by the Commission which the President has not yet adopted. The third includes proposals which neither the Commission nor the President advanced but which I think should be considered by the Congress.

CATEGORY I: COMMISSION PROPOSALS ADOPTED BY THE PRESIDENT WHICH SHOULD BE MODIFIED

A. Wiretapping and eavesdropping

The Commission's proposals on wiretapping and eavesdropping were not unanimous. All members agreed that all surreptitious electronic surveillance by private citizens should be outlawed. The President adopted this proposal. I concur.

A majority of the members of the Commission supported wiretapping by law enforcement officers acting under court order and supervision, both in national security cases and in criminal investigations. The President rejected the proposal so far as criminal investigations are concerned. I disagree with the President. Said differently, I agree with a majority of the Commission on this issue.

In order fully to appreciate this issue, it is necessary to know something about its history. Since the telephone is of relatively recent origin, the history is brief. In 1928, the Supreme Court was first confronted with the question: "Is evidence obtained by law enforcement authorities by tapping the telephone of the accused from a point outside his premises admissible in a federal criminal prosecution?" The accused contended that it was inadmissible and his argument was that the wiretap constituted an "unlawful search and seizure" as that clause is defined in the 4th Amendment. The Court decided against the accused.

Six years later in 1934, the Congress adopted section 605 of the Federal Communications Act. That section outlaws interception and disclosure of wire communications. In the years that followed, the Department of Justice interpreted the language of section 605 in such a manner as to permit wiretapping by law enforcement officers so long as the information acquired thereby was not disclosed outside the law enforcement agency.

Pursuing the same interpretation of section 605 language, individual states have enacted laws legalizing wiretapping by law enforcement authorities under orders of state courts. However, federal authorities have not had access to evidence accumulated under these state laws; state authorities are afraid to disclose that evidence for fear of polluting it in their own investigation.

I applaud and share the President's concern for the cause of personal privacy. So far as possible, private citizens must be free from fear that their conversations, intended to be private, might be monitored by unknown, unauthorized strangers. This right of personal privacy surely incorporates the right of free speech. So long as the fear is plausible, a person's willingness to voice candid, critical or constructive ideas is inhibited. Whatever discourages dissent from the popular view slows the intellectual dialogue from which new ideas and new concepts spring. Accordingly, and counting personal privacy among the dearest ingredients of personal liberty, I enthusiastically support the President's recommendation to outlaw wiretapping by unauthorized personnel.

For this reason, I believe that police officers, *acting under court orders*, should be permitted to protect society by use of wiretap and eavesdropping devices in investigations of major crimes. To accomplish that purpose, I am preparing legislation. In the case of *People* vs. *Berger*, however, the Supreme Court is currently considering the constitutional questions involved. How those questions are resolved will affect the bill I am writing and I shall defer its introduction pending a final decision, which I understand is imminent.

B. Federal grants-in-aid

The Commission proposed a variety of federal grants-in-aid to States, local and regional law enforcement agencies. Many of these the President incorporated in the draft bill he calls "The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967." By way of shorthand terminology, it might also be called "The 90–60–100 Aid Bill."

Title I of the President's proposal would authorize the Attorney General to make grants to state and local governments for the preparation of plans for the improvement and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice. For planning purposes, the federal grant could be up to 90% of the total cost. Said differently, the grantee would have at 10% investment in the plans.

Title II authorizes federal grants of up to 60% to finance the development of new methods of crime fighting, the development and acquisition of equipment, the promotion of better community relations (including public education relating to crime prevention), facilities for the processing and rehabilitation of offenders, and more and more effective manpower, including recruitment, education and training of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel. The latter embraces the payment of regular salaries, with the limitation that no more than one-third of the federal grant can be used for that purpose. There is no such limitation with regard to salaries of personnel undergoing training and education.

Title II also envisions construction grants to finance physical facilities for local police forces, provided that no more than half the federal grant shall be used for such purposes.

Title III authorizes grants up to 100% of the cost of functions similar to those presently authorized under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965.

The President's Safe Streets and Crime Control proposal, like most grant-in-aid programs currently administered by the federal government, undertakes to write distribution formula. Like most such formulae, this one is too broad and too flexible; it is imprecise and inexact. Indeed, except for limitations heretofore noted and a stipulation that not more than 15% of the total appropriation shall be used in any one state, there is little in the President's draft fixing the share the several states may receive. Indeed, section 411 largely shuns the question by giving the Attorney General authority to "establish criteria to achieve an equitable distribution

among the states of assistance under this Act."

This imprecision would not perhaps be quite so consequential but for the fact that Section 407 empowers the Attorney General to withhold grants previously authorized and allocated when he determines that the grantee has somehow failed to comply with some provision of the Act or regulations promulgated by the Attorney General. Since nothing requires that any regulation once promulgated remain constant, the Attorney General is free to make and unmake, change and rechange regulations as the mood might strike him. Even if he makes no changes, the very threat to make a change is sufficient to compel the very closest compliance. I am not sure that what we seek is utter and abject compliance on the part of local law enforcement officers with regulations written by central law enforcement officials.

I do not criticize the Commission's catalog of needs. I do not fault its goals. I find it difficult to quarrel with some of the methods it proposed. I think the federal government does have a proper role to play in assisting local law enforcement agencies. In the last Congress, I supported, and I am glad that I did, enactment of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

However, I have two fears. The first, I think, is shared by every thoughtful person. That is the fear of a mammoth police pyramid with its apex centered in Washington and its base spread into every precinct and hamlet in America. I do not for one moment contend that the apparatus the President proposes resembles such a pyramid. Rather, he intends that law enforcement remain a local responsibility. In his crime message, he said, "Our system of law enforcement is essentially local; based on local initiative, generated by local energies and controlled by local officials."

Yet, what is intended today can sometimes become tomorrow the foundation for what ever was intended. Federal grants made today with an irreducible minimum of administrative stipulations tomorrow can be hedged about by all manner of conditions precedent and subsequent. For that reason, it is incumbent upon us as lawmakers to give the most careful scrutiny to every new pocketbook adventure the federal government takes into the realm of state and local government.

My second fear is that the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act undertakes too much, with too little, too soon. There is not enough money in the federal treasury to do immediately all that needs to be done eventually. Our enthusiasm for the whole cause must be tempered with emphasis upon its most important parts first. Among all the desirable goals we must forge a chain of priorities.

The first link in that chain, it seems to me, is education and training of law enforcement officials and criminal justice personnel. Ask any police chief and he will tell you that what he needs most is better trained men. The Commission agrees. The President agrees. The Justice Department, acting under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, already has basic statutory authority to proceed. Rather than launch a new experiment with some untried program, we should invest whatever education and training money we can afford in prudent expansions of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

Another link in the chain of top priorities is the urgent need for more scientific and technological research. As the Crime Commission reports, ". . . in terms of economy of effort and of feasibility, there are important needs that individual jurisdictions cannot or should not meet alone. Research is a most important instance."

The President recognizes this need. His draft legislation proposes a most ambitious attack on the problem. The difficulty is that it may be too ambitious, too fragmented. His proposal, I am afraid, splinters the effort and scatters the resources. A far more realistic and effective approach would be that suggested by the distinguished Minority Leader. The gentleman from Michigan suggests the establishment of a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Crime. Patterned after the National Institutes of Health, this new institute would assemble the nation's best talent to conduct the research and test the techniques our local law enforcement and criminal justice personnel must have to improve the total system of justice. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. Cramer), one of the most knowledgeable Members of this body in this field, has already drafted and introduced appropriate legislation. It deserves the preferred attention of the Committee on the Judiciary.

C. U.S. Corrections Service

Although there would seem to be no specific predicate in the report of the President's Crime Commission, the President proposes the establishment of a "United States Corrections Service" within the Department of Justice. The President's proposal serves to underscore the importance of criminal rehabilitation. No area of the American system of Justice is more vital. In the last Congress, I enthusiastically supported the legislation which became Public Law 89–176. That law authorizes the Attorney General to employ three prisoner rehabilitation techniques with which some of our states have had a most rewarding experience. First, it establishes the system of residential community treatment centers. Second, it permits prisoners to take emergency leave under appropriate safeguards. Third, it permits selected prisoners to work for pay in the community or participate in community training programs during regulated hours and under strict supervision.

These techniques help to cushion the shock of sudden transition from institutional life to free civilian life. The risk to the community is carefully circumscribed and minimal. Every dollar spent in these and other prisoner rehabilitation programs saves money and reduces the likelihood of recidivism by the convicted criminal.

For these reasons, I applaud that part of the President's proposal which enlarges the stature and expands the function of the Advisory Corrections Council. However, the rest of the proposal is likely to provoke intense resistance by the judges of the Federal district courts and members of the Probation Service.

In 1940, the Probation Service was transferred from the Department of Justice to the Judiciary. Last year, the Department of Justice urged legislation to return the Service to its own jurisdiction. The legislation never progressed further than the committee hearing state. Now the Department offers a new bill which it hopes will be regarded as a compromise. It would preserve the identity of the Probation Service but little more than identity. It would transfer its functions to the Department of Justice, leaving only the privilege of preparing pre-sentence reports for the judge.

Today, the Probation Officer, appointed by the District Judge, is the functional right arm of the judge. He prepares pre-sentence reports on which the judge makes his decision as to the advisability of granting the convicted defendant probation. He supervises the probationer during his probation. He has similar responsibilities with respect to prisoners on parole. He guides the course of rehabilitation in the work-release program. From the beginning of every case which falls within his jurisdiction, he intimately involves himself with the accused. He knows his personality, his talents, his frailties, his environment, his family. Perhaps better than any other person, he is equipped to guide the delicate course of human rehabilitation.

I seriously question the wisdom of stripping the Probation Officer of all prisoner rehabilitation functions except that of preparing pre-sentence reports. Among other things, I am afraid that the judge may be reluctant to use the rehabilitation technique of probation if he knows that supervision during the probationary period will be transferred from his court to a "community correctional officer" who will be an employee of the Executive branch of the government. A community correctional officer would not be responsible to him but to the Department of Justice. Whatever discourages the use of probation harms the cause of rehabilitation.

I also doubt the validity of the Justice Department's claim that once an accused is convicted he belongs under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Executive Branch of government. Indeed, I support the converse of that proposition. It is the Executive Branch which investigates the citizen. It is the Executive Branch which arrests and arraigns the citizen. It is the Executive Branch which indicts and prosecutes the accused. It is the Executive Branch which incarcerates the convict. It would seem only fair that the Executive Branch, having assumed such an adversary posture against the citizen for so long, should gracefully yield the role of probational rehabilitation to the Judicial Branch of government.

This criticism of the President's proposal is not intended to deny the need for reform and improvement. I simply suggest that there is a better solution. What is needed is more probation officers, better trained probation officers and better paid probation officers.

CATEGORY II: COMMISSION PROPOSALS WHICH THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT ADOPTED

The President's Commission chaired by former Attorney General Katzenbach was truly a Presidential Commission. It was constituted by Presidential order; its members were appointed by the President; it served under the President, at the pleasure of the President; and it reported its findings to the President. Yet, the President has not so far seen fit to adopt many of the proposals made by the President's Commission. Without attempting to make a complete inventory, here are a few of the more important:

(1) The FCC should develop plans for allocating portions of the TV spectrum for police use.

(2) To improve instant communication techniques, enhance crime prevention and hasten the investigatory process, the federal government should assume leadership in initiating portable two-way radio development programs, perhaps by underwriting the sale of first production lots.

(3) A technical assistance program should be launched under which local jurisdictions can request the help of experienced federal prosecutors in the prosecution of organized crime, and the Department of Justice should conduct organized crime training sessions in those states and localities where the syndicate functions.

(4) The staff of the Organized Crime Section of the Department of Justice should be enlarged and its decision-making authority broadened when working with local U.S. Attorneys in the prosecution of organized crime.

(5) A permanent Joint Congressional Committee on Organized Crime should be created. For that purpose, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Cramer, is offering legislation.

(6) U.S. Attorneys should be authorized to appeal court orders granting pretrial motions to suppress evidence or confessions. Frequently, as the Commission report documents, the most careful investigations and the most elaborate prosecutions have been frustrated at the last moment before trial

by court orders suppressing the very evidence without which conviction is impossible.

(7) While maintaining the requirement of proving an intentional false statement, the two-witness requirement and the direct evidence rules in perjury prosecutions should be abolished. If uniform state statutes can be coordinated with a federal statute, there should be a general federal witness immunity statute replacing the host of conflicting, awkward, almost inoperable specific witness immunity laws on the federal statute books. The immunity granted should be broad enough to insure compulsion of testimony but should be restricted to those cases approved by the chief prosecuting officer of the jurisdiction. Statutes at both Federal and state levels should be careful to leave no opportunity for interference with concurrent investigations in other jurisdictions. The President's recommendation on immunity is inadequate.

(8) Federal judges should be authorized to lengthen the prison sentence for felony when it appears that it was committed as a part of the continuing illegal business in which the defendant occupied a supervisory or other management position. The Commission feels that extended sentences are vital as a deterrent in the fight against organized crime.

(9) While most Commission recommendations concerning juvenile delinquency were addressed essentially to the states and localities, the Federal government has the responsibility, similar to that of States, to attack the juvenile delinquency problem in the District of Columbia. The President's February 27 Message on the Nation's Capital proposed the establishment of a District Youth Services Office and discussed enlargement of a variety of existing District youth programs. However, the President did not embrace a number of the more specific recommendations the Crime Commission made. Adequate and appropriate separate detention facilities for juveniles should be provided. Juveniles should enjoy the right to notice, right to counsel and other constitutional rights vouchsafed to the adult offender. Juvenile courts should increase the number of preliminary conferences to dispose of cases short of adjudication. Wherever possible, in order to avoid the stigma and enhance the prospects of rehabilitation, consent decrees should be employed in lieu of adjudication. There should be more and better trained probation officers specializing in juvenile rehabilitation.

CATEGORY III: PROPOSALS WHICH NEITHER THE COMMISSION NOR THE PRESIDENT ADVANCED

A. Miranda and Escobedo decisions

The most conspicuous omission of the Commission's report was its failure to come to grips with the problems of law enforcement raised by recent Supreme Court decisions. I have reference to those decisions which affect interrogation, confessions, right to counsel and Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination.

There is a respectable body of legal opinion which holds that these decisions have retarded if not defeated the process of law enforcement. The nucleus of that body of opinion is to be found in the dissenting views of four Justices of the Supreme Court. Seven of the 19 members of the President's Commission buttress that nucleus and, indeed, somewhat enlarge upon it. Even now, special Subcommittees in the other body, chaired by the Senator from Indiana, the Honorable Birch Bayh, and the Senator from Arkansas, the Honorable John McClellan, are conducting a study of the pragmatic effects of these decisions. Perhaps it would be wise to defer legislative action until those Subcommittees have made their reports. However, it is not too early to begin to formulate possible alternative solutions.

There are those who feel that the problems first raised by *Mallory* and *McNabb* have now been rendered largely moot by the five-to-four Supreme Court decisions in *Miranda* and *Escobedo*. Assuming, but not conceding, that this is true, action must first be addressed to the latter decisions.

Miranda and *Escobedo*, based upon the Fifth and Sixth Amendments, require that the accused be advised of his right to counsel, either private or appointed, his right to remain silent and the fact that anything he says may be used against him. I do not condemn the substance of the Court's decisions. When a man is accused of a criminal act, he cannot be compelled to be a witness against himself and he is entitled to have the assistance of counsel for his defense. The Constitution says so.

The problem these decisions have caused law enforcement officials has not been tested so much in substance as in procedure. And lower court interpretations and applications of the substance of the Supreme Court's decisions have compounded the procedural problem. As a result, the state of the law is such today that police officers do not know precisely at what point in the pre-trial phase of prosecution and to what degree the substance of the Miranda-Escobedo mandate must be applied.

Some legal scholars believe that only a constitutional amendment can clarify the confusion. I am inclined to feel that a statute might suffice to bring some order out of the chaos. The self-incrimination clause of the Fifth Amendment confines its * * * to "any criminal case." The Counsel clause in the Sixth Amendment applies "in * * * criminal prosecutions." It would seem that the constitutional intent was that these guarantees be the property of one charged with a crime.

I am fully familiar with the view that they were intended to apply as well to the suspect as to the accused. Yet, I submit that in the present state of conflicting and contradictory views, both lay and judicial, it would be only fitting that the Congress at least explore and test the possibility of drawing a statutory line between the investigatory and accusatory stages of the pre-trial process. It would be a difficult, but not insurmountable, undertaking. Reasonable men should be able to foresee at what point the suspect becomes an accused and is placed in jeopardy of life or liberty.

The Congress has the power to legislate on the subject and bring some precision and uniformity and stability and constancy to bear. If, after careful study, the Congress fixes such a point in the pre-trial process and the courts later disagree, then at least the present uncertainty will have been resolved and law enforcement officers will have been given some precise guidance.

B. McNabb and Mallory decisions

If Congress should take this first vital step, then Congress should address itself to the problem raised by *McNabb* and *Mallory*. These decisions nullified confessions, otherwise voluntary and free from coercion or promise of reward, because of delay in bringing the citizen before a magistrate. The rationale adopted by the Court was that the delay was "unnecessary" under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5(a) and provided police officers with too much "opportunity for the extraction of a confession." Apparently, the delay and the environment of the police station was regarded as an insipid form of coercion. However, it must be understood that in *McNabb*, Mr. Justice Frankfurter did not bottom his decision on a constitutional question but upon the power of the Supreme Court to supervise the conduct of lower federal courts and to establish and maintain "civilized standards of procedure and evidence." The *Mallory* decision was pitched on the same foundation.

Accordingly, if Congress should first draw the line between investigation and accusation, Congress could then write appropriate guidelines and define in precise terms what delay preceding arraignment will be counted reasonable.

C. MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS TO STRENGTHEN CRIMINAL STATUTES

Aside from the *Miranda* and *Mallory* questions, I suggest Congress consider several other proposals which, while not within the framework of the Commission's report or advanced by the President, could do much to immediately strengthen and improve our system of criminal justice.

(1) In the last Congress, the House adopted as an amendment to the Civil Rights bill the legislation authored by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Cramer. The Cramer amendment made it a federal crime to travel or use any facility in interests or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance. That legislation failed of passage in the other body. It has been introduced in this Congress, and as an amendment to Title 18 of the Code, it is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. Patterned after the language of the Fugitive Felony Statute, it falls clearly within the Constitutional domain of the Congress. It would not infringe any Constitutional rights of orderly and peaceful speech, assembly or petition. It should be enacted. It would do something positive to make our streets safer and control interstate crime.

(2) The Bail Reform Act passed by the Congress last year has enhanced the cause of justice in our criminal justice system. It helps to remove discrimination between the affluent suspect and the penurious suspect. However, experience under the Act establishes the validity of the amendment which was urged unsuccessfully in the House last year. The amendment was intended to grant the court more discretion and flexibility in applying the several alternatives to money bail. Judges have publicly complained that the rigidity of the statute leaves little or no opportunity to consider danger to the community as an element of release. Our streets would be safer if this amendment is adopted this year.

(3) The cause of enforcement would be greatly facilitated by enactment of a fair and effective law against obstruction of criminal investigations. The present construction of Justice statute, Chapter 73 of the Code, outlaws resistance to and interference with process servers, extradition agents, officers of the court, jurors and witnesses before the court, executive agencies and the Congress. It does not go far enough. It fails utterly to protect the citizen informer in his efforts to communicate information about violations of federal criminal statutes to criminal investigators. It is at the citizen-informer level that the most effective crime control begins. The same is true of crime prevention.

(4) Mental incompetence as a defense against charges of criminal conduct is basic to our concept of justice. The subject is treated in Chapter 313 of Title 18 of the Code. Many learned physicians and criminologists feel that the present statute is obsolete in part, imprecise in general and inadequate to protect fully the constitutional rights of the accused to notice, confrontation, counsel and protection against self-incrimination. Corrective legislation has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri, Dr. Hall. It deserves the prompt attention of the Congress.

(5) The President and the Commission recommended a variety of federal grants-in-aid to State and local police forces. I was disappointed that neither the President nor the Commission commented upon a bill which I offered in the last Congress and reintroduced in this Congress. My bill is not accurately called a "grant-in-aid program." Rather, it is a compensation program. It

would authorize the Attorney General to pay specified compensation to the survivors and dependents of local law enforcement officers killed or disabled while attempting to apprehend persons committing federal crimes. I suggest that here is an opportunity for the Federal government to contribute substantial, tangible assistance to the cause of local law enforcement in an area where the federal government has both an indisputable jurisdiction and a clear responsibility.

(6) Congress simply must give its preferred attention to the federal criminal penalty structure. It is a hodge-podge, makeshift mess of conflict and contradiction. It mystifies the layman, confounds the lawyer, intimidates the prosecutor, frustrates the judge and confuses the juror. Mandatory penalties and split-sentence statutes sometimes defeat their own purpose, leading to acquittal as the only alternative to excessive punishment. Too often, there is no reasonable or constant equation between penalty and offense. Two examples will serve to illustrate. The maiming offense is a felony. It draws a penalty of up to seven years in prison or a fine of up to $1000 or both. On the other hand, an assault with intent to maim draws a penalty of up to 10 years or a fine up to $3000. The lesser offense draws the greater penalty. Again, the penalty for armed bank robbery is imprisonment from one day up to 25 years; the penalty for armed robbery of a postage stamp is 25 years and the only alternatives are probation or acquittal.

D. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAW

Reform and revision of the penalty structure is one of the specific missions of the National Commission on Reform of the Federal Criminal Law, created under legislation signed by the President on November 8, 1966. This Commission was conceived as a follow-on to the President's Crime Commission. The function of this second commission is a logical progression of the function of the first. That function is to review all federal criminal law, both case and statutory, and recommend legislative proposals, including revisions and recodifications, to improve the federal system of criminal justice.

The new Commission is composed of 12 members, three each appointed by the House, the Senate, the Judicial Branch of government and the Executive Branch of government. The President has named as Chairman the Honorable Pat Brown of California. The other eleven members are: Senator John L. McClellan of Arkansas; Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Senator Roman L. Hruska of Nebraska; Representative Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin; Representative Don Edwards of California; Representative Richard H. Poff of Virginia; Mr. Donald S. Thomas, Austin, Texas; Mr. Theodore Voorhees, Philadelphia; the Honorable George C. Edwards, Jr., U.S. Court House, Detroit, Michigan; the Honorable James M. Carter, U.S. Court House, San Diego, California; the Honorable A. Leon Higginbotham, U.S. Court House, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

I earnestly hope that the President will expedite the supplemental appropriation necessary to organize and staff the Commission. As the author of the legislation and one of the members of the Commission, I am anxious to cooperate in every way possible to see that this investment of public funds pays the nation proper dividends.

THE COMMON MARKET LOOKS AT THE KENNEDY ROUND

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural negotiations at the Kennedy Round are of vital importance to American farmers and businessmen. As many of us have pointed out before, what happens at Geneva in the next few weeks will have a significant impact on our farm exports, and consequently, on the income of U.S. agriculture and agribusiness.

It is necessary to our understanding of these events that we know the views of the other participants in the negotiations. For this reason I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Hendrikus Vredeling, vice president of the Agricultural Committee of the European Parliament, which appears in the March 20 issue of the Common Market Farm Report. I am certain that the views and opinions expressed by Mr. Vredeling will be of interest to all who are concerned about the current GATT talks.

The article follows:

THE KENNEDY ROUND AND AGRICULTURE—ACCESS REQUIRES CERTAIN COMMITMENTS

(By Hendrikus Vredeling)

The major aspects of the EEC's proposals on farm products in the Kennedy Round is that they put agriculture on the same footing as industry. Acceptance of this point alone would constitute an enormous concession by the industrially developed countries. Concessions like these should form the basis for GATT agreements.

The EEC's proposals would internationally freeze or "bind" internal measures of agricultural policy. As this would establish a link between national measures and world trade, it has momentous implications. The Americans, on the other hand, place disproportionate emphasis on access rights to importing countries' markets, particularly the EEC's.

Naturally, the EEC has to recognize that access to the markets of importing countries, though not an absolute right, is a real concern of the exporting countries, and they must be able to safeguard their interests in the framework of GATT.

But this right of access directly impinges on the agricultural policy of the importing countries. So it is not surprising that a major importing area such as the EEC would like to regulate internationally those elements of exporters' agricultural policy bearing on ability to export.

EEC IS NOT UNIQUE IN ITS POLICY

The keystone of the EEC's agricultural policy is a system of levies on imports from non-member countries set to maintain a desired internal price level. Exporting countries have raised strong objections to this system and urge a reduction of levies. If the EEC did make such a concession, it would be unique. Before the Community came into existence, countries such as the Netherlands and Germany had variable-levy systems for farm products to which neither the U.S. nor any other GATT exporters ever took serious exception. Countries such as Denmark and the United Kingdom have adopted similar systems in recent years without arousing any opposition. Why so much protest now that the EEC has adopted it?

It is understandable that the exporting countries should feel their interests threatened by the EEC's agricultural policy in view of the Community's importance as a market. The EEC, recognizing their cause for concern, has offered to negotiate not only on customs duties but also on agricultural policy in general.

EEC DEMANDS RECIPROCITY

The EEC stresses that, until now, farm products have never formed part of GATT agreements. For several important farm products, the United States has always enjoyed the advantages of a "waiver", i.e., it was exempt from GATT rules for those products. Furthermore, GATT rules and GATT negotiations have always focused chiefly on import duties and quotas. They have never embraced the various and often complicated systems of market organization which are part of the industrialized countries' national agricultural policies. These domestic systems, with their milling and mixing rules, import time-tables, levy systems, production bonuses, plant protection measures, food inspection legislation, etc., really influence foreign agricultural trade far more than simple customs duties or quotas, the chief instruments for controlling industrial trade.

This means the participants should be prepared to accept the principle of binding the support they give to agriculture (which is a technical way of expressing national agricultural policy), and they must be prepared to negotiate on its level.

This support amounts to the difference between the price level on the world markets and the final price the farmers in a particular country receive. The margin of support is the measure of national agricultural policy. The Community proposes to bind the results of this agricultural policy and not its building blocks. The aim of the negotiations could then be to agree on the maximum amount of support permissible. The Community offers to bind this maximum amount for three years on the basis of present EEC agricultural prices and market organizations. No changes would be permissible without GATT negotiations and any subsequent unilateral increase in agricultural protection could be compensated by other concessions. The Community has also proposed worldwide agreements for some products, such as grains, beef, dairy goods and sugar.

Politically then, the EEC's negotiating mandate for farm products in the Kennedy Round reduces to reciprocity.

AGRICULTURAL AGREEMENTS SHOULD BE TIED TO FOOD AID

One point quite open to criticism is the proposal to separate any world agreements on agricultural commodities entirely from the question of food aid to developing countries. The objections are most obvious in the case of commodities like grains. The EEC has proposed to fix world reference prices for cereals to act as yardsticks for the support given to agriculture in importing and exporting countries. The proposal includes arrangements to prevent unsalable surpluses from arising and creating a threat to the market; specific self-sufficiency levels would be fixed beforehand for both importing and exporting countries, and any quantities produced in excess of this would be removed from circulation at the producer's cost. The country or area concerned (the EEC, for instance) would then decide whether to store this quantity or supply it on a non-commercial basis to countries short of food.

The EEC has fixed its degree of grain self-sufficiency at 90 per cent. Whenever the Community produces more than 90 per cent of its requirements of cereals, it would make 500,000 metric tons available for food aid, paid for by the Member States.

The great objection is that such measures debase food aid to a completely commercial affair to safeguard the agricultural and trading interests of the industrially developed countries. The EEC Commission's original proposal included food aid as an integral,

positive part of a world grain agreement, but the Council of Ministers scrapped this provision.

The situation at present, then, is that the EEC only undertakes to participate in helping developing countries with food aid when its own output has expanded to exceed the self-sufficiency level of 90 per cent (the Community has averaged 86–87 per cent in recent years). It could hardly have given a better illustration of "Charity begins at home." How grateful the developing countries should be!

This brings us to a point of much more general application. The Kennedy Round consists mainly of negotiations between the industrially developed countries. What points of contact tney have with the developing countries mainly concern farm products; yet preferential tariff cuts to support industrialization in the developing countries are not discussed at all.

GATT NEGOTIATIONS TOO NARROWLY CONCEIVED

In this way, GATT and UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) are working in entirely watertight compartments. On the plane of world politics, this means that the Kennedy Round is contributing explosive material for the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, planned for the end of this year or the beginning of next. The industrially developed GATT partners should reach agreement, provisional or otherwise, during 1967. Should they not then arrange for a "Development Round" to follow the Kennedy Round immediately, based on the agreements reached there? These negotiations should include discussion of preferential tariff cuts for the developing countries. Further negotiations could take place in UNCTAD regarding the world arrangements for agricultural commodities, which, considering the complexity of the questions involved, cannot possibly get beyond basic principles in the Kennedy Round.

Such a concord of wills among the industrialized countries could have great political significance. Then the second Trade and Development Conference could offer something concrete. It would be particularly important for the EEC to take the initiative in the matter.

Much would be gained if the industrialized countries could begin to consider the Kennedy Round a first step towards a better, more equitable division of world trade.

BUT WIDER TALKS EXCEED TRADE EXPANSION ACT

It must, however, be borne in mind that such a goal exceeds the authority of the American Trade Expansion Act. While the laborious procedure by which the EEC Council of Ministers reaches agreement on the GATT negotiations is not exactly inspiring, American negotiators can only provisionally accept the EEC's proposals for the binding of support and for world agreements on agricultural commodities. The EEC Council establishes the Commission's mandate for the Kennedy Round item by item; but in matters outside the sphere of tariffs cuts the EEC has to bargain with a partner who has not been empowered by the U.S. Congress to negotiate. Even if the United States Administration accepted the EEC's proposals in this area, Congress would still have to approve them.

Until now, this political aspect of the GATT negotiations has been overly ignored in the one-sided focus on the EEC's indecision.

AGRICULTURE MUST BE INTEGRAL SECTOR OF ECONOMY

Some people in the Community and even some Ministers of Agriculture wish to treat agriculture separately in the negotiations. This means that they want to balance agricultural proposals made by one member of GATT against those made by another.

It would be regrettable if, in this way, agriculture were to regress on the international plane to the position of isolation from which it has just emerged on the national plane. The most profitable, most modern agricultural systems are found in those countries where they have the most frequent and the closest contact with industry.

If, within GATT, agricultural concessions could be balanced by industrial concessions, reciprocal obligations would arise between them. A modernization of agriculture would therefore have to go hand in hand with reduced protection of trade in farm products. For this, industrialization and integration of towns and the countryside are necessary, leading to a community of interests between agriculture and industry. It seems far-fetched; but, all the same, this could be one of the positive results of the Kennedy Round.

It is essential for the EEC and the USA to reach agreement in the agricultural sector. If they do not, they risk a relapse into agricultural isolationism, with countries trying to wrest concessions from each other by threats in the field of commercial policy. Something of the sort can already be seen in the attitude to the Kennedy Round adopted by COPA, the Committee of Agricultural Organizations in the Community. Pressure groups on both sides of the Atlantic would nullify the political concept which inspired President Kennedy when he made his offer of an Atlantic partnership between the USA and the countries of Western Europe working in co-operation.

Let us hope that the partnership concept wins out over the short-sightedness of the pressure groups.

If the Western world is more than just the sum of the "free" interests of a number of groupings with great economic and political power, it must be shown in the Kennedy Round negotiations and in the following UNCTAD negotiations.

PRESIDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY PACKAGE HOLDS SURPRISES

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1967, President Johnson came to the Congress of the United States with a message on older Americans and a request for social security legislation. That evening, the Evening Star carried the byline: "15 to 59 Percent Rise Asked in Social Security," and in the first paragraph of that story the President was quoted as "urging Congress to 'bring the greatest improvement in living standards for the elderly' since the Social Security Act was passed in 1935." And from coast to coast, news media carried stories of the President's proposal. A promised increase in benefits of 20 percent has been widely publicized.

Few people realize that the President has written a whole new set of tax provisions for the senior citizen—that he plans to drastically change what we have regarded as sound and just principles. First, he would repeal the extra $600 exemption provision for persons reaching age 65 and replace it with one which is related to individual income. Second, he would make social security and railroad retirement pensions taxable income—they have been tax free since 1940. In fact, many persons would never realize an increase in income from the President's proposal. Many "older Americans" would pay more taxes than ever before while all "younger Americans" would feel the pinch of higher social security taxes.

The only way to reap the President's reward would be to continue working after retirement age and to forget about pensions or retirement income—if that can be considered just reward. It is a principle which has no relationship to the philosophy underlying the social security program in its inception.

Let me further point out that the President's proposal assumes that the working force of our society who are contributing to social security are the persons who should bear the responsibility of providing for our senior citizens. The President's bill calls for these people to finance the cost of inflation by paying a higher payroll tax. Second, the President fails to recognize that our economy will continue to change in the next few years. There is no reason to believe that inflation will not continue—but the administration refuses to make social security benefits inflationproof by including a provision for automatic adjustments in benefits to correspond with the cost of living. Failing to include such a provision in the past lies at the heart of the problem facing us now. Finally, the President's proposal is politically motivated, carefully molded to fit around election years. Payroll tax hikes are disguised—one year he would raise the tax base; the next year he would raise the tax rate; but never would the more obvious raise in the tax rate precede an important election year.

Now we are all familiar with the President's love of "surprises and secrecy"—but I submit, this proposal should not be held out to the people like "good candy." It is "chocolate covered" but the "filling" will disappoint many senior citizens.

YOUNG MEN WITHOUT A COUNTRY

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with much discussion on the possible revision of the draft in evidence these days, one facet of this issue needs closer inspection. This is the practice of running to Canada to seek a sanctuary from U.S. military service which approximately 3,000 American citizens have resorted to in the recent past. It is hoped that when final draft revisions are presented, corrective measures will be proposed to rectify this practice. With thousands of American boys setting a fine example in Vietnam, it is distressing that these so-called Americans can flout the law.

I include the article, "Young Men

With a Country—In Canada To Avoid the Draft," from the New York Daily News of February 19, 1967, by George Nobbe, in the RECORD at this point:

YOUNG MEN WITHOUT A COUNTRY—IN CANADA TO AVOID THE DRAFT

(By George Nobbe)

TORONTO, February 18.—While 150,000 American draftees fight and die in the steaming jungles of Vietnam, other thousands of their young countrymen are finding a comfortable, bulletproof sanctuary in a land largely hostile to U.S. policy in Asia.

These are the new breed of draft dodgers, mostly self-proclaimed pacifists, who are quietly drifting across the Canadian border in ever-growing numbers to settle in peaceful if self-conscious anonymity in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver.

Estimates now put their total at up to 3,000, most of them in their early 20s and all of them quite safe from the law—our extradition treaty with Canada does not let federal agents retrieve Americans who go north to duck military service.

In Canada, some teach or study, others paint, write or hold a variety of odd jobs in a country that has not had conscription since the end of World War II.

But all of them have one thing in common in addition to their aversion to khaki: they can't come home again. This will remain so even if peace comes to Vietnam and even if the U.S. should suddenly abolish the draft, for there is no statute of limitations on draft dodgers who leave the country.

An expatriate band who are still only a source of minor irritation to Washington and occasional embarrassment to their hosts, they face five years in jail and $10,000 fines if they are caught on the American side of the border.

Canada's almost childishly simple immigration and citizenship requirements are luring more and more of them north as the months go by. A huge influx is expected in June, when graduating college seniors run out of 2–S student deferments in this country.

Their cause has been taken up by the emerging New Left among Canadian youth; organizations such as the Montreal Council to Aid War Resisters, The Toronto Student Union for Peace Action and the Vancouver Committee to Aid War Objectors have sprung up across Canada.

Another, the Union Generale des Etudiants de Quebec, along with a loosely-knit collection of pacifists at the University of Waterloo, is even exploring the possibility of providing living quarters, food and small amounts of money for incoming Americans.

The financing of these groups is something of a mystery. Their leaders maintain that voluntary contributions, membership dues and some cash from the sale of propaganda literature cover most of the operating costs.

The Canadian government has adopted a hands-off policy on the draft dodgers, largely because they aren't actually breaking any law. It offers neither aid nor encouragement to them.

But if the administration of Prime Minister Lester Pearson, occasionally harassed by a parliamentary minority on the issue, doesn't actively encourage these refugees from the draft, it doesn't exactly make things difficult for them, either. And it resents alleged U.S. efforts to hustle them back across the border.

The FBI has been blamed repeatedly for hounding draft-dodging Americans as well as Canadians who work briefly in the States and then duck back across the line when draft calls show up. Washington heatedly denies these charges.

NEEDLES LAW

One American, 22-year-old Tom Hathaway, who ducked out of Boston when his induction notice came in 1963 and went to Toronto to study at the Royal Conservatory of Music, grew so tired of periodic searches of his apartment that he tacked this notice to his door:

"FBI, CIA or RCMP: Please don't rifle through my wife's drawers. Thank you."

Hathaway, for whom a warrant has been issued, explains his reluctance to serve by saying, "I don't like the idea of compulsory service. It's like some guy coming up to me and saying, 'Help me dig this ditch, it's your sewer.'

"The military is a very ugly institution, a uniform is a very destructive thing to put on, destructive to yourself and to other people. I find it hard to see why I should do something just because somebody tells me to, particularly when it's as destructive as the Army."

His attitude, which is fairly typical of the Americans who hole up in the cheap rooming houses of Toronto's earnestly Bohemian Yorkville section, seems to be reflected by many Canadian officials.

If you talk to officers at the bigger border crossing points, such as Niagara Falls, you get stiff answers from men such as Winston C. Fischer, chief Canadian immigration officer there:

"We're not here to enforce American draft regulations, we're here to enforce the immigration act and its regulations and there is no reference there to draft dodging."

To which Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the sometimes crusty director of U.S. Selective Service, snaps:

"It's primarily Canada's business, of course, but I wouldn't recommend these people as the kind of additions to a country I'd want."

The majority of Canadians seem to share Fischer's point of view, and offer any number of reasons.

One they cite is the chronic underpopulation and shortage of trained labor in Canada. Another is the country's traditional distaste for conscription.

An explanation that can be documented is that most important Canadian newspapers and magazines take an extremely dim view editorially of U.S. Vietnam policy.

In the end, most Canadians have become so inured to the influx of American draft evaders that even the Royal Canadian Legion, a relative of our own American Legion, has taken no stand on the issue and, according to its commander, Ronald MacBeth, does not anticipate doing so.

Wth no pressure to change the extradition treaty's terms in sight, Canadian and American draft foes have been having a field day.

Thousands of sardonic pamphlets telling Americans how to escape military service by emigrating to Canada are mailed into the U.S. every month, most of them going into college towns.

One, entitled "Escape From Freedom" or "I Didn't Raise My Boy to be a Canadian," is put out by the Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) in Toronto. It is virtually a handbook for draft dodgers.

On its cover is a six-panel cartoon character, a typical American mother explaining between sobs what led her son to leave the country.

SATIRICAL NOTE

At one point she says, "I talked to him. I said, 'Let the government worry about morality. All you have to do is burn the villages.' But he wouldn't listen. He'd just start yelling about Hitler."

At another, she is saying, "Our minister talked to him. He said, 'Let the government worry about human dignity. All you have to do is napalm the women and children.' But it had no effect. He'd just start yelling about the Nuremberg trials.

"So the day his draft card arrived, he left for Canada.

"I didn't raise my boy to be a Canadian."

Inside the 12-page pamphlet are helpful hints for would-be draft dodgers. Among other things, it recommends that the evaders appear neat and honest, bring money, cross at peak tourist hours to avoid too close an examination and be prepared to show Canadian immigration officials that they can establish themselves in jobs.

It cautions them that avoiding the draft "is probably not an acceptable reason for wanting to enter the country" and tells them how to achieve "landed immigrant status," the designation for anyone who has been lawfully admitted in Canada for permanent residence.

The booklet points out that, once in this category, Americans are allowed to hold jobs, and within five years can apply for full citizenship.

It also warns that liberal though the immigration standards are, Canada will turn down prostitutes, homosexuals, mentally or physically defective persons, deserters, narcotics addicts, ex-convicts and subversives.

Campus radicals, peace marchers or civil rights advocates do not fall into the last category, the pamphlet points out, adding that about the only reason you need give for wanting to enter is something suitably vague about better job opportunities, cheaper education, more freedom.

Questions about draft status simply are not asked, either at the border or by most employers and landlords in the bigger cities.

Rich Paterak, a 23-year-old Deadham, Mass., native with an uncanny resemblance to Sen. Robert F. Kennedy and just a trace of a Boston accent, described just how easy it is.

"My wife and I talked it over, told our parents what we were planning, and just got in the car and left. We were all dressed up and we had about $2,500 we had saved, so no one paid much attention to us. Besides, my wife has a teacher's certificate and they need teachers up here."

Paterak, who makes about $25 a week working for SUPA's Toronto office had worked for VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) in Louisville and Chicago before going north.

An extremely literate young man who is well grounded in Vietnamese history, Paterak said, "all of a sudden it just seemed pointless."

"Here we were working to fight slums and all the time we were afraid all our work would be undone during a war. I had read articles about draft dodging in Canada so we just left."

He and his wife reached Toronto last fall and although Paterak has not received an induction notice, he is classified 1–A and does not intend to return when he is called. "I just sent them a change of address form," he said, "and I guess I'll tell them I'd rather not do it when I'm called."

What did his parents think of his decision?

'Well, my wife's folks were pretty upset, but my father just said he wasn't going to tell me what to do with my life. My mother was worried because she knew I would never be able to come back, but I have a grandfather who left Poland to avoid conscription, so it wasn't so bad, telling them."

Would he risk going home, for example, if one of his parents were ill or died and what would happen if he did?

"I'd be picked up pretty fast. The FBI probably has my picture, they're always around at protest marches or war demonstrations, and even if I did manage to get home, there are a lot of patriots who'd be glad to turn me in.

THEY'RE CANDID

"You know, it's strange. For a long time the American Legion types used to say, 'if you don't like it here, why don't you go somewhere else?' Well, we did and that makes them even madder."

Paterak, who says the only war he would be willing to fight in would be a revolution,

claims he is not a pacifist, although he said he would have had misgivings about serving in World War II.

Living in an $80-a-month, one-bedroom apartment, he is typical of a large segment of young American "protestors" in Canada in that, technically, he has not yet dodged anything.

In theory, he, like many others, could still change his mind when he gets his induction notice, and report when ordered without being prosecuted.

"But I don't know anyone who has gone back. I know I won't," he said.

Though there are no figures available on draft-eligible Americans in Canada, the University of Toronto alone admits to having 400 enrolled.

E. M. Davidson, director of admissions, says he doubts any significant number plan to use the school to evade the draft because, in the Province of Ontario, a U.S. student must have completed at least one year of college in the states to qualify for admission. This, he feels, tends to indicate that these are serious older students, not just boys looking for a way out.

However, in neighboring Quebec or the far western province of British Columbia, Davidson said, no such rigid academic standards are applied to Americans.

There, most of the self-acknowledged draft dodgers are college graduates subject to imminent induction in the U.S.

Norman Rich, a San Francisco painter who went to Vancouver with the help of a draft-evasion organization run by professors at the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University, is 25. His reasons?

I have a thing about the idea that, at a certain age, you are taken out of a civilized life and turned into a machine that has no choice and whose only job is to take away life."

John Callender, a Connecticut native now living in Montreal and combining his studies at Sir George Williams University with a job as a cataloguing clerk, is 24.

He crossed the border because he felt, "I am the judge of what I should do and what I should be."

But despite these pious disclaimers, one irony seems to have eluded these new American expatriates:

If the Vietnam war ends and draft calls are cut to the bone, they will be rebels without a cause, stateless men with nothing to protest.

For all their highly articulate arguments about the advantages of Canadian citizenship—lower taxes and living costs, better travel and employment opportunities, more freedom and less pressure—you can detect a sort of wistfulness when a Tom Hathaway contemplates life in Toronto with a brand new Canadian wife.

"I'm a pacifist. It's a moral thing. I will just have to stay here and live, raise a family maybe. It's not any different, but my mother, [the only one left in the family] misses me."

There are other problems, too, aside from those caused by severing all connections with families and friends.

Not the least of these is that a youth actually under indictment for draft dodging cannot legally accept financial help from his parents without the risk of involving them, under U.S. law, in aiding and abetting a fugitive.

Another is that Americans, whatever their reasons for being there, are not terribly popular in Canada, probably because U.S. money controls so much of the Canadian economy and Canadians resent it.

The draft dodgers, welcomed with open arms now because it is one way of pulling the American eagle's tail feathers, will, after all, eventually be taking jobs away from native Canadians.

Anonymity in huge cities like Montreal and Toronto, whose populations exceed two million, is easy for a man in his 20s, just as easy as it is in this country, where no one pays a great deal of attention to self proclaimed individualists.

Anonymity later, when it comes to character references and job resumes, could become an entirely different matter.

Then, too, there is the possibility that Canada, itself a NATO ally of the U.S., could become involved in a war that would be just as abhorrent to the new breed of expatriates as the current one in Vietnam.

Tony Hyde, a 21-year-old Canadian representative of the Toronto SUPA organization, summed up the Americans' dilemma quite neatly.

"It's a big decision for these boys, because all Americans, deep down, are patriots. It's a very human kind of problem . . . leaving their parents, their girl friends . . . to come up here as an expression of their moral principles."

THE HONORABLE BRUCE BROMLEY, SPECIAL COUNSEL ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL MATTER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall my concern at the time of the debate on the question of retention of counsel to defend the House of Representatives and various persons served in connection with the matter of civil action file No. 559–67, *Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., et al.*, plaintiff v. *John W. McCormack, et al.*, defendants (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1967, at page 6036 et seq., and more specifically at page 6048, with respect to H. Res. 376).

I therefore was quite pleased when it was announced that the Speaker had appointed, as special counsel, my constituent and friend, the Honorable Bruce Bromley of New York (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, March 14, at page 6603.

With the current newspaper coverage of the litigation, I thought it would not be amiss to bring to the attention of the House and its Members some information about its special counsel, Hon. Bruce Bromley. There follows the biographical sketch from "Who's Who in America," but, of course, it cannot really do justice to his longtime record of public service in many civic matters and his preeminence at the bar.

The merits of the specific litigation aside, we could not have more competent or more understanding repersentation, and the House and its Members are fortunate in the choice of counsel made by the Speaker, and I commend the Speaker for it.

[From "Who's Who in America"]

Bromley, Bruce, lawyer; born Pontiac, Michigan, March 20, 1893; s. Peter Brewater and Sarah Suydam (Ditmas) B.; A.B., Univ. Michigan, 1914, LL.D. (hon.), 1949; LL.B., Harvard, 1917; LL.D. (hon.), Union U., Schenectady, 1958; m. Esther Baldwin, May 10, 1922; children—Stephen Baldwin, Peter Brewster, Bruce (dec.), Sarah Suydam (Mrs. Cory B. Kilvert). Admitted to N.Y. Bar, 1920; assoc. firm Cravath, Swaine & Moore, N.Y.C., 1923–26, partner, 1926–49, 50—; asso. judge N.Y. State Ct. Appeals, 1949; Sterling lectr. Yale Law School 1933–38, 46–47. Dir. IBM Corp., 1958—. Mem. Lawyers Com. for Civil Rights Under Law, 1963—, Mayor N.Y.C. Bd. Ethics, 1961—, Nat. Com. Study Antitrust Laws, 1953—. Fellow Am. Coll. Trial Lawyers; mem. Assn. Bar City N.Y., N.Y. County Lawyers Assn., Am., N.Y. State bar assns., Met. Trial Lawyers Assn. Home: 10 Gracie Sq., N.Y.C. 10028. Office: 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, N.Y.C. 10005.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1967]

HOUSE SAYS COURT LACKS RIGHT TO RULE IN POWELL EXCLUSION

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The House of Representatives asked the Federal District Court here today to throw out Adam Clayton Powell's suit to regain his seat. It contended the court lacked power to interfere in the actions of a coordinate branch of government.

A brief for Speaker John W. McCormack and other leaders and officers of the House said that to proceed with the case "would involve the court in political questions which under the constitutional plan of separation of powers are reserved for determination by the legislative branch."

Mr. Powell was excluded by the House on March 1. It had accused him of misuse of House funds, contempt of New York court orders and other conduct unbecoming a member. He then sued for a preliminary injunction requiring the Speaker to swear him in.

Mr. Powell's counsel has until Monday to file a reply to today's motion by the House. Oral argument on a preliminary injunction and establishment of a special three-judge court will be heard Tuesday by Judge George L. Hart Jr.

Bruce Bromley, special counsel retained by Speaker McCormack and the other defendants, said in his summary of argument:

"This court is confronted at the threshold with the fundamental question whether it has the power to proceed to adjudication of the issues raised by the complaint. Clearly it does not, for reasons that are basic to the separation of powers within our government.

"The court's inquiry must start and immediately end with the express prohibition of the Constitution, contained in Article I, Section 6, Clause 1, that the members of the House are not to be questioned in any other place, including a court, for what they may say or do as part of their proceedings."

DEFENSE STAND DETAILED

If there is any judicial power to review such decisions as the exclusion of a member-elect, the defense said, "it extends only to determining that the House properly interpreted its constitutional powers so as to exclude Mr. Powell for the offenses he was found to have committed."

Lawyers explained that that meant the House believed the most a court could do would be to see if the House action had been arbitrary, or in violation of some other part of the Constitution, such as racial discrimination.

Mr. Powell's complaint shows on its face, the defendants' brief continued, "that Mr. Powell was excluded for activities unbecoming a member of the House, including misuse of House funds and contempt of court orders."

"The complaint does not allege," it continued, "that Mr. Powell was excluded because of this race, religion or political beliefs, statements or activities. There is no basis for judicial intervention into the political question of how the House should judge the qualifications or behavior of its members."

The suit by Mr. Powell raised the racial issue, but did not contend he was excluded

because he was a Negro. He and the group of constituents who joined in filing the suit alleged that they, being nonwhite citizens, "are being subjected to the pains and penalties of discrimination based upon race and color forbidden" by the Constitution.

Five of Mr. Powell's co-plaintiffs are women who complained that they and all other qualified women electors in the 18th District of New York were being denied rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

REJOINDER BY HOUSE

The House reply to these points was: "Plaintiffs apparently claim that because Mr. Powell is nonwhite, that because some also are female, the court must infer automatically that Mr. Powell's exclusion was motivated by discrimination on account of race or sex. Such inferences are plainly impermissible and the allegations of the complaint are, therefore, plainly insufficient."

Mr. Bromley, the House Counsel, cautioned that the relief sought by Mr. Powell "would bring the judicial and legislative branches into the conflict prohibited by the doctrine of separation of powers."

"Judicial direction as to how the members of the House should vote and act within the House would violate the doctrine of separation of powers and the guarantees of freedom of speech and debate, and could not in any event be enforced," he said.

"Similar considerations bar the grant of any relief as against the nonmembers of the House delegated by the House to implement its mandate within the chamber.

"Just as a court has no power to direct a member to take or refrain from taking a particular action in the House, it lacks power by injunction or mandamus to direct a nonmember agent charged by the members with executing their will to take or refrain from taking particular action within the House. This conclusion derives not only from commonsense but from applicable doctrines of legislative and sovereign immunity.

Lawyers who worked on the brief with Mr. Bromley included Lloyd Cutler, Louis F. Oberdorfer, Max O. Truitt Jr., Timothy B. Tyk, James S. Campbell, and Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, all of Washington. Also, John R. Hupper, Thomas D. Barr, Victor M. Earle 2d, Jay E. Gerber, and Cravath, Swaine & Moore, of New York.

SOVIETS SEEK SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, for some years the Soviet Union and other Communist nations have been attempting to acquire from the United States increasingly more advanced equipment, machines, and technical and industrial processes. Regrettably all too often they have succeeded as the administration has systematically sought to weaken controls on exports.

There is a saying: "give an inch and they'll take a mile." How far the inch could be stretched is demonstrated by the Soviet's open bid, as reported in the press, to purchase a prized deep-sea research submarine, the *Star III*, an offspring of our Polaris submarine technology, developed and manufactured in the United States.

When the Soviets made an offer to buy *Star III* over a month ago, the firm which manufactures it immediately contacted the State Department asking for advice and instructions. At the present time, according to my understanding, this matter is being studied by the State Department.

It is easily understood why the Soviets would be eager to own, test, and examine at their leisure a working model of the *Star III* embodying advanced submarine technology and workmanship.

The manufacturer of *Star III*, Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, is the principal designer and builder of our Polaris submarines. General Dynamics is recognized as one of our foremost producers in a variety of areas, such as marine systems, aircraft, and the nuclear and space fields.

Surely it is no mere coincidence that from the wide range of research submersibles available in the United States and abroad, the Soviets have chosen to obtain the one produced by the builder of the American Polaris fleet. I am sure that our intelligence experts would leap at the chance to examine a similar prototype of the Soviet state of the art in this field of technology.

Since *Star III* is intended for ocean research, to do the job requires a hull strength capable of withstanding pressures at great depths. Such an evironment demands technology conceivably well beyond the grasp of present Soviet know-how.

It is difficult to believe that Soviet engineers, well practiced in exploiting foreign technology, would not have first crack at the *Star III*. It is also sound speculation that it might never reach the bottom of the Black Sea for exploration purposes, which is the reason cited by the Soviets as to why they want the submarine, but rather that it would go straight to the laboratory to be taken apart piece by piece.

The Soviet request, then, is not hard to understand. What is difficult to understand, however, is how the U.S. Government could give any serious consideration to this sale. I can think of no technical field more vital to our national survival than the design of submarines, and no country in whose hands this technology would present a greater threat to the security of this country than the Soviet Union.

It is therefore my hope, and, I am sure, the desire of the overwhelming majority of Americans that there will be a firm denial of the Soviet request to acquire the *Star III*.

It is of interest to see what the workers who built the *Star III* submarine say about the matter. According to a newspaper article which was published in the March 8, 1967, issue of the New London, Conn., Day, the employees where *Star III* is built have made a strong public protest against this sale. A spokesman for this group points out that—

We don't feel we should turn over any of our technological know-how in any area to a potential enemy.

I agree wholeheartedly with the position taken by these citizens.

When vital military know-how may be at stake, we cannot err in judgment. We cannot give the benefit of doubt to the other side. In the interest of our national security we must take every precaution to insure that vital secrets are protected and I have informed the Secretary of State of my deep concern about the Soviet attempts to acquire the *Star III* and called on the Department to reject the proposal.

OVERSEAS AID

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent statement, the AFL–CIO executive council endorsed the President's foreign aid policy and urged Congress "to give prompt and overwhelming support to President Johnson's proposal for $3.1 billion in new funds for 1968 foreign aid."

The statement illuminates the organization's position on foreign aid and presents a clear and businesslike view of our foreign aid objectives which should be of interest to all of my colleagues. I therefore ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks the statement of the executive council of the AFL–CIO.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON OVERSEAS AID, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 26, 1967

In the present international situation, overseas aid is an indispensable part of our nation's foreign policy for preserving world peace, promoting freedom and fostering economic progress based on social justice.

In this recognition, the AFL–CIO urges Congress to give prompt and overwhelming support to President Johnson's proposal for $3.1 billion in new funds for 1968 foreign aid.

The President reflects the viewpoint of the overwhelming majority of the American people in calling on the countries devoted to peace, democracy and human well-being for maximum cooperation in helping the developing nations achieve freedom from hunger, tyranny and war. Such concerted efforts would be a boon to all mankind and additionally they would strengthen the recipient nations' social base against subversion by Communists and other reactionary forces and thus tend to discourage aggressive adventurers endangering world peace.

The Executive Council rejects the notion that the Foreign Aid program is a wasteful give-away or policy of futile philanthropy. Though comparatively prosperous, our own country has a better chance of attaining broadly-based stable prosperity in a peaceful world not weighed down by impoverishment, ignorance, illness and dictatorship.

Moreover, our country's foreign aid program should be judged on the basis of what it has prevented, as well as on what it has performed.

The world would be far different today if we had not aided free Europe and Japan, Israel and India, Jordan, Brazil and the Republic of China, Kenya and Korea, Chile and the Dominican Republic, among others. No one can deny that, if left unaided, the developing countries would have been endangered by explosive squalor and chaos which could only have provided fuel for more wars.

Instead, today, western Europe, Canada, and Japan have been giving about $2 billion a year in aid to the developing countries to achieve social and economic progress. While we believe they should provide more aid, what they are doing confirms the essential

effectiveness of our country's foreign assistance program.

The increased assistance rendered by nations we once helped accounts, in some measure, for the decline of our aid burden in recent years. When the Marshall Plan was started, our economic aid constituted 2% of our gross national product. Then, 11.5% of our Federal budget was earmarked for foreign aid. In contrast, for the year 1965, our overseas economic assistance took only three-tenths of 1 percent of our GNP and about 2% of our Federal budget. And, as President Johnson has pointed out, "the combined value of our economic and food aid is less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of our national income."

The Executive Council has often called for an annual foreign aid authorization at least equal to 1 percent of the gross national product. We reaffirm this proposal. An authorization of 1 percent of GNP would be a realistic response to the President's admonition that "in the long run, the wealthy nations cannot survive on islands of abundance in a world of hunger, sickness and despair."

It is in our own national interest to do everything to reduce the gap between the richer and the poor nations by aiding the latter's industrial development and enhancing their prosperity.

The net outflow of dollars attributable to AID has hardly affected our balance of payments deficit and was far more than compensated for by the AID program's stimulus to exports and jobs.

No doubt, aid to the new nations is a more complex and difficult process. It will take longer to realize the fruits of our assistance programs and to attain decisive results in the industrially under-developed areas. It takes more time, effort and greater outside assistance to help the emerging nations develop the necessary modern social, economic and cultural changes and institutions.

There is no other way to help these peoples achieve industrialization and modernization without repeating the tragic cost in human exploitation and degradation incurred by the industrial revolution in western Europe and by the forced industrialization and collectivization in the Communist countries.

Over the years, some mistakes have been made in conceiving AID programs and administering them. Experience has to be gained and errors have to be corrected. The AID program now proposed by the President has the advantage of two decades of experience behind it—experience under Republican and Democratic administrations.

On this basis, the Executive Council welcomes the President's proposal "to provide the continuity needed for sound management" by requesting "authorizations covering two years."

We likewise support the President in his emphasis that "the development job is primarily the responsibility of the developing countries themselves." AID will be increasingly geared to helping nations help themselves.

Thus, every nation aided by the United States would be required to provide the major portion of the resources required for the development. Today, India and Turkey finance more than 75% of their development programs from their own resources. Recipient countries would be required to show that they are improving their own agricultural output before they can be eligible for American aid.

Furthermore, U.S. AID dollars are now seldom given directly to foreign governments. Most of current American AID involves the financing of U.S. goods and services for specific projects. Their feasibilities and priorities are carefully considered in advance. In the fiscal year 1965, more than 90% of the AID-financed commodities were purchased from American firms. Over $80 million were paid U.S. shipping lines for transporting these cargoes. In the coming year, well over 85% of AID expenditures will be for purchasing American goods and services. This compares with but 42% in 1960.

The AFL–CIO has always insisted that our country's AID program should be directed and administered in such a way as to help the growth of democratic institutions, like free trade unions and cooperatives, in the less developed countries.

We are proud of the role the AFL–CIO and organizations like the American Institute for Free Labor Development and the African-American Labor Center have played in this work and we intend that it shall be continued and expanded.

We have persistently sought to have U.S. AID efforts geared to improving the living standards of the people, no less than to advancing their rate of national economic growth. In this spirit, American labor has actively championed agricultural reforms, better working conditions, higher educational levels, improved health and social projects.

We heartily approve the President's request for authorization "to establish a National Advisory Committee on Self Help" which will "consist of members from both parties, from the business community, from labor, from universities and from other walks of life."

It would be wrong to approach foreign aid in a narrow business sense. Our humanitarian traditions, democratic heritage and our deep concern for the kind of world in which our children will live do not permit the American people to revert to any policy, like scuttling foreign aid, which would—in effect—be isolationist. We help others not because we seek their gratitude. We help others because our highest ideals and most vital interests require a world free from tyranny, poverty and war.

The Executive Council rejects as baseless the notion that "we give to conquer." We likewise repudiate as outright slander the contention of those who brand our country's AID effort merely as "an instrument of cold war" or "national charity."

Between 1945–1960, our country pumped in about $22 billion as aid to developing nations. In the past 12 years, the U.S. has distributed $15.5 billion in surplus food around the world. Our country has given thirty times as much aid to other countries as all the Communist nations put together. Here is no "arrogance of power."

America has neither sought nor acquired a foot of foreign soil in return. The American people can be justly proud that no other nation in history has done as much for safeguarding and strengthening freedom and assisting economic progress based on social justice.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO LIBERALIZE THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF PRIVATE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to provide more equitable treatment of private business development corporations by liberalizing the tax treatment of their bad debt reserves.

Under present Federal tax law two types of tax deductions may be made to offset losses occurring from bad debts. First, an uncollectable debt may be deducted from current taxable income at the time it becomes uncollectable. Second, a fund may be built up out of current income as a reserve against bad debts. The amount that may be allocated to this reserve fund is controlled by law, and may be deducted from current income. This has the effect of reducing taxable income by the amount of the addition to the reserve.

At present no special provisions for the tax treatment of reserves for bad debts are applicable to business development corporations. These corporations are permitted only the same deduction for bad debt reserves as ordinary businesses, in spite of the fact that their financial risks are ordinarily higher than those of most ordinary businesses. This bill would provide a more realistic reserve deduction for business development corporations. It would allow deduction of additions to reserves of up to 10 percent of outstanding loans.

A private business development corporation is a corporation designed to promote industry in a specific State or area. It carries out this objective primarily by lending to small businesses that cannot obtain funds through normal lending channels. Business development corporations are organized in a variety of ways. Often, however, they are made up of private citizens, chambers of commerce, or other local business organizations interested in promoting the economic development of an area. They usually obtain funds by issuing stock or borrowing from member organizations. Business development corporations are not organized primarily as profitmaking organizations; rather they are designed to foster the economic development of an area. Thus, they ordinarily operate at little or no profit, and such dividends as have been distributed have been minimal.

Private business development corporations are thus different in purpose from ordinary lending institutions. This bill, in fact, is designed to apply only to those business development corporations that make loans to small businesses that have been refused credit from banks—as defined in section 581 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Federal tax policy has been liberal to other groups designed to promote economic welfare through mutual cooperation. Such groups include savings and loan associations, mutual insurance companies, cooperatives, and private investment companies.

Savings and loan associations are a notable example of how a liberal tax policy can stimulate economic growth. Before 1952, savings and loan associations were accorded outright exemption from the Federal income tax, and thereafter they were permitted to retain reserves tax free until the total of reserves, surplus, and individual profits equaled 12 percent of deposits. Recently this tax benefit has been reduced, but during the period when these organizations were undergoing rapid growth and providing substantial loans to finance home building, the liberal tax treatment undoubt-

edly played an important role in helping them achieve their success.

Small business investment companies have also been granted liberal tax treatment of their reserves for bad debts. These companies were established pursuant to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, for the purpose of aiding small businesses. These investment companies are allowed to establish bad debt reserves equal to 10 percent of their outstanding loans, for the period 1959–68. In some cases, where the facts warrant, the reserves may even exceed the 10-percent limit.

Business development corporations are still in a developmental stage. Their primary objective is the stimulation of economic growth through loans to marginal borrowers. These facts, in conjunction with historical Federal tax policy, point to the justice of more liberal tax provisions for the bad debt reserves of business development corporations.

The desirability of such treatment is particularly obvious in light of current policy fostering regional economic development. The value of business development corporations is most apparent in areas of underemployment. Here, private development corporations can supplement the efforts of governmental agencies to help bring about economic betterment.

Even in more developed areas, private business development corporations can provide a valuable service. This is particularly true in light of the increasing demand for business loans throughout the country. In this situation small marginal borrowers find it more and more difficult to secure the necessary capital to insure the success of their operations. The business development corporation can help to meet the increasing demand for loans in developed and underdeveloped areas alike.

Many States have shown a rapid growth of industry in recent years, and the encouragement of business development corporations will help insure the continuing supply of capital so necessary if industry is to continue to grow. The continued growth of industry in every State is vitally important to the maintenance of a healthy national economy. One way to help maintain this growth is the enactment of this bill to encourage private business development corporations through more equitable tax treatment of their bad debt reserves.

THE NEED TO ENACT H.R. 6845, A BILL TO SEE THAT EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION IS MAINTAINED AS THE MEDIUM WITH A MESSAGE

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher and one who has always been vitally interested in education, I have long recognized the growing contributions of communications to the field of learning. The jet speed of our technological revolution, especially in the area of communications, has arrived faster than our reflections can handle. Many of our Nation's schoolchildren are living in an electronic environment only to enter a classroom which might be operating on the postulates of the past. The conflict between the dynamic world of technological advances and the somber world of traditional approaches to learning is upsetting for both the student and the schools. What is needed is an immediate desire on the part of educators to yield to change and focus their reflections on the exciting media of the future, particularly educational television.

The medium of television is so new and yet has already been criticized for not living up to its potential. Quite recently an entirely new jargon has appeared in the world of television: public television as contrasted with educational television so that the public will regard the medium as being too highbrow; instructional television as distinct from educational television to single out the advantages of television for classroom use; satellite television and its immediate application for international communications; and quality television to distinguish it from the mass programing which focuses on the size of its audience. But the greatest plea for excellence in educational television came from President Johnson himself in his messages to the 90th Congress when he said:

> We should insist that the public interest be fully served through the public's airwaves.

A multitude of things have happened since 1900 and many of them have resulted in our new technology. Today, television enters a child's life at such an early stage that he is often planted in front of a TV set when he is still in diapers. Children will watch television and do watch television, but the majority of the programs offered to them are merely a device to keep them quiet rather than stimulate their curiosity and learning. President Johnson proposed that a corporation for public television be established to provide support to noncommercial television and help local stations improve their proficiency.

I personally endorse the President's recommendations and I am proud to say that I was the first House Member to do so. The subject of educational television is not new to me since I introduced two bills to finance educational television before the President announced his proposals. I sincerely hope that an Educational Television Act will be passed in this session of Congress and intend to press for hearings on the subject.

It is significant, I believe, that the growing interest in educational television was highlighted at the National Association of Educational Broadcasters' conference held in the District of Columbia last month. For the first time, the delegates to this conference were not in the position of beggers trying to win support for the product they believed in. The awakening of the promise of educational television had arrived through the Ford Foundation's plan to harness communications satellites for the benefit of ETV and the Carnegie Commission's report advocating public television.

At last the dreams of the great medium of educational television have been realized. I hope these dreams can become a reality, the kind of reality that can use communication to erase ignorance. Perhaps the vision of Interama of which I was the legislative author, and its goal of promoting brotherhood among the Americas, in my district of Florida can be the beginning of a grand design for educational television. I see the possibility of a great ETV system via satellites to the underprivileged nationals in Latin America. What a great exchange this would be by using Interama as the master station to bring our message of democracy to the peoples of Latin America. This exchange of culture would be both ways and the boys and girls of our country could see how their counterparts must live and go to school. Educational television has a great message to offer its audience, the message of learning and hope.

WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot these days about cutting back on public expenditures, and one of the favorite targets for such demands are programs designed to pursue the struggle against poverty. I have never understood why businessmen and bankers can clearly understand that it is necessary to invest money in machinery, in building, in capital improvement, and yet be so blind to the necessity and prudence of investing money in human improvement.

The poverty programs are investments in human capital improvement. Victories in this struggle ultimately pay off—in hard, cold cash. In a recent article in the Machinist, we are shown how the work experience and training program can, with a little expenditure of funds, take people off the public assistance rolls and turn them into productive, taxpaying assets to the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted at the conclusion of these remarks.

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM MOVES 32,000 OFF RELIEF INTO JOBS

In the past two years more than 32,000 illiterate American adults have moved off relief rolls into paying jobs because their Government cared enough to teach them to read and write. It is one of the victorious battles in the war on poverty.

On the average, each of these bottom-rung Americans was drawing $144 a month in relief from public welfare before he started training. After training, most were able to move off relief and take jobs at an average starting wage of $258 a month. They be-

came tax-payers instead of tax-eaters, as President Johnson likes to say.

These are results of a little-publicized anti-poverty weapon called the Work Experience and Training Program directed by U.S. Welfare Commissioner Ellen Winston in 600 communities.

About 70,000 other persons are now in training. On the basis of experience over the past two years, about 36,000 of these can be expected to complete training and get a job. The others will fall by the wayside for a variety of reasons—poor health, inability to keep up with the training and other factors.

Trainees have been about equally men and women, white and non-white. More than 50,000 have received basic instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic—the 3 R's. Some 6,400 were able to take the equivalent of a high school course to qualify for better paying jobs. In addition, more than 14,000 men and women have developed new work skills or had existing skills upgraded through vocational instruction. Many others got needed medical services. Many got work experience on projects to beautify city areas or construct recreation facilities.

Here are two case histories:

A 44-year-old handicapped man with a wife and three children had been on relief in the Des Moines, Iowa, area for 16 years. With impaired vision, he was convinced he couldn't get a job. Community agencies hadn't been able to help him.

After several false starts, he completed his training in the Work Experience program. Following several failures to find work, he finally got a job as a building maintenance man at $14.50 a day. He has since accepted responsibility for two other men in training.

A 34-year-old women in the Tampa, Fla., area was left with four children when her husband deserted her. She had a tenth grade education and had been on relief since 1960. Nervous and physically run-down when she entered the Work Experience program, she got help in solving her home problems. Arrangements were made to care for her children and send one son to a clinic.

Through the program she gained a high school equivalency certificate, completed training as a laboratory aide, passed an examination and now has a laboratory job at $220 a month.

THE LATE JACK PIZZANO

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in each successive generation of our country, there is always the challenge of how best to serve our youth—to stimulate them—to instill in them courage and fortitude and a sense of purpose in life—in order that they may grow into patriotic strong citizens.

One of the most important aspects of fostering this growth and development in our youth—particularly today—is that of nurturing their desire and interest in building strong, healthy bodies. With good health and strong bodies, our young people are better equipped to mature into adulthood with alert, mature minds.

One leading citizen of my city, New Orleans, who devoted his entire working career to serving young people in this way so that they would become devoted citizens of this great country was the late Jack Pizzano, who passed away last month in his adopted city. For several years prior to his passing, Jack—or "the Champ" as he was affectionately known—was the supervisor of health, safety, and physical education for the New Orleans public school system. In this endeavor, as in his previous posts of responsibility, Jack acquitted himself with distinction and honor. Jack had served in my city's public school system for 35 years, having begun his career as football coach at Alcee Fortier High School. For more than 20 years, he had served in the post of supervisor of health, safety, and physical education for all the public schools of New Orleans.

In his lifetime, Jack had been honored by many recreational and physical fitness organizations across the Nation for his good works for the young people of his community. He passed away before he could receive personally one of the highest honors of his career. On the day before his passing, he was notified that he had been chosen as one of 12 outstanding physical fitness leaders in the United States. Jack was to have journeyed to Washington, D.C., to receive this coveted honor at a banquet hosted by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce last evening at the Statler-Hilton Hotel here. Today he was to have been received by President Johnson at the White House, along with the other 11 regional physical fitness leaders of our Nation.

Jack was not able to make that last journey, but "The Champ" came to Washington in spirit. His wife, Inez, ably and graciously represented him at the Jaycee banquet last night, and she did so again today in the audience with the President.

I was honored to have joined with my colleague from Louisiana, Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, in attending the banquet at which Mrs. Pizzano accepted for her husband this physical fitness award.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Jack Pizzano was a public servant in the fullest sense of the word—he was engaged in working for the benefit of our young people, and thus for the good of our country and its future. Jack Pizzano realized fully the importance, in this rushing world of ever-increasing responsibility for the United States, that we must have strong and healthy citizens of stout heart and mind. So he devoted his life to this great task, and my city of New Orleans and State of Louisiana are finer places in which to live because he served us for so many years. The young people of my city owe Jack a great debt of gratitude, and I know he will be sadly missed by his fine family and his many friends in New Orleans and in Louisiana.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a news story from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La., of March 23, 1967, and the splendid editorial from the Picayune of March 24, 1967. The story and editorial follow:

NEW ORLEANS HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION OFFICIAL DEAD—JACK PIZZANO COLLAPSES, DIES UNEXPECTEDLY

Jack Pizzano, health, safety and physical education supervisor for New Orleans public schools for the past 22 years, died of an apparent heart attack at 7:30 p.m. Wednesday while visiting the home of friends. He was 64.

Mr. Pizzano, who began his career as the first football coach of Fortier High School, had served a total of 35 years with the school system at the time of his death. He had held his present position since 1945.

Funeral arrangements were incomplete Wednesday night.

A graduate of Tulane University where he was active in football and boxing, Mr. Pizzano was honored just two months ago when the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce named him Louisiana's physical fitness winner for the year. He was to have appeared April 2 in Washington to accept the honor.

BACKED TAX HIKE

Since he assumed his supervisory position with the school system 22 years ago, he had witnessed the construction of 23 gymnasiums and 90 blacktopped outdoor multiple sports areas in the city.

Last year he backed the sales tax hike as an "absolute answer" to deterring juvenile delinquincy and preventing school students from becoming school dropouts.

For many years he fought untiringly for improved recreational facilities for youngsters and advocated health and safety practices as steps toward a more fulfilling life. He had attended physical fitness and safety meetings throughout the country, and had traveled to distant nations in order to expand his knowledge and experience in these fields.

In 1964 he participated in the National Conference on Intramurals for boys and girls of elementary, junior and senior high school ages, held at Michigan State University.

DRIVING SAFETY

Among the many positions held by Mr. Pizzano during his career was president of the Louisiana Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation. He was chairman of a leadership team at the Teen-Age Safety Council of the Southern Safety Conference in 1956.

Mr. Pizzano had also been a staunch advocate of driving safety and had lectured throughout the years on the importance of careful driver training. He supervised the testing of thousands of New Orleans high school students and analyzed the results, pointing out defects in driving techniques.

In 1950 he spent three days conferring with police, school officials and school students in Bogalusa, during which time he reorganized that city's school police system.

After receiving his early education in Massachusetts, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, he entered Tulane and was graduated in 1930. At Tulane he lettered in football and was active in Boxing and baseball.

He won the heavyweight boxing championship of the Southeastern Conference and received a letter as a Tulane back in 1926, 1927 and 1929.

After being graduated, he coached boxing at Tulane part time and served as part time athletic and recreational director for the A. J. Higgins School. He was a former athletic director of the Louisiana National Guard and was the athletic consultant for the U.S. War Department throughout the Pacific Theater of Operations in World War II. He had also participated in conducting the Pacific Olympics of the Army of Occupation in 1946.

For the Orleans Parish School Board, Mr. Pizzano had served as the coordinator of Civil Defense and coordinator of fire prevention. He was responsible for developing and initiating the compulsory physical fitness program in 1945 for New Orleans public school students from kindergarten through 12th grade.

Mr. Pizzano's memberships included the Fire Prevention Committee and Traffic Com-

mittee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area; the School Safety Division of the Metropolitan New Orleans Safety Council; the First Aid Committee of the American Red Cross; the Traffic Committee of the Metropolitan Safety Council; the local board of the American Cancer Society.

He had been a delegate to the National Conference on Physical Education, Health and Recreation; a member of the National Conference on Intramurals; president and vice-president of the Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation; chairman of State, city and County Directors of the Southern Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation; vice-president of the Southern AAU.

He was a member of the board of the New Orleans Golf Association; a member of the executive board of the New Orleans Public School Athletic League; a director of the New Orleans Prep Coaches' Association; a director of the Public Junior High School Athletic Association, and a member, on national, regional, state and local levels, of the National Safety Council. He had also written a number of physical fitness and safety articles for magazines and other periodicals.

Mr. Pizzano's survivors include his widow, the former Miss Inez Commander; two daughters, Miss Louise Pizzano and Mrs. W. E. Lehder, Jr., both of New Orleans; and four brothers, Louis Pizzano of Baltimore, Md., Calvin Pizzano of Boston, Mass., Anthony Pizzano of Philadelphia, Pa., and Vincent Pizzano of New York City, N.Y.

JACK PIZZANO

The old "champ" went in the way he wanted it. No floundering in the ring, no long ordeal for others, no holding and grabbing; just the clean, decisive knockout. Jack Pizzano meant a lot to a lot of people—not only because of his long string of achievements in his chosen field of physical fitness for youth; but because in his valor, bluff good-humor, sympathy, drive, common sense and insuppressible boyishness many saw the kind of guy they'd mostly like to be and the kind they wished there were more of.

Nearly everyone was "champ" to the "champ"—just a sobriquet, fondly bestowed, dating back to early days at Tulane University when in boxing and football (and personality) he became an extremely popular figure. His, however, was far from the unfortunate case of the perpetual athlete, subsisting on the past. After World War II, in which he served both as a war department consultant in the Pacific and as captain of a Louisiana State Guard company, he entered in earnest on fulfillment of his vision for upgrading boys and girls in physique, morale, and consideration for the safety of themselves and others.

Besides making New Orleans public schools a model along this line, he became a national pivot in formation of a similar program—generously passing along his ideas and experience, never ceasing to try to learn more himself. We have had many occasions to comment on this program—its sound approach, broad base, practicability, well-thought-out detail, multiple usefulness, and adaptability to national needs. At the last he was engaged in a million-dollar project involving federal-supply of athletic and recreational equipment here for economically handicapped children. Its successful completion, a matter of complexity requiring great care, was due for news report at an early date.

Amid all the compliments, hard work, ups and downs, he remained "the same old Jack," tough when he had to be, more often the other way. His death at 64, was foreshadowed a few years since: he had to give up a few social pleasures, but few, if any, could detect self-pity or anything, in conduct, other than the continued beating of a stout heart. He knew his job; knew how to promote, as well as execute it.

It never seemed right to call him "Mr.", except among the young. So, in this last tribute, we say goodbye only to "Champ": And may his likes increase.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XL

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the whole concept of the draft runs counter to the needs of a modern, technical, highly skilled military force. America's defense is now so complex, its demands for highly trained and specialized manpower so great, that the old-fashioned conscript army, in which many men serve short terms of duty, is becoming less and less suited to the needs of modern arms, and, at the same time it is becoming more and more expensive to maintain.

To operate this sophisticated defense system, a high-caliber personnel is demanded by the Military Establishment. Our fleet of nuclear submarines requires the greatest degree of expertise to operate on the part of every member of the crew. Our missile system is guided by complex electronic equipment. At the end of World War II only one out of three enlisted positions in all branches to the service were in the electronics, technical, or mechanics group of skills. By 1965, these occupational categories accounted for 46.5 percent of all enlisted jobs. Yet perhaps the most critical problem that our Armed Forces faces today is that of retaining experienced personnel in these fields.

Despite the belief held by supporters of conscription that the draft is nothing more than a manifestation of the concept of citizen participation in the country's defense, the draft actually hurts the professionalism that our military forces need. Of the draftees, for example, 91 out of every 100 leave the armed services as quickly as they can at the end of their 2 years. In the officer ranks, 73 percent of those who receive the commission by way of ROTC do not elect to remain beyond their original obligation.

The draft has failed to provide the quality that our Armed Forces seek. Hanson W. Baldwin observed that:

> There is not much doubt that service professionalism would be increased, and the present large personnel turnover decreased, with a resultant increase in effectiveness, if an all-volunteer force could be recruited and reenlisted. Both economy and combat effectiveness, therefore, might be promoted by replacement of the draft with an all-volunteer system.

The following chart shows how dismally low the first term reenlistment rates are and the serious problem this poses for the Armed Forces:

Department of Defense—"Unadjusted" reenlistment rates for "1st-term Regulars" by major occupational group service, fiscal years 1961 through 1965

Fiscal year	Total	Ground combat	Electronics	Other technical	Administrative and clerical	Mechanics and repairmen	Crafts	Services	Miscellaneous
Total, Department of Defense:									
1961	25.3	27.7	20.9	25.8	27.9	25.5	25.3	32.8	20.6
1962	27.4	26.6	25.5	26.6	28.8	27.2	27.5	33.5	24.1
1963	24.9	24.4	22.2	25.9	27.0	24.7	24.9	29.1	20.9
1964	25.2	28.5	23.6	25.7	27.1	23.6	24.2	29.6	15.1
1965	24.0	29.5	23.6	22.5	26.2	22.8	22.8	32.0	10.5
Army:									
1961	26.0	32.1	14.4	21.4	23.2	24.7	20.3	34.2	66.9
1962	23.8	29.0	16.0	17.9	21.7	22.2	16.9	30.1	32.0
1963	22.2	28.9	15.3	18.8	18.8	19.3	17.4	27.9	32.4
1964	27.9	34.7	21.3	24.3	24.9	24.7	23.5	31.6	30.0
1965	25.7	35.1	18.0	20.1	20.3	23.8	21.6	33.3	22.9
Navy:									
1961	27.8	----------	27.2	30.9	27.9	27.9	26.7	55.5	18.9
1962	28.3	----------	25.8	32.7	36.4	26.9	28.4	61.0	23.3
1963	25.1	----------	22.9	29.9	31.4	24.5	22.9	54.4	18.9
1964	22.5	----------	22.6	25.6	26.2	21.1	22.0	54.4	14.7
1965	21.4	----------	21.8	21.8	27.4	19.7	20.7	60.3	13.5
Marine Corps:									
1961	18.3	16.9	14.1	32.3	23.0	22.4	18.0	21.7	9.8
1962	20.0	18.0	16.2	28.5	25.5	21.1	24.2	22.2	21.2
1963	15.5	13.9	11.9	19.9	18.8	22.3	14.0	16.3	21.6
1964	14.4	14.0	12.3	13.6	17.2	16.0	17.1	13.9	12.1
1965	15.2	14.4	14.0	23.2	19.1	12.8	16.1	15.7	20.2
Air Force:									
1961	23.5	----------	19.1	25.4	27.4	22.8	28.5	26.9	19.7
1962	35.3	----------	35.3	33.4	36.0	37.0	33.6	34.8	28.5
1963	35.1	----------	34.3	33.0	42.6	36.0	33.3	28.0	38.6
1964	29.5	----------	31.1	28.7	34.5	28.1	28.1	26.4	13.8
1965	27.3	----------	32.0	27.2	37.5	27.5	25.8	26.6	47.9

JOHN J. LINNEHAN, FEDERAL CO-CHAIRMAN OF NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION, SPEAKS AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE JOINT CIVIC AGENCIES OF GREATER SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on March

22, John J. Linnehan, Federal Cochairman of the newly created New England Regional Commission, addressed the annual meeting of the Joint Civic Agencies of Greater Springfield in my home city of Springfield, Mass.

The New England economic development region is one of five in the United States designated to date by the Secretary of Commerce under authority of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I was one of the sponsors of this legislation with Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. My bill was H.R. 7093 in the 89th Congress. President Johnson signed the legislation into law on August 26, 1965, at the White House.

The New England economic development region was formally designated in Washington on March 2, 1966, at the request of the New England Senators and Governors led by Senator KENNEDY. It is the only economic development region designated under the law which contains the entire area of each participating State. The four other regions contain only part of each State.

Mr. Linnehan was appointed by President Johnson as New England Federal Cochairman and was confirmed by the Senate on January 16, 1967. He had been endorsed by the New England Members of Congress, and has the complete confidence of the New England delegation and Governors.

Mr. Linnehan is well qualified for his new position, having both business and government experience in Massachusetts and in Washington. A graduate of Haverhill High School in Haverhill, Mass., he received a bachelor's degree in economics and government from Tufts University in Medford, Mass., in 1954. He joined the C. Frank Linnehan Co., in Haverhill, and became the manager and director. In March 1962, he was named special assistant to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration in Washington.

He remained with the Small Business Administration until February 1965, when he assumed the position of director of governmental affairs for the National Association of Home Builders in Washington, a post held until President Johnson named him New England Federal cochairman.

The New England Regional Commission held its organizational meeting in Washington on March 20 last, and I had the pleasure of attending this session. The State members of the commission unanimously elected Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, the State cochairman, and Gov. John W. King, of New Hampshire, the alternate State cochairman of the commission. Governors Volpe and King will serve in these offices through December 31, 1967. The commission will establish a planning and operation division in Boston and a Federal program and liaison division in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD Mr. Linnehan's speech before the Joint Civic Agencies of Greater Springfield, and the newspaper account of the meeting that appeared in the March 23 edition of the Springfield Union:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. LINNEHAN, FEDERAL COCHAIRMAN, NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE JOINT CIVIC AGENCIES OF GREATER SPRINGFIELD, MARCH 22, 1967

This afternoon I had the opportunity to inspect the Springfield Urban Renewal area, the new highway construction area, the new regional food center, and your new Industrial Park. The City of Springfield, its fine municipal leadership, the officers of the Joint Civic Agencies, and all interested and dedicated Springfield citizens working to make a new and better area are to be commended for this combined effort for joint purpose. You all can be justly proud of your accomplishments to date, and I am certain these are only beginnings of more to come.

Introduction. Your Executive Vice-President, Paul Greeley, has asked me to speak this evening on the economic problems and potentials of the New England Region, and on the role of the New England Regional Commission in meeting the Region's problems and Achieving its potentials.

Of course, I can not presume to tell you of all of New England's problems and potentials. They are many and varied, simple and complex, short-range and long-range in both diagnosis and prescription.

I would, however, like to single out a few general problems the Region faces—and which the Commission must face—if this new organization is to make a real and lasting contribution to New England's future economic development. My singling out of certain problems is not intended to imply that the Commission will tackle these problems first or even to afford them a certain priority. They are, however, severe obstacles to our overall development, and many specific Commission programs will contribute, in one way or another, to their solution.

The Commission. I would like first to briefly outline the background of the New England Regional Commission. The law creating the New England Regional Commission—the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—was signed by President Lyndon Johnson at the White House on August 26, 1965. The law directs the Secretary of Commerce to designate appropriate "economic development regions" and invite the States located in the regions to establish multistate regional commissions. Thus far, five such regions have been designated and a multistate commission has been formed for each.

The New England economic development region was formally designated in Washington on March 2, 1966 at the request of the New England Senators and Governors led by Senator Edward M. Kennedy.

It is the *only* "economic development region designated under the law which contains the entire area of each participating State—the four other regions contain only part of each State.

You should all know of the outstanding role of the New England Congressional delegation in sponsoring and passing the legislation creating the Commission. Senator Kennedy was one of the Senate sponsors of the legislation. The other sponsor was Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine who is one of the ranking members of the Senate Committee on Public Works, which reported the legislation to the Senate floor. Congressman Edward P. Boland of Springfield was one of the original sponsors of the Bill in the Congress and actively supported the legislation in the House of Representatives. And, the legislation itself was overwhelmingly supported by the entire New England delegation.

The Commission is composed of one Federal member, called the Federal Cochairman, and one member from each of the participating States. At our organizational meeting in Washington Monday, the State members elected Governor Volpe to be the State Cochairman.

Congressman Boland attended the Commission's organizational meeting Monday evening and has offered the Commission every possible assistance in initiating its activities. He is, as you know, deeply interested in the problems of industrial expansion and development.

New England's six Governors—Chafee of Rhode Island, Curtis of Maine, Dempsey of Connecticut, Hoff of Vermont, King of New Hampshire, and Volpe of Massachusetts—have designated themselves the State members of the Commission. I have been designated by President Johnson to serve as the Federal Cochairman of the Commission.

The Federal government will pay the Commission's administrative expenses for the first two years; after that, the States and the Federal government will share those expenses equally. In addition, the Federal government will provide technical assistance to help the Commission carry out its functions and develop its recommendations and programs.

The Commission is, in a real sense, a joint Federal-State partnership, a partnership which, as President Johnson has said, creates "new concepts of cooperation, *a creative Federalism* between the national capital and the leaders of local communities." Significantly, the law provides that the decisions of the Commission require the affirmative vote of the Federal Cochairman *and* the majority of the State members.

The Commission's general responsibility is to coordinate a joint Federal-State effort to develop the economy of the New England States. Its specific duties include developing overall economic development plans and programs and establishing priorities for the region's development; to hold hearings and conferences; to conduct investigations, research, and studies designed to foster regional growth; and when appropriate, recommending changes in existing laws or programs or recommending additional programs needed for the region.

In brief, the Commission is charged with studying the region's problems, planning and programming the full range of Federal, State, local and private development efforts, and recommending and initiating new programs.

There is one important fact I want to make clear at the beginning of our work—the New England Commission will not be merely another group organized for only planning action.

New England problems and potentials. The overriding New England problems I referred to earlier fall into two general areas: (1) population and income, and (2) employment and unemployment. Again, I would like to say that these are *only two* of the region's overall problems. They are very general in nature, but I am sure many Commission activities will be addressed, in one way or another, to their solution.

First—population and income. Between 1960 and 1965, New England's population has increased in absolute terms by slightly more than 10%, to a total of more than 11 million. On the other hand, it is no secret that, in general, there has been, over the last 20 to 30 years, a gradual shifting of population away from New England and the Eastern seaboard to the Far West and Southwest. New England is definitely growing at a slower rate than other parts of the country. And, it is growing at a slower rate than the Nation itself.

In further examining these general population trends, two additional facts stand out.

First, within New England itself, some parts are growing much more rapidly than others. This movement is generally a north-to-south one, with younger people leaving the less urbanized northern areas for the job opportunities available in the southern areas.

Second, the New England population is getting older. As a region, New England has a higher percentage of the elderly (those

over 65) than any region except the Middle Western States. Within the region, only Connecticut has a lower percentage of elderly citizens than the National average.

Turning to income, we see much the same situation. The surface facts appear favorable, but a close examination discloses severe underlying problem areas.

New England's per capita income is above the National average. However, when the States are considered separately, only Connecticut and Massachusetts are above the National average. In addition, as recently as 1960, over 30% of the region's families were considered to be in the poverty range—that is, with family incomes below $3,000.

The problems of low income and poverty are most severe in the region's northern rural areas and in certain older industrial areas of southern New England.

These figures and trends in New England's population and income suggest an important and perhaps crucial long-range problem. We have, in reality, two distinct areas within New England, a true North-South problem, the dimensions of which we are just beginning to discover.

The effects of this movement of population from north-to-south and the migration of the younger people of the north to the expanding industries of the south will require careful scrutiny by the Commission. I believe that many of the Commission's activities (both short- and long-range) will be concerned with reducing this developing economic gap.

The potential for New England, at least in this area, is not hard to define. We want a highly integrated regional economy, developing along lines that benefit each State and all areas of the region equally, and with all areas of the region contributing to the well-being of the entire region.

Second—employment and unemployment. In general, New England's employment picture is a mixed one. We still retain our leadership as one of the Nation's principal manufacturing centers. However, as recently as 1964, only 2 of our States—Connecticut and New Hampshire—had unemployment below the National average. Almost half—8 out of 17—of our major labor market areas were considered to be areas of "substantial unemployment."

The reasons are well known. Our patterns of employment are rapidly changing. We are becoming more dependent for additional job opportunities on jobs in trade and service industries and in State and local government. Manufacturing as a source of employment is steadily losing ground.

Two types of problems result. *First,* those areas now losing manufacturing jobs are losing the tax resources which are required to support new jobs in needed governmental service activities. And *second,* workers who lose jobs in manufacturing are not qualified for the professional white-collar jobs needed in the expanding trade, service, and governmental areas.

The mix of jobs needed for a healthy and balanced economy, the public and private investment which should be encouraged in these areas, and the appropriate encouragement which should be given to the location of expanding industries are just a few of the problems the Commission faces in the fields of employment and unemployment. Commission policy will need to face these overriding issues at many points. Our goal of a balanced and healthy economy for New England will depend greatly on the Commission's approach to these questions.

Status of EDA's Springfield Armory study. The Commission will be doing for the entire New England region much the same thing as is now being done by the Economic Development Administration, an Agency of the Federal government, as a result of the closing of the Springfield Armory. The EDA Study has 3 important phases—

(1) A site study for a vocational technical institute in Armory Square, an institute which will continue the training in vocational skills needed throughout the region;

(2) a proposed organization and layout for a small arms museum, to increase and promote tourism in the Springfield area; and

(3) a study of additional industrial possibilities for the Springfield area to help counteract the expected economic setback.

I understand from the Economic Development Administration that its final reports and recommendations will be completed in April. I am hopeful that many of these findings and recommendations will be helpful to other areas in New England which may face similar problems.

The Commission is well aware that no State or local government can attack in any meaningful way the four problems that are obvious—employment, water and air pollution, and transportation. Our problems ignore city, county, and State boundaries and defy the well-intended solutions of single units' of government.

Just as a slum area in section of a city retards the health and vitality of the entire, inadequate transportation facilities in one area and lack of labor mobility in another clearly affect the economic health and vitality of the entire New England region.

Of course, the New England Regional Commission cannot perform alone the task of attacking all of New England's problems. Its most effective role is that of a catalyst, moving all sectors of the region—private industry, and local, State and Federal governments—toward increased understanding and cooperation, planning and action. Its activities can provide the broad guidelines under which sound development can be carried on by the region's citizens and institutions.

As a region, we have great strength—a high level of skilled manpower, great colleges and universities, important natural resources, and highly capable representation at all levels of government.

The Commission's next steps. As you may know, the Commission held its organizational meeting in Washington this past Monday, March 20. The six Governors and I signed the Charter and various Resolutions necessary to activate the Commission.

Governor John A. Volpe of Massachusetts was elected State Cochairman and Governor John W. King of New Hampshire was elected Alternate State Cochairman, to serve through December, 1967.

The Bylaws call for a Boston and Washington office for the Commission. They also require the Commission to meet four times annually, twice in Boston and twice in Washington.

Our next meeting is scheduled for April 10. At that time, we will appoint an Executive Director, adopt a budget, and plan our initial activities.

Prior to coming here today I read your annual report for 1965–1966, and this afternoon I read your 1966–1967 annual report. I was greatly impressed by the scope of your activities in the field of economic development. Your Area and Economic Development Division possesses a well-balanced program, encompassing the fields of industrial development, manpower retraining, regional planning, water resources, and transportation. You are to be commended for doing such outstanding work for the Greater Springfield area. I trust you do not mind if we on the New England Regional Commission attempt to emulate, for the entire region, your comprehensive plan of action for Greater Springfield.

On behalf of the other members of the Commission, I look forward to working with groups such as the Joint Civic Agencies of Greater Springfield for the betterment of the entire New England region.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Mar. 23, 1967]

JCA PRAISED FOR ECONOMIC ACTION PLAN—NORTHEAST REGIONAL UNIT OFFICIAL ADDRESSES ANNUAL BANQUET

John J. Linehan, federal co-chairman of the newly created New England Regional Commission, speaking before more than 300 at the annual Joint Civic Agencies banquet Wednesday night in Kimball Towers, lauded the JCA for the scope of its activities in the field of economic development.

"WELL-BALANCED PROGRAM"

"Your area and economic development division possesses a well-balanced program, encompassing the field of industrial development, manpower retraining, regional planning, water resources, and transportation. I trust you do not mind if we on the New England Regional Commission attempt to emulate, for the entire region, your comprehensive plan of action for Greater Springfield," Linehan said.

The New England Economic Development Region, one of five in the country designated by the secretary of commerce under authority of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, was formally designated in Washington on March 2, 1966. It is the only economic development region which contains the entire area of each participating state—the others contain only part of each state.

The commission is composed of one federal member, called the federal cochairman, and one member from each of the participating states. At the commission's organizational meeting Monday in Washington, the state member elected Gov. Volpe as state cochairman.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Linehan outlined the political history of the legislation creating the commission, naming Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., and Rep. Edward P. Boland, D-Springfield, as key sponsors.

He said the chief New England problems are "population and income" and "employment and unemployment."

He said that New England's population has increased by slightly more than 10 per cent, to more than 11 million of the younger people hand, he said, there has been a gradual shifting of population away from New England and the Eastern Seaboard to the Far West and Southwest.

"New England is definitely growing at a slower rate than other parts of the country. And, it is growing at a slower rate than the nation itself," he said.

He said the problems of low income and poverty are most severe in the region's northern rural areas and in certain older industrial areas of the south—cities such as Providence, Woonsocket, Fall River and New Bedford.

POPULATION MOVEMENT

He said the effects of a population movement from north to south and the migration of the younger people of the north to the expanding industries of the south will require careful scrutiny by the commission.

He stressed the need for developing a highly integrated regional economy that will benefit each state and all areas of the region equally.

Citing the Economic Development Administration's study now being done as a result of the closing of the Springfield Armory, the cochairman said he hoped the results of the study, due for completion in April would be helpful to other areas with similar economic setbacks.

DATA FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H.R. 7874, that states as its purpose "to provide that the Joint Committee on the Library shall make an annual report relating to the use of automatic data processing by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress."

The purpose of my bill is somewhat wider and more far reaching than the foregoing words "automatic data processing" would indicate. I believe that other bills have been introduced in Congress to authorize the Library of Congress to secure automatic data processing equipment.

My bill, in which I place the emphasis somewhat differently, stems from some experience I was privileged to have in my years in business. In business the professionals make a very sharp distinction between the "hardware" of automatic data processing and the "software." The "hardware" is, of course, the marvelous electronic equipment that is part of the modern technology of business, government, and military operations. The "software" is all of the planning and all of the thinking and the policymaking that governs the computer. More particularly, this concerns selection of information to be handled that will be appropriate to the purpose intended. It concerns dimensions of the memory, specification of flow of input and output, ease of feedback and facility of interrogation and answering. These are characteristics of system rather than of the equipment that implements the system. The system itself is primary.

My bill, H.R. 7874, accordingly provides that the Joint Committee on the Library "shall maintain continuing surveillance over the use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress." It calls for the committee to attend especially to "the adequacy and appropriateness of the data base." It would require the committee to concern itself with "the availability and usefulness to the Congress of informational services which could not be provided except by means of automatic data processing." Further, it provides that the committee should concern itself with "the policies and procedures governing the use of automatic data processing by the Legislative Reference Service, and the appropriateness and effectiveness of such policies and procedures not only in performing the beneficial utilization of the capability but also in restraining wasteful use thereof."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this legislation which I propose puts the data and the data system ahead of the computer itself as the primary concern. This is the accepted view of information systems. It is especially significant for data relating to Congress.

Many authorities have been concerned about the ease and facility with which information is supplied to Congress and Congressmen, to say nothing of its substance. The view is not uncommon that Congressmen are inadequately provided with information and that the speed with which the information is provided to them is not adequate to the responsibilities of the function.

Assemblying and marshaling facts is a skill that is no less important and no less difficult than marshaling armies in the field. The old saying goes that "the pen is mightier than the sword."

Among causes advanced for an asserted decline of congressional stature, is the inability of individual Congressmen, and perhaps all of Congress, to obtain information on a scale that might be needed to fully carry out their responsibilities. Political scientists in some cases are worried that Congress is not able to fulfill its function on a parity with the coordinate branches of the Government. Therefore, expansion of the information tools available to Congress is undoubtedly an end for us to seek most earnestly.

Further, the bill contains a final section which calls for a complete report to the Congress by the joint committee on an annual basis. This periodic review of the informational needs and resources of the Congress is of vital concern. It places a responsibility on designated Members of Congress to maintain a continuous review of the informational tools and such data as Congress needs. It recognizes that change is inevitable and perpetual and that it must be reckoned with in the context of data that Congressmen need.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this bill because I am convinced that "software" is more important than "hardware." This is a relatively simple thought but it has been proven in business especially that a failure to realize this truth is invariably a source of grief.

I am sure that many Congressmen feel concern about the information services for our body and also recognize that these will have immense significance for Congress in the years to come.

POST OFFICE RESEARCH AND ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the application of modern technology is essential to building the kind of postal service our vigorous Nation demands. An important step in that direction was taken recently when the Post Office Department's Research and Engineering Advisory Council held its first meeting here in Washington.

Through this Council, outstanding scientists, engineers, and educators from private industry, government, and some of our top universities are giving the Post Office Department the benefit of their vast wisdom and experience. They are helping the Department apply advanced scientific concepts and technology to its postal modernization and mechanization programs.

I am confident, too, the Post Office will receive excellent assistance in this regard from the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization, under the very capable and dedicated leadership of my colleague from Texas, the Honorable JOE POOL. I have discussed the urgent need for postal modernization many times with Mr. POOL, and I know he will do everything in his power as a subcommittee chairman to enable the Post Office to meet and solve its mounting problems.

Speaking at the first meeting of the Advisory Council, Postmaster General O'Brien said that when it comes to technology and the Postal Service: "The vistas are broad; the challenge is great." Postmaster General O'Brien's remarks at the Advisory Council meeting provide a timely summation of the need to marshall the full strength of our Nation's technological resources against a wide array of postal problems. With permission granted, I insert the full text of Postmaster General O'Brien's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE FIRST MEETING OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING ADVISORY COUNCIL, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 23, 1967

I am delighted to welcome you here this morning. This meeting marks the formal beginning of what I am confident will be a most fruitful and rewarding relationship, not just for the Postal Service but, more importantly, for the American public and the American business community we serve. I hope and trust you gentlemen will find this cooperative effort equally as rewarding.

This alliance between the Post Office, private industry and the academic community is an example of the creative federalism President Johnson is working so hard to foster as an integral part of our national policy and national life. All of our efforts to improve the quality of American society require the understanding, the cooperation, and the commitment of a broad range of private organizations.

Your presence here today testifies to your willingness to join in that effort. It was most gratifying to me and, I am sure, to Dr. Packer that not a single person we asked to serve on the Advisory Council refused. And I am well aware that time is one of your most precious commodities.

It is particularly fitting that the Post Office should call on private industry and the nation's educational system to assist us in improving postal service. The Post Office's importance to business, to education and to culture can hardly be overstated.

More than 80 per cent of all the mail we handle is generated by businesses or institutions. The Postal Service is the nation's primary artery of commerce, and, of course, the personal communications network of 190 million Americans.

Our schools and organizations supporting the arts depend heavily on the Postal Service. The Congress has recognized this by granting these groups preferential postal rates.

There is virtually no segment of our society that does not to some degree depend on the Postal Service. Our constituency, so to speak, stretches over the full social and economic fabric of the nation, as well as extending to its furthest geographical limits.

The task we face is enormous, at times almost frightening. This fiscal year we expect to process about 80 billion pieces of mail. The United States Post Office Department now handles as much mail as all the other nations of the world combined.

And mail volume seems never to have heard the old saying that everything that goes up must come down. It has been rising steadily, with relatively sharp increases over the past few years, reflecting the unprecedented economic expansion the nation has experienced since 1961.

In the last ten years annual mail volume has increased from 59 to 80 billion pieces. The postal work force has grown from 521,000 to 700,000. And our annual expenditures have risen from $3 billion to $6.3 billion.

It has only been very recently, however, that we accelerated our interest in an attention to technology to match the rapid growth in our workload. The technological revolution was slow in coming to the Postal Service, but I believe the events of the past 12 to 18 months demonstrate that it has arrived in full force.

I think that fact was demonstrated by our request and Congress' approval last year of a new position of Assistant Postmaster General for Research and Engineering.

I think it was demonstrated by our selection of Dr. Packer to head the new Bureau of Research and Engineering.

I think it was demonstrated by establishment of this Advisory Council, composed, as it is, of outstanding engineers and scientists from throughout the nation.

And I think it was demonstrated by the postal budget President Johnson sent to Congress in January. Our spending request for the coming fiscal year can be described as a modernization budget—the first true modernization budget in postal history.

It calls for more than $300 million in postal modernization expenditures. Included in our budget proposal are requests for an increase of 40 per cent in spending for research and engineering and a boost of 46 per cent in outlays for plant and equipment.

In announcing that he would recommend a postal rate increase, President Johnson stressed the necessity to move forward with postal modernization. He said the additional revenues produced by the proposed new rate structure would be used to finance an expanded postal modernization program and proposed pay raises for postal employees as well as reduce the substantial postal deficit.

Our 1968 budget also includes a new item—an item never before carried in a postal budget. This is a request for $56 million in funds for the construction of new post offices.

In the past, all postal facilities built by the government were constructed under the supervision of the General Services Administration. Now, we have been delegated authority to build our own post offices.

And the Bureau of Research and Engineering has been given far-reaching new responsibilities in the construction process. Its involvement starts with the planning of new post offices and continues until they are in regular operation with all mechanization and mail handling systems working at peak efficiency.

We are determined not to repeat the mistakes of the past, when post offices were constructed as multi-purpose buildings or as general warehouses. Post offices must be designed and constructed as modern mail processing plants. They must be designed and constructed to accommodate the machines and the mail movement patterns that will be used in them.

We are aware that the job of postal modernization cannot be accomplished overnight. We know we cannot attach a booster filled with money to the Postal Service and thrust our mail delivery system dramatically into the space age.

We do not intend merely to throw money at the problem and wait for dividends to accrue in the form of better postal service. But neither do we intend to let matters drift back to the situation that existed just a few years ago—an ironic situation that saw the nation with the most advanced technology in the world all but ignoring research in its own Postal Service.

With your help, we intend to focus the full range of technological knowledge and ability on our efforts to develop a modern, highly-mechanized, efficient, economical mail delivery system. To achieve this goal, we must adapt what is best from private industry and significantly upgrade our own ability to do basic research.

Our problems and the solutions we are seeking cover the entire gamut of the mail delivery process. And, as I am sure Dr. Packer will stress, we view our problems as parts of an integrated system rather than as separate, isolated difficulties. We believe the systems approach is the only logical way to close the technology gap and produce the kind of postal service the nation needs and has every right to demand.

We have a number of challenging areas for your immediate attention. The handling of mail while it is in a post office is the part of our operation that lends itself most readily to mechanization. Our ultimate goal is to develop a completely integrated mechanized system for processing and sorting various types of mail—a mechanized system capable of carrying the mail from where it enters the post office through to the point of dispatch.

The first and last phases of postal operations—pick-up and delivery—are less susceptible to mechanization of the type we normally deal with in the Post Office. But improved systems for collection of mail and for business and residential delivery in urban and suburban areas are needed.

And I can assure you, we will not hesitate to consider any ideas just because they are unique or represent a radical departure from traditional postal techniques. On the contrary, we are anxious to break new ground. We will not innovate merely for the sake of innovation, but we will not fear to break the old molds when new forms shape a better future.

Transportation, naturally, is another area of vital importance to the postal service. The traffic jams that plague our big cities and frustrate the average motorist also complicate and delay delivery of the mails.

Subways, the new high-speed trains that will soon begin running along the Northeast seaboard, and other types of proposed fast transit systems offer potential for improved mail service. We want to explore them all.

A related matter on which we seek the benefit of your wisdom and experience is the development of better postal traffic management and control systems.

I have touched on a few of the major areas we will ask you to venture into with us. The vistas are broad; the challenge is great.

This is, indeed, a time of change and a time of challenge for the postal service. The challenge is to meet the greatest flood of mail ever seen by man with the finest postal service in history.

With your help, I am confident we will prove equal to that challenge.

NATIONAL POETRY DAY

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House joint resolution calling for the observance of National Poetry Day on October 15 of each year. I introduced an identical resolution in the last session of the 89th Congress but, unfortunately, no action was taken before the end of the session. However, the response from poetry lovers indicated remarkable, organized, nationwide support for such a proposal. My office handled a large volume of calls from other congressional offices which needed further information to reply to correspondence on the subject.

A poetry day has been observed by Governor's proclamation, act of legislature, or by action of poetry societies in 42 different States. I am today calling for the culmination of these widespread efforts to get official recognition of the importance of poetry to our culture and our heritage. A national observance in honor of poetry would serve to remind us that our deepest roots are human and aesthetic not scientific and technical. In a time when the daily output of writing is so great as to stagger the imagination but the noble thought elegantly and eloquently phrased is rare, a national poetry day would remind us of the importance of the beauty and quality of language to effective communication, without which, we are doomed.

I urge your support for this resolution.

THE COMPUTER-TABULATED RESULTS OF THE 1967 QUESTIONNAIRE PROJECT OF REPRESENTATIVE CHAMBERLAIN

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the computer-tabulated results of my 1967 questionnaire project have been received and I am pleased to provide this information to my colleagues. In general I was impressed both by the substantial lack of approval of many administration programs as well as the lack of support for a number of its legislative requests before the 90th Congress. In view of the fact that the questionnaire was made available through the newspapers to everyone in Michigan's Sixth Congressional District, which is both industrial and agricultural in character, I believe that these results are of particular interest and value.

As would be expected, the questions relating to the war in Vietnam prompted an avalanche of comments reflecting all shades of opinion and a deepening concern which I fully share. It is significant, I believe, that 45 percent said they did not agree with the administration's conduct of the war with 60 percent urging that it be pursued more vigorously while 18 percent called for pulling out entirely. Individual comments ranged

from "Stop the bombing of North Vietnam unconditionally" to "Warn Hanoi to either surrender or get blown off the map." Perhaps most representative, however, was the statement "The war in Vietnam seems endless—certainly it is confusing." In sharp contrast to the low rating given the operation of many Great Society programs by the respondents to the questionnaire, I especially noted the support given to two proposals which are being offered by Republicans in the 90th Congress. A better than two-thirds majority indicated that social security benefits should be tied to the cost of living index, while 56 percent indicated they favored a plan for sharing Federal revenues with the States. As one who joined in sponsoring legislation in both these areas I believe that the responses clearly reveal a growing interest in these constructive alternative proposals.

The complete results are as follows:

Results of Congressman Chamberlain's 1967 questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Do you favor merging the Departments of Commerce and Labor into a single Department?	29	35	36
2. Should postal rates be increased to help meet operational costs?	55	34	11
3. Do you believe strikes in transportation industries such as railroads, airlines, buses, and trucking should be forbidden by law?	54	35	11
4. Should social security benefits be tied to the cost-of-living index?	68	20	12
5. With farm surpluses reduced and demand growing, should an effort be made to relax farm controls?	88	6	6
6. The budget, as submitted by the President, has a deficit of $8,100,000,000. Should nonmilitary spending be cut to reduce this deficit?	78	15	7
7. Should income tax for individuals and corporations be increased 6 percent as the President has recommended?	17	68	15
8. It has been suggested that 3 percent of the money collected by the Federal Government be returned to State and local governments to be used as they see fit. Do you approve?	57	28	15
9. The President has urged the expansion of trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern European Communist countries. Do you favor this?	36	46	18
10. The administration has asked for $3,100,000,000 for next year's foreign aid. This program should be—	*Percent*		
Increased	3		
About this level	15		
Decreased	52		
Discontinued	25		
Blank	5		
11. Do you agree generally with the way the administration is conducting the war in Vietnam?	25	56	19
12. Would you like to see the war—	*Percent*		
Pursued more vigorously	60		
United States pull out entirely	18		
Deescalated	12		
Blank	10		
13. Do you believe that the U.S. aim in South Vietnam should be to—	*Percent*		
Win	51		
Arrange a cease-fire	20		
Withdraw with honor	22		
Blank	7		

	Good	Fair	Poor	Blank
14. Most of the Great Society programs will soon be reviewed. How do you rate the war on poverty as a whole?	*Percent* 5	*Percent* 19	*Percent* 63	*Percent* 13
How do you rate the following programs?				
(a) Community action programs	8	25	34	33
(b) Job Corps	14	24	39	23
(c) VISTA (Domestic Peace Corps)	17	25	29	29
(d) Headstart	24	23	26	27
(e) Federal Teachers Corps	7	20	34	39
(f) Demonstration cities	5	15	44	36
(g) Urban renewal	13	27	35	25
(h) Rent supplement	6	16	45	33

TREASURY - POST OFFICE - EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, some of the press reports of the action taken in the House on March 24 on the Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office appropriation bill charged that the 5-percent Bow expenditure limitation amendment which I offered would have forced President Johnson to cut his own salary by 5 percent.

This charge is on a par with charges made by opponents of the amendment during the debate that the amendment constituted a meat-ax cut in an appropriation bill.

The facts will not sustain either of these charges. The amendment would not have dictated any such action by the President. Nor can the expenditure limitation amendment fairly be construed as a meat-ax or any other kind of reduction in the appropriations called for in the bill.

The amendment did not, as has been charged, provide for any cut at all in the appropriations. Let me explain what the amendment contemplated in language I hope will be clear enough to eliminate all misunderstandings. The amendment did not touch a single appropriation item in the bill. All it did was say that the executive branch could not spend in fiscal year 1968 more than 95 percent of the net aggregate expenditures proposed in the budget for these departments in fiscal year 1968. While the appropriations recommended in the bill totaled $7.5 billion, the net expenditures contemplated in the budget amount to only $2.1 billion, so the reduction in spending would have totaled only $109 million.

Congress usually deals with appropriations, which means granting to the executive branch of the Government the authority to obligate funds for future expenditures, some of which are to be made during the year in which the appropriation bill is passed but some of which will not be spent for years. The proof of this lies in the fact that at the end of fiscal year 1968 the budget contemplates that there will be a total of $132.8 billion on hand in the executive branch of the Government in unspent funds previously appropriated.

To limit spending in an appropriation bill is the only way Congress can exercise any substantial control over spending. Of course we can control new appropriations by reducing budget requests, but the fact that the executive agencies will have $132.8 billion on hand from funds previously appropriated at the end of 1968 shows clearly that Congress has virtually lost control over the level of spending in any one year.

The spending limitation amendment would have left it up to the President to decide where the spending reductions should be made. The President would have had the same flexibility in determining areas where cuts should be made as he had last November when he announced a budgetary cutback of $5.3 billion in Federal programs, which he estimated would result in expenditure reductions of $3 billion in current fiscal year. The only difference in operation of the Bow expenditure limitation amendment and the President's expenditure reduction action of last fall is the fact that the amendment would have made the 5-percent reduction mandatory. Thus the administration would not have been permitted to rescind some of the proposed reductions as has recently been done.

Instead of being a meat-ax cut, or an

act of irresponsibility, the Bow amendment is one of the fairest that could be offered to reduce Federal spending because it gives the President the greatest possible degree of flexibility in determining where within the framework of the bill in question, spending reductions are to be made. It would not have denied the administration the power to obligate all of the funds provided in the bill. All it undertook to do was reduce the level of spending by 5 percent during fiscal year 1968.

We are all pleased to have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] back with us and to know that he has fully recovered. I for one hope that he will continue this year to offer expenditure limitation amendments on other appropriation bills because it represents a fiscally responsible method of reducing Federal spending, without tying the President's hands, and it permits the Congress to make a contribution in behalf of fiscal restraint at a time when goodness knows some fiscal restraint is very much in order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. KLEPPE.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. EILBERG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCCARTHY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 623. An act to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 5, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

594. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide scholarships to selected persons for education in medicine, dentistry and other health professions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

595. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department without competition for the period July 1, 1966 through December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–568; to the Committee on Armed Services.

596. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisons of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

597. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisons of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

598. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisons of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 364. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 312; with amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6167. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 7910. A bill to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to exclude from such act contracts with the Post Office Department the principal purpose of which is the transportation, handling, or delivery of the mails; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 7911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 7912. A bill to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to exclude from such act contracts with the Post Office Department the principal purpose of which is the transportation, handling, or delivery of the mails; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 7913. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7914. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 7915. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent termination of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7916. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to establish a new program of mortgage insurance, direct loans, and bond guarantees, administered through a bank for urban rehabilitation and development within the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to supplement existing housing and related programs of such Department; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7917. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to further protect the interests of the United States in the insurance of certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7918. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives for the rehabilitation of rental housing for low-income families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude real property (other than the taxpayer's residence) from capital gains tax treatment, to limit the deduction for real estate taxes paid on unimproved land, and to eliminate the deductions for real estate taxes and depreciation on multifamily housing which is not maintained in a safe and sanitary condition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 7920. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7921. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase to $30,000 the maximum servicemen's group life insurance which may be provided members of the uniformed services on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7922. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7923. A bill to amend the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to the discontinuance of passenger operations by common carriers of passengers by motor vehicle and to impose an 18-month moratorium on the discontinuance of any such operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 7924. A bill to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7925. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 7926. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, dividend, and reserve provisions; to require the establishment of an education

committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7927. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7928. A bill to amend section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act to provide that the definition of "employer" therein shall include certain corporations or associations operating a hospital; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7929. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 7930. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 7931. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to exclude Post Office Department mail transportation contracts from the Service Contract Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 7933. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the provisions permitting the deduction, without regard to the 3-percent and 1-percent floors, of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 7936. A bill to prescribe the geographical limits of the naval districts and to provide that the commandants thereof shall be officers not below the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 7937. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to correct an inequity with respect to survivor annuities of certain students by reason of the 4-month interim period requirement between school years; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7938. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to protect any veteran against a loss of pension as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7939. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7940. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent termination of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7941. A bill to establish and develop the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 7942. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give employers and performers in the performing arts the same rights given by section 8(f) of such act to employers and employees in the construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 7943. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 7944. A bill to equalize the rates of disability compensation payable to veterans of peacetime and wartime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 7945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for certain local residential real property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 7946. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 7947. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to the State of Michigan to assist such State to carry out projects relating to the conservation of anadromous fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 7948. A bill to authorize the granting of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances, and all rights in connection therewith and pertaining thereto, to certain homestead patentees who were wrongfully deprived of such property and rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7949. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish a memorial museum at Las Vegas, N. Mex., in honor of the Roosevelt Rough Riders; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 15 of each year as National Poetry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

120. By Mr. KYROS: Memorial of the 103d Maine State Legislature, memorializing Congress recommending full development of electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper St. John River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

121. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to increasing economic assistance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7950. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kievman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7951. A bill for the relief of Idilio Marques Simoes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 7952. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luitgard R. Oswald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7953. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Di Marco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7954. A bill for the relief of Jean M. Vorbe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7955. A bill for the relief of Alberto Vadra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7956. A bill for the relief of Jorge E. De Moya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7957. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dario Duque; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7958. A bill for the relief of William H. Nickerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7959. A bill for the relief of Brenda Gilo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 7960. A bill for the relief of Claire Zibley Malik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7961. A bill for the relief of Morris Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1967

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

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

O Thou God of grace and glory, in hours of confusion and commotion we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee. To Thee who knowest the secrets of our hearts, we commit ourselves and our Nation. We acknowledge our love of ease, our pride of race and place and possession, our hard bargaining and ruthless competition, our failure to take account of the needs of others, and to realize that in very truth humanity is one.

Work in us by Thy grace, we pray, a miracle of renewal and transformation. Grant us the strength of will to keep Thy commandments and walk in Thy ways. There lie our fortune and destiny, for there truth may walk in shining garments and goodness grow glorious, and all that is excellent and beautiful, unselfish, and of high repute may make our inner lives even as the garden of the Lord.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 3, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which

it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4717. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn.;

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89–487; and

H.R. 5876. An act to amend titles 5, 14, and 37, United States Code, to codify recent law, and to improve the code.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 4717. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn;. to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89–487; and

H.R. 5876. An act to amend titles 5, 14, and 37, United States Code, to codify recent law, and to improve the code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSEL LOANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected financial management practices in the Department of Labor, dated March 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1964

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, for the fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HIGHWAY SAFETY AND BEAUTIFICATION

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authorizations from the highway safety and beauty trust fund to carry out the purposes of the highway safety and beautification programs under title 23, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution providing for the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Whereas, Both houses of the eighty-ninth congress of the United States of America, at the first session of such congress, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of the members of each house thereof, made a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following words, to-wit:

" 'Joint Resolution

" 'Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

" 'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'Sec. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'Sec. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office; therefore be it

"RESOLVED, By the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, that the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further

"RESOLVED, That the Secretary of State of Ohio be, and he hereby is directed, to deliver to the Governor of this state a certified copy of this resolution, and such certified copy shall be forwarded at once by the Governor to the Administrator of General Services, United States Government, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of State of the United States.

"CHARLES F. KURFESS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"JOHN BROWN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted March 7, 1967."

A resolution of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN MASSACHUSETTS

"Resolved, That the General Court hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to establish a national cemetery in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, March 6, 1967.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Senate adopted in concurrence, March 13, 1967.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
"Clerk.

"[SEAL]
"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION EXEMPTING LETTERS AND PACKAGES MAILED TO SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM FROM ALL POSTAGE CHARGES

"Whereas, No effort should be spared in maintaining constant communication between members of our armed forces serving

in Vietnam and their relatives and friends; and

"Whereas, The flow of such communication should be facilitated to the fullest degree; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation exempting letters and packages mailed to such servicemen from all postage charges; and it be further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Postmaster General, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, March 6, 1967.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 13, 1967.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
"Clerk.

"[SEAL]
"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

H.P. 1080

Joint resolution memorializing Congress recommending full development of electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper Saint John River

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the One Hundred and Third Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your Honorable Body as follows:

Whereas, the people of Maine throughout the years have supported the concept of developing Passamaquoddy Bay for electric power purposes as indicated by a great number of favorable and sometimes unanimous Acts of the State Legislature, and earlier by a state-wide referendum that favored Quoddy by nearly ten to one; and

Whereas, the need for vast quantities of reasonably priced power to satisfy the future needs of Maine, the Northeastern States, and the Eastern Provinces of Canada has been established without question; and

Whereas, development of electric power from the Upper Saint John River and Passamaquoddy Bay can be very valuable as peaking power and for base load power; and

Whereas, other substantial benefits such as increased numbers of tourists, increased recreational uses of the Bay and River, down stream power benefits on the Saint John River, flood control benefits and much needed construction job opportunities in the site areas will result; and

Whereas, the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties of Maine advocate the development of the electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper Saint John River, now therefore, be it

Resolved: That the 103rd Legislature recommends the full development of the electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and such supplemental development of the electric power potential of the Upper Saint John River as may be recommended as economically feasible by studies now under way by the Department of the Interior without substantial destruction of the recreational and industrial advantages now recognized as existing in the Saint John River area, and that necessary interconnecting transmission facilities be provided between the projects and the load centers of the Northeast to provide the optimum benefits to the United States and Canada; and be it further

Resolved: That this 103rd Legislature respectfully asks that required action be taken to start the projects at the earliest possible time in the most economic and practical sequence of development; and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

House of Representatives, read and adopted, March 21, 1967.

Sent up for concurrence.

BERTHA W. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

In Senate Chamber, read and adopted in concurrence, March 22, 1967.

JERROLD B. SPEERS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress in support of legislation that will provide for uniformity of traffic signs in interstate travel.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

H 1518

Resolution memorializing Congress to enact such legislation as will make all traffic signs uniform in size, color, and design as to prevent confusion in interstate travel

Whereas, Interstate highways and an ever-increasing mobilization of the population have added dramatically to the number of automobiles which traverse the state borders and cause more fatalities each coming year; and

Whereas, By making all traffic signs uniform in size, color and design will help to reduce the problems which are encountered by highway travelers and help to reduce the number of traffic accidents; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the state of Rhode Island through its general assembly now requests the congress of the United States to give consideration to this serious situation and to enact the necessary legislation to make all traffic signs uniform in size, color and design as to prevent confusion in interstate travel; and be it further

Resolved, That the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use concerted effort to bring about the enactment of this resolution; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3. A bill to provide effective procedures for the enforcement of the establishment and free exercise clauses of the first amendment to the Constitution (Rept. No. 85).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 471. A bill for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co. (Rept. No. 86).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 60. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oton Socarraz (Rept. No. 87);

S. 65. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Alberto Rojas-Machado (Rept. No. 88);

S. 66. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Reboredo-Newhall (Rept. No. 89);

S. 73. A bill for the relief of Armando Jose Alonso-Garcia (Rept. No. 90);

S. 75. A bill for the relief of Rita Maria Garmendia de Alsina (Rept. No. 91);

S. 91. A bill for the relief of Daniel Pernas-Beceiro (Rept. No. 92);

S. 129. A bill for the relief of Carlos J. Abroleya (Rept. No. 93);

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo (Rept. No. 94);

S. 131. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez (Rept. No. 95);

S. 132. A bill for the relief of Dr. Albert Fernandez-Bravo y Amat (Rept. No. 96);

S. 133. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez (Rept. No. 97);

S. 134. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver (Rept. No. 98);

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarita L. Agullana (Rept. No. 99);

S. 164. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cesar A. Mena (Rept. No. 100);

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramon Baez Hernandez (Rept. No. 101);

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez (Rept. No. 102);

S. 168. A bill for the relief of Maria Jordan Ferrando (Rept. No. 103);

S. 169. A bill for the relief of Dr. Roberto E. Parajon and Maria C. Florin Parajon, his wife (Rept. No. 104);

S. 170. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pablo A. Suarez (Rept. No. 105);

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot (Rept. No. 106);

S. 175. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sherif Shafey (Rept. No. 107);

S. 256. A bill for the relief of Rosa Anna Genovese (Rept. No.108);

S. 287. A bill for the relief of Wen Shi Yu (Rept. No. 109);

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo) (Rept. No. 110);

S. 461. A bill for the relief of Gustavo Eugenio Gomez (Rept. No. 111);

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo N. Hernandez, Jr. (Rept. No. 112);

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario Guillermo Martinez (Rept. No. 113);

S. 466. A bill for the relief of Victor Abadi (Rept. No. 114);

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando O. Garcia-Hernandez (Rept. No. 115);

S. 533. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Bethard (Rept. No. 116);

S. 543. A bill for the relief of Henri P. Boutin (Rept. No. 117);

S. 652. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard (Rept. No. 118);

S. 661. A bill for the relief of Dr. Albert Victor Michael Ferris-Prabhu (Rept. No. 119);

S. 822. A bill for the relief of Hye Suk Paeng and Mi Kung Paeng (Patricia Ann) (Rept. No. 120);

S. 857. A bill for the relief of Puget Sound Plywood, Inc., of Tacoma, Wash. (Rept. No. 121);

S. 897. A bill for the relief of Hilda E. M. Hofstra (Rept. No. 123);

S. 904. A bill for the relief of Doreen Delmege Willis (Rept. No. 125);

S. 905. A bill for the relief of John Theodore Nelson (Rept. No. 126); and

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Dr. Esther Yolanda Lauzardo (Rept. No. 127).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 39. A bill for the relief of Athanasia Argere (Rept. No. 129);

S. 67. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan Ramon Diaz Zayas Bazan (Rept. No. 130);

S. 72. A bill for the relief of Carlos Miguel Calonge-Diaz (Rept. No. 131);

S. 74. A bill for the relief of Ena Herminia Mourino de Moya (Rept. No. 132);

S. 126. A bill for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez (Rept. No. 133);

S. 128. A bill for the relief of Andrew Loriz (Rept. No. 134);

S. 280. A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted by a U.S. citizen (Rept. No. 135);

S. 298. A bill for the relief of Sixto M. Pagaran (Rept. No. 136);

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oscar Lopez (Rept. No. 137);

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Kil Ja Chung (Rept. No. 122);

S. 899. A bill for the relief of Julio Juan Castellanos Lopez (Rept. No. 124);

S. 900. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Sanchez Jerez (Rept. No. 138);

S. 956. A bill for the relief of Nachman Bench (Rept. No. 128); and

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Hofacker (Rept. No. 139).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 24. A bill for the relief of Wong Ock Wah (Sheck See Hom) and his wife, Mon Hing Mong (Rept. No. 144);

S. 127. A bill for the relief of Julio Dumas and his wife, Josephine Dumas (Rept. No. 140);

S. 135. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hilario Anido, (Rept. No. 141);

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Nariko Susan Duke (Nakano) (Rept. No. 142); and

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jesus L. Lastra (Rept. No. 143).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bert T. Combs, of Kentucky, to be U.S. Circuit Judge, 6th Circuit;

Robert C. Belloni, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon; and

Jack T. Stuart, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Mississippi.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frank J. Murray, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter N. Lawson, of South Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Carolina.

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

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador at Large;

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Maurice J. Williams, of Maryland, to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and South Asia, Agency for International Development;

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, Frank Stanton, of New York, and Thomas Van Husen Vail, of Ohio, to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information;

Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Vietnam;

William W. Heath, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Sweden;

John M. McSweeney, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bulgaria;

Douglas MacArthur II, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Austria;

Richard H. Nolte, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United Arab Republic; and

Karl F. Rolvaag, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iceland.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1408. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ivonne Mireya Mercado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1409. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1410. A bill for the relief of Tran Van Nugyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPONG:

S. 1411. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of Kyoung-Hi Park Kim; and

S. 1413. A bill for the relief of Vernon Louis Hoberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 1414. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide that persons inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under such act shall not be assigned to duty in southeast Asia unless they volunteer for such duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1415. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain changes in the method of nominating persons for appointment to the service academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Merlin R. Owens, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1417. A bill to provide for a survey by the Secretary of the Interior to establish the route of the Chisholm Trail and for the establishment of markers to identify such route, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1418. A bill to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1419. A bill for the relief of Winston George Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Lugarda Losoya Damian-Ruiz;

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of C.P.O. James G. Dole, U.S. Navy; and

S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Richard Vigil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. MONTOYA):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1424. A bill to enable the District of Columbia to participate in the health and medical assistance benefits made available by the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. FONG, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1425. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to proscribe the mailing of certain matter not desired by addressees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1426. A bill to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has announced hearings on Colorado River Basin project bills. This problem has been before the Congress before, but has floundered because of lack of unity among the States in the Colorado Basin. Last year we thought we had achieved that unity, but the bill was killed when "nature preservationists" conducted a well-financed campaign against it.

In response to this attack the administration has proposed a bill—S. 1013—this year which sacrifices the hard-won unity of the Colorado Basin States in

order to stop the attack of the "nature preservationists"; overlooked, however, is the need for water conservation and development in our arid West. The administration would authorize the central Arizona project but then, ostrichlike, would hide its head and not see the problem that has delayed this project all of these years. The basic problem which has plagued this legislation is simply that there is not sufficient natural flow in the Colorado River to meet the demands within the basin beyond the year 1990. Therefore, any meaningful legislation must involve balancing the interests of the State of Arizona with the other States who have rights to the waters of the Colorado River.

The first safeguard that the other basin States need is a study of sources to supplement the natural flow of the Colorado River. Without a legislative commitment to study water importation from areas of surplus, there is a danger that when the upper basin States utilize their allocations, there will be insufficient water for the central Arizona project to divert. Although I support any feasible means of augmenting the water supply, importation appears as the only practical means today.

Second, the upper basin States want their most needed projects authorized so that they can utilize a greater share of the waters allocated to them.

The third need is for the establishment of a lower basin fund. There is no fund established under the administration bill because the steamplant will produce no revenue which could be added to a fund. The authorization of the High Hualapai Dam would provide revenues for the lower basin fund. This fund could then be utilized to support the costs of supplemental water.

In short, the administration bill provides for the immediate needs of Arizona, but the needs of the other six basin States will be sacrificed. That is exactly what Secretary Udall warned against a year ago when he hailed the Colorado River Basin project bill as a fine example of regional cooperation and said that this cooperation was essential to its success.

Recognizing the need for cooperation, several bills have been introduced this year along the lines of the bill reported by the House last year. I cosponsored Senator KUCHEL's bill, S. 861, and I still support it. I also support S. 1242, introduced by Senator ALLOTT a short time ago. All of these bills embody a regional approach to the problems of the Colorado River Basin. The administration bill does not.

But to make clear and to fully protect the interest of Utah in this legislation, I am introducing a slightly modified version of the Kuchel bill which I cosponsored earlier this year.

This bill authorizes the construction of the central Arizona project with an aqueduct capacity of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second. It authorizes, as does Senator ALLOTT's bill, S. 1242, the construction of the High Hualapai Dam and contains the language earlier submitted by Senator ALLOTT regarding section 305(a), dealing with California's guarantee of 4.4 million acre-feet of water per year. The major departure in my bill from those previously introduced concerns the matter of study of importation of water from sources outside the Colorado River Basin. My bill provides that a feasibility grade study be initiated concerning the importation of water from the north coastal streams of the State of California. The first 2½ million acre-feet of such import from this source would be allocated to the satisfaction of the obligation of the Mexican water treaty and to losses of water associated with the performance of that treaty. Additionally, a quantity of water, not to exceed 2 million acre-feet annually, would be made available to areas served by the importation facilities en route to the Colorado River system. Further, the bill would initiate a reconnaissance-type study of importation from areas of surplus other than the north central area of the State of California.

The State of Utah is greatly imperiled by the threat to its future rights in the Colorado River system and inasmuch as the supply of the Colorado River is inadequate to meet the demands placed upon it, the provision of an import study in this legislation is imperative. The provision to make the first area subject to import study the north coastal streams of California is consistent with the general provision of Secretary Udall's Southwest water plan.

Section 602 of my bill provides criteria for the coordinated long-range operation of the Colorado River storage reservoirs. This important provision is supported unanimously by the Colorado River States and, in a slightly modified form contained in my bill, would provide an additional safeguard to the future generations of Utahans who will look to the Colorado River for water.

Section 501(a) contains language which would enable the State of Utah and the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill their commitments which were established by agreement with the Ute Indian tribe of the Uinta and Ouray Indian Reservation. By reason of this agreement it is necessary for the Ute Indian unit to be given a priority in planning, so my bill provides that the planning report on this unit must be completed prior to 1972.

Section 401 as outlined in my bill restores language which was a part of H.R. 4671, 89th Congress, providing that all of the separable and joint costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at the previously authorized Dixie project shall be nonreimbursable in conformity with the original authorizing legislation. My bill provides, as do others, for the integration of the Dixie project into the Colorado River Basin project and directs that the Dixie project shall participate in the lower basin fund.

In other respects, this legislation is similar to previous bills introduced. This recognizes the fact that S. 20, providing for the National Water Commission, has been passed by the Senate. It also contemplates that the revision of the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park shall be accomplished by legislation similar to that introduced by Chairman ASPINALL as H.R. 6132 and by Senators DOMINICK and ALLOTT as S. 1243. This bill reflects the longstanding interest and constructive approach that has been taken by the State of Utah in intra- and inter-state water projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1409) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF DRAFTEES BEING SENT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA WITHOUT THEIR CONSENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the selective service law to preclude the sending of draftees to southeast Asia without their consent.

The undeclared war which the United States is waging in Vietnam is illegal and immoral. It is unjust for the United States to force its own draftees to serve in Vietnam at a time when the South Vietnamese Army is experiencing a desertion date of over 110,000 per year. Sufficient moral issues are raised by the U.S. conduct of the undeclared war in Vietnam to justify removing from draftees the onus of resolving the very real mental conflict which so many of them have about serving in Vietnam.

In his state of the Union message to the 90th Congress on January 10, 1967, President Johnson said:

> We are shaping a new future of enlarged partnership in nuclear affairs, in economic and technical cooperation, in trade negotiations, in political consultation, and in working together with the governments and peoples of Eastern Europe.

The President went on to enumerate the many ways in which he is seeking to end the cold war, mentioning, among other things, the agreement on the peaceful uses of outer space, direct air flights to the Soviet Union from New York to Moscow, the removal of more than 400 nonstrategic items from export control, permitting the Export-Import Bank to make loans to Poland, Hugary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia, in addition to Rumania and Yugoslavia, and extending the cultural agreement with the Soviet Union. President Johnson went on to ask the Senate to approve the consular agreement with the Soviet Union—which it has now done—and an East-West trade bill.

If the so-called detente with the Soviet Union is getting on so well, why does the United States still maintain in Europe 300,000 fighting men who could be used in Vietnam rather than the draftees who are now sent there. The desertion rate of the South Vietnamese fighting forces was 96,000 in 1965; it rose to more than 110,000 in 1966—an increase of over 14,000 men over 1965 desertions. Should the United States draft its own fine young men to fight in Vietnam as replacements for South Vietnamese deserters?

There recently came to my attention a copy of a contract which the Agency for International Development entered into

with a group of California State colleges under which approximately 100 South Vietnamese college students will be brought to the United States—at the expense of the United States—for a college education. The cost to the United States of training these college students will be $417,710. It is incongruous that the United States should be considering dropping all draft deferments for its own college students, and has actually dropped deferments for all nonmedical graduate students, and at the same time grant what amounts to deferments to South Vietnamese college students who—if the struggle is so vital for them—should be in South Vietnam fighting for their country.

I hope that my amendment to the Selective Service law, barring draftees from being sent to southeast Asia without their consent, will be given favorable consideration by the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, which is now considering an extension of the selective service law.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement on the floor of the Senate on March 10, announcing my intention to introduce this amendment to the draft act, be printed at this point in my remarks, as well as the text of my bill S. 1414 which is that amendment.

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

The bill (S. 1414) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide that persons inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under such act shall not be assigned to duty in southeast Asia unless they volunteer for such duty, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1414

A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide that persons inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under such Act shall not be assigned to duty in Southeast Asia unless they volunteer for such duty

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, (50 App. U.S.C. 451–471), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 22. No person inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under this Act shall be assigned to duty or required to perform service in Southeast Asia unless such person volunteers for assignment to duty in such area."

The statement presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

DRAFTEES SHOULD NOT BE SENT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA WITHOUT THEIR CONSENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson's request of March 6, 1967, that the selective service law due to expire on June 30, 1967, be extended for 4 years, should give the Congress an opportunity, among other things, to examine the moral and legal bases for sending draftees to fight, against their will, in Vietnam—in an undeclared, illegal, and immoral war 10,000 miles from our shores.

As in the last Congress, it is my intention at the appropriate time to introduce an amendment to any draft extension proposal, providing that no draftee can be sent to southeast Asia without his consent.

I have repeatedly stated the bases for my total opposition to the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. The United States is acting in Vietnam in total disregard of the express provisions of the United Nations Charter. The United States is acting in Vietnam against the clearly stated provisions of its own Constitution.

It is acting in violation of the SEATO Treaty.

It is acting in violation of its own commitments made in 1954 by Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith when, in referring to the Geneva accords establishing the independence of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam, he pledged that the United States would refrain "from the threat or use of force to disturb them" and that the United States would support the elections for the officials who would govern reunified Vietnam, whose separation into North and South Vietnam was admittedly temporary and only for purposes of demilitarization. This was all part of the Geneva accords and was supported by the above-cited unilateral commitment of the United States. That was the commitment which the United States later violated, when it supported Diem's refusal to hold the promised election.

Moreover, the United States is acting in violation of President Johnson's own promises to the American people.

On August 29, 1964, he said:

"I have had advice to load our planes with bombs and to drop them on certain areas that I think would enlarge the war and result in committing a good many American boys to fighting a war that I think ought to be fought by the boys of Asia to help protect their own land. And for that reason I haven't chosen to enlarge the war."

Again on September 25, 1964, he said:

"There are those that say you ought to go north and drop bombs, to try to wipe out the supply lines, and they think that would escalate the war. We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. We don't want to get involved in a nation with 700 million people and get tied down in a land war in Asia."

Again on October 21, 1964, President Johnson said:

"We are not going to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

The President has not asked the Congress for a declaration of war and yet he seeks authority to draft American boys and send them to southeast Asia to fight in bloody, savage military battles unsanctioned by law, whose death toll is steadily rising. Last week establishes a new peak of American casualties. Is it any wonder that many thousands of American boys are morally tormented about fighting in Vietnam?

The administration is telling the American people repeatedly that the dangers from the Soviet Union are less and less, day by day, and that the passage of the proposed consular treaty with Russia wil prove that to the world. And yet, the same administration tells the American people that the dangers of Soviet aggression in Europe are so great and continuing that it cannot risk reducing its troop commitments in Europe—over 300,000 men—but must instead draft American boys to serve without their consent in southeast Asia. If more men are needed to replace our mounting casualties, let the draftees be sent to Europe, and let experienced American military personnel trained in Europe replace them in southeast Asia.

There is a vast difference between sending enlisted men of the Armed Forces to Vietnam and sending draftees there. When a man voluntarily enlists in one of the branches of the armed services, he does so with his eyes open—he knows that he must obey the orders of the Commander in Chief and go where he is sent—even if it is to fight and perhaps die in Vietnam. His is not "to reason why." He undertook to obey orders when he voluntarily entered military service. No one forced him to enlist.

The draftee—after he is inducted—also agrees to obey orders but his agreeing to do so is not on a voluntary basis. He has no choice. But he does know that he is being sent to fight in a war which the Congress did not declare. And he does know that under the Constitution—which he must swear to uphold and defend when he is inducted—only the Congress can declare war. This is a part of the crux of the reluctance of so many of our young men to serve in Vietnam in addition to the fact that the United States is there illegally, and having invited itself in—contrary to the official allegation that it was invited in and thereafter started bombing—north and south—became the aggressor.

In 1965, there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army. In 1966, that figure had climbed to 110,000 men deserting the South Vietnamese Army. No one knows how much higher it will go in 1967.

The President, in his recent draft message, proposes:

"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."

What are we doing? Are we drafting American youths to go to Vietnam to replace the South Vietnamese draft dodgers and to fight and perhaps die there for a people who do not care enough about the conflict to stand and fight for what is presumably their own cause? That makes utterly no sense. It is entirely unfair to American draftees. This is directly contrary to President Johnson's own statement of September 28, 1964, in which he said:

"We are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men, with our leadership and our officer direction, and such equipment as we can furnish them."

Three years ago exactly—on March 10, 1964—when, in my speech on the floor of the Senate, entitled "The United States Should Get Out of Vietnam," I analyzed the situation in Vietnam and the United States involvement there, urging the United States to disengage itself from its military involvement there, I said:

"I consider the life of one American worth more than this putrid mess. I consider that every additional life that is sacrificed in this forlorn venture a tragedy. Someday—if this sacrificing continues—it will be denounced as a crime."

On May 14, 1966, a distinguished former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, who had seen service in Asia, confirmed my earlier remarks before the 10th Annual College World Affairs Day in Los Angeles, when he stated:

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

I agree with General Shoup and can only wish that his sound view had been and would henceforth be heeded. Both my words and the words of General Shoup are particularly pertinent to the situation of draftees who are being sent involuntarily to fight in Vietnam in an undeclared, illegal, immoral, indefensible, monstrous, and ever more costly war.

There has been much criticism of the way the draft has been applied, and various proposals including some made by the President to improve its procedures. It is my view that this involuntary servitude is itself totally unjustified at least as far as our war in southeast Asia is concerned, and should be abolished. That is the purpose of my amendment.

It is my hope that when my amendment is brought up on the floor of the Senate, there will be a full and free debate on this entire matter.

METHOD OF ACADEMY NOMINATIONS SHOULD BE CHANGED

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill which will do away with the authority of Members of Congress to nominate young men for appointment to the Academies of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The same basic method of congressional appointment has been in use since first effected well over a century ago and I feel that this method, although well established, is deficient in certain aspects and that it does not result in the best selection of candidates overall.

Even though most Congressmen are quite conscientious in their manner of selecting nominees, excellent young men are often passed over. The job of competently screening the many applicants for an academy nomination are a burdensome one. It takes a great deal of a Congressman and his staff's time and effort. Applications, high school records and letters of recommendation should be studied and compared. Academic and physical examinations must be arranged for each applicant. If the best job of selection is to be achieved, personal interviews should be conducted, and this, in many instances, is an almost impossible task for a Senator or Congressman.

Some Congressmen try to handle this task themselves. Others gain help from a citizens board who handle the applications and actually select the nominees in their State or district. Still others may not be so thorough in their process of selection. Although certainly not true in my office, it is thought by many that political debts and involvements are embodied in the selection process in some instances. Whether or not this is true I cannot say.

What is perhaps more important is a fear that many young men who sincerely desire to attend one of our military academies and to make the military a career are discouraged in their own minds from making application because they feel they have no political connections which would help them gain a nomination. This is indeed tragic. Twenty-five to 35 percent of those young men who enter our three major academies drop out for various reasons before they reach graduation. For those who do finish, 15 to 30 percent resign from military duty before serving 10 years; in other words, they decide against a military career. And yet, it appears we have qualified young men who would give anything for such a career, who are afraid to apply because they do not have political pull.

Finally, Mr. President, the fact is that many Senators and Congressmen do not always utilize their opportunity and obligation to nominate young men to the academies. Let me cite this example. Records from the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs show that for the class entering this coming summer, 1967, there were 945 vacancies available to be filled by congressional nominations. Yet, only 671 of these privileges were utilized. This does not mean that the positions will be left wanting, for they are to be filled by other qualified alternates from a nationwide pool of those who were not selected initially. However, the fact remains that Senators and House Representatives failed to make almost one-third of the nominations available to them.

Mr. President, I think it is essential that the United States, in its position as a world leader, pick its future military leaders in as efficient and effective a manner as possible. To do so in my opinion requires that we retire the present system. But with what can we replace it? One answer would be to give the military academies themselves the responsibility of selecting their students. I find this objectionable because it is not in keeping with the traditional American concept of civilian supremacy over the military.

A more reasonable method would, I feel, be to transfer the responsibility of nominating young men for our academies to an existing body or to one to be specifically appointed by the Governor in each State. In this way, the basic principles of the current selection method would remain unchanged; yet, the process of selection could be carried out much more efficiently and effectively. Thorough testing could be conducted by such a committee at central points in each State. Personal interviews, so important in determining the personality, character, and desire of applicants, would never have to be sacrificed.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today employs this latter method. It is not a new idea. A similar proposal was made by Senator Henry B. Anthony, of Rhode Island, in 1863, but was defeated 32 to 6.

It was—

Senator Anthony declared—

one of those propositions that everybody was in favor and nobody would vote for.

This still may be true today although I sincerely hope it is not. It is indeed time to seriously consider a change in this nominating procedure which would relieve the responsibility from the already overburdened offices of Senators and Representatives and which, more importantly, would better assure the selection of those young men most qualified for and desirous of a military career.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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. 1415) to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain changes in the method of nominating persons for appointment to the service academies introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1415

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4342(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out clauses (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) Ten cadets from each State plus five cadets from each congressional district of each State nominated by an existing agency committee or department designated by the Governor of the State to select nominees to the Academy, or by a committee appointed by the Governor of the State for the purpose of selecting nominees to the Academy.";

(2) by redesignating clauses (5) through (9) as clauses (4) through (8), respectively; and

(3) by striking out "Each Senator, Representative," in the sentence immediately following clause (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Each agency, committee or department designated or appointed under clause (3) and each".

(b) Clause (5) of section 4342(b) of such title is amended by striking out "by persons named in clauses (3) and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "by agencies, committees or departments designated or appointed under clause (3)".

(c) Section 4342(f) of such title is amended by striking out "clauses (3)–(7) and (9)" and inserting in lieu thereof "clauses (3)–(6) and (8)".

(d) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 4342(g) of such title are each amended by striking out "(3) or (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)".

(e) Section 4342(h) of such title is amended by striking out "Congressman or other".

(f) The second sentence of section 4343 of such title is amended by striking out "by the persons named in clauses (2)–(8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "under authority of clauses (2)–(7)".

(g) Section 4347 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking out "If" at the beginning thereof and inserting "(a) If";

(2) by striking out "nominated by a Representative" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "nominated by an agency, committee or department referred to in clause (3) of section 4342(a) of this title"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In any State in which one or more Representatives to the Congress are elected at-large, five candidates for each Representative so elected shall be nominated from the State at-large by an agency, committee or department of such State designated or appointed under clause (3) of section 4342(a) of this title."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 6954(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out clauses (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) Ten cadets from each State plus five cadets from each congressional district of each State, nominated by an existing agency, committee or department designated by the Governor of the State to select nominees to the Academy, or by a committee appointed by the Governor of the State for the purpose of selecting nominees to the Academy.";

(2) by redesignating clauses (5) through (9) as clauses (4) through (8), respectively; and

(3) by striking out "each Senator, Representative," in the sentence immediately following clause (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Each agency,

committee or department designated or appointed under clause (3) and each".

(b) Clause (5) of section 6954(b) of such title is amended by striking out "by persons named in clauses (3) and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "by agencies, committees or departments designated or appointed under clause (3)".

(c) Section 6954(e) of such title is amended by striking out "Congressman or other".

(d) Section 6955 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking out "If" at the beginning thereof and inserting "(a) If";

(2) by striking out "nominated by a Representative" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "nominated by an agency, committee or department referred to in clause (3) of section 6954(a) of this title"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In any State in which one or more Representatives to the Congress are elected at large, five candidates for each Representative so elected shall be nominated from the State at large by an agency, committee or department of such State designated or appointed under clause (3) of section 6954(a) of this title."

(e) Section 6956(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of the Navy shall, as soon as possible after the first of June each year, notify in writing each agency, committee or department designated or appointed under clause (3) of section 6954(a) of this title and each delegate in Congress of any vacancy that will exist at the Naval Academy because of graduation in the following year, or that may occur for other reasons, for which the agency, committee, or department or delegate is entitled to nominate a candidate and five alternates."

(f) The second sentence of section 6956(b) of such title is amended by striking out ", or if the nomination cannot be made by reason of a vacancy in the membership of the Senate or the House of Representatives,".

(g) The second sentence of section 6956(e) of such title is amended by striking out "(2)–(8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2)–(7)".

(h) Section 6958(b) of such title is amended by striking out "(3)–(7) and (9)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)–(6) and (8)".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 9342(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out clauses (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) Ten cadets from each State plus five cadets from each congressional district of each State, nominated by an existing agency, committee or department designated by the Governor of the State to select nominees to the Academy, or by a committee appointed by the Governor of the State for the purpose of selecting nominees to the Academy.";

(2) by redesignating clauses (5) through (9) as clauses (4) through (8), respectively; and

(3) by striking out "Each Senator, Representative," in the sentence immediately following clause (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Each agency, committee or department designated or appointed under clause (3) and each".

(b) Clause (5) of section 9342(b) of such title is amended by striking out "by persons named in clauses (3) and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "by agencies, committees or departments designated or appointed under clause (3)".

(c) Section 9342(f) of such title is amended by striking out "clauses (3)–(7) and (9)" inserting in lieu thereof "clauses (3)–(6) and (8)".

(d) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 9342(g) of such title are each amended by striking out "(3) or (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)".

(e) Section 9342(h) of such title is amended by striking out "Congressman or other".

(f) The second sentence of section 9343 of such title is amended by striking out "by the persons named in clauses (2)–(8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "under authority of clauses (2)–(7)".

(g) Section 9347 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking out "If" at the beginning thereof and inserting "(a) If";

(2) by striking out "nominated by a Representative" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "nominated by an agency, committee or department referred to in clause (3) of section 9347(a) of this title"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In any State in which one or more Representatives to the Congress are elected at-large, five candidates for each Representative so elected shall be nominated from the State at-large by the agency, committee or department of such State designated or appointed under clause (3) of section 4342 (a) of this title.".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective January 1, 1969.

SURVEY TO ESTABLISH THE ROUTE OF THE CHISHOLM TRAIL

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is difficult for us to imagine that the historic Chisholm Trail—so much a part of the folklore of our frontier—was first cut by wagon tracks only 100 years ago.

In 1865 an Indian trader by the name of Jesse Chisholm broke a fresh route through the tall plains grasses and the forests between Wichita, Kans., and Council Grove, Okla.—near the present site of Yukon, Okla. From this genesis, the trail has been extended in both directions, as far north as Abilene, Kans., to its Rio Grande terminus.

Chisholm's tracks between the North Canadian and the Arkansas were followed northward the following year by Capt. Henry Spekes with the first of countless herds of longhorns which would eventually walk to market over the route before it was closed by settlements and quarantines.

The Texas extension of the Chisholm Trail reached from the Rio Grande through present Cameron Willacy, Kleberg, Nueces, San Patricio, Bee, Karnes, Wilson, Guadalupe, Hays, Travis, Williamson, Bell, McLennan, Bosque, Hill, Johnson, Tarrant, Wise, and Montague Counties.

According to a study prepared for me by the Library of Congress, variations from the direct route included Hidalgo, Brooks, Jim Wells, Live Oak, Goliad, Gonzales, Caldwell, Falls, Denton, and Cooke Counties. Fixed points were the crossing of the Colorado River in the eastern part of present Austin, Brushy Creek at Round Rock, Kimball's Bend on the Brazos, and Trinity Ford in Fort Worth below the junction of Clear and West Forks.

Between these, variable routes were used and innumerable branch or feeder trails fanned out in both directions throughout the length of the main trails. Many of these feeders were also termed the Chisholm Trail. From the Matagorda country, herds were likely to enter the main trail on the McLennan County prairie near present McGregor. Most other trails from beyond the Colorado concentrated at Austin.

The Red River was crossed at Sivell's Bend, Spanish Fort, or Red River Station, which eventually superseded the others. Bearing northwest between Box and Red Creeks to Blue Grove, the Trail turned north to a landmark known as Monument Hill, near Addington, passing about 3 miles east of Ryan, Okla. For 80 miles it was within 1 to 5 miles of the present Rock Island Railroad and U.S. Highway 81, but halfway between the Washita and the South Canadian it turned via the present town of Tuttle to Yukon.

Local laws forbidding cattle movements closed the longhorn trading in such cattle centers as Abilene, Salina, Ellsworth, Hays, Wichita, Caldwell, Hunnewell, and Wellington during the early 1870's, until, by 1877 all former Chisholm Trail terminals were excluded from the Texas trade of 1877. Dodge City was by that time the principal Kansas outlet for Texas cattle, and the Dodge or Western Trail became the main longhorn highway.

Much of this background information was secured, I want to note, from Walter Prescott Webb's "Handbook of Texas." My purpose in this historical review today, Mr. President, is as a prelude to the introduction of a bill to establish the route of the Chisholm Trail and to have the Secretary of the Interior establish markers to identify the route.

I introduce a bill on behalf of myself, Mr. CARLSON, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 1417) to provide for a survey by the Secretary of the Interior to establish the route of the Chisholm Trail and for the establishment of markers to identify such route, and for the other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOWER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CHANGES IN PASSPORT LAWS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter to the Vice President from the Assistant Secretary of State dated March 20, 1967, in regard to it.

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

The bill (S. 1418) to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1418

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 July 3, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 217a), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The validity of the passport shall be limited to a period of not more than five years. The Secretary of State may limit a passport to a shorter period. A valid passport outstanding as of the effective date of this Act shall be valid for a period of five years from the date of issue except where such passport is or has been limited by the Secretary of State to a shorter period."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (22 U.S.C. 214), is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States quarterly a fee of $2 for executing each application for a passport and $13 for each passport issued: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit the right of the Secretary of State by regulation to authorize State officials to collect and retain the execution fee of $2. No passport fee shall be collected from an officer or employee of the United States proceeding abroad in the discharge of official duties, or from members of his immediate family; from an American seaman who requires a passport in connection with his duties aboard an American flag vessel; or from a widow, child, parent, brother or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member. No execution fee shall be collected for an application made before a Federal official by a person excused from payment of the passport fee under this section."

SEC. 3. Section 1 of Title IX of the Act of June 15, 1917 (22 U.S.C. 213), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. Before a passport is issued to any person by or under authority of the United States such person shall subscribe to and submit a written application which shall contain a true recital of each and every matter of fact which may be required by law or by any rules authorized by law to be stated as a prerequisite to the issuance of any such passport. If the applicant has not previously been issued a United States passport, the application shall be duly verified by his oath before a person authorized and empowered by the Secretary of State to administer oaths."

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day following the date of its enactment.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1967.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a proposed bill to make several changes in the passport laws now in force.

The principal features of the bill are provisions to (1) change the period of validity of United States passports from the present three years renewable for two years, to five years without renewal; (2) provide for a statutory change in the fees for execution of an application and the issuance of the passport and a change in the categories of persons eligible for no-fee passports; (3) modify the present requirement of an oath in the execution of a passport application when the applicant has previously been issued a passport.

Existing law (22 U.S.C. 217(a)) provides that a passport shall be valid for a period of three years and may be renewed for a further period of two years. These periods parallel Section 352(a)(1) and (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1484 (a)(1) and (2) providing that a naturalized citizen shall lose his nationality by three years' continuous residence in the country of his birth or former nationality or by five years' continuous residence in any other foreign country. The decision of the Supreme Court in *Schneider* v. *Rusk,* 373 U.S. 163 (1964), holding this discrimination as to naturalized citizens unconstitutional, eliminated the basis for these specific periods of passport validity.

Section 1 of the bill provides for a passport valid for five years. This provision would eliminate the now unnecessary renewal requirement and would reduce the workload of passport issuing offices. The amount of the fees to be collected for an application for a passport, for issuance of a passport and for renewal of a passport are prescribed by statute (22 U.S.C. 214). Section 2 of the bill provides for a uniform fee of $2.00 for the execution of the passport application and a fee of $13.00 for the issuance of the passport. Thus, the total Cost of $15.00 for the new 5 year passport would be the same as the existing total cost of $15.00 for the present 3 year passport renewed for 2 years.

This section of the bill also provides for a technical change in the present law respecting categories of persons eligible for no-fee passports. The term "member of the Armed Forces" replaces the words "soldiers, sailors or marines" so as to include the Air Force. Finally, the section provides for exemption from the execution fee for those entitled to no-fee passports, when the application is made before a Federal official.

Section 213 of Title 22 United States Code requires that each time a person applies for a passport he must personally appear before a person authorized to administer oaths so that he may swear to the statements contained in his application for a passport. The Department considers this requirement of personal appearance unnecessary once the person's citizenship and identity have been established. Section 3 of the bill would, therefore, eliminate the necessity of successive personal appearances by individuals who have already been issued a passport. The Department would provide by regulations that such persons would be able to apply for successive passports by mail. The Department believes that this procedure would not impair the integrity of United States passports since false statements made in the application would be covered by the criminal provisions of Sections 1001 and 1542 of Title 18 United States Code.

In our view, the enactment of this proposed bill would make possible significant improvements in the passport issuing process to the benefit of both the public and the Government. These improvements are essential in view of the substantial increase each year in the number of the passports which the Department, its passport agencies in this country and its foreign service posts abroad must process. Therefore, it is hoped that early and favorable consideration may be given to this proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended.

The bill would authorize long-term cost sharing for land treatment in small watersheds to assist farmers in carrying out their responsibilities in preventing erosion which would cause sedimentation in the flood-prevention structures and reduce their effectiveness.

The bill would provide for the use of other Federal funds for the acquisition of land, rights-of-way, and easements for the carrying out of the most effective means of flood prevention for downstream protection. Many small watersheds are denied activation to provide flood prevention because of the inability of the local people to obtain easements and rights-of-way due to the cost. The amendments in this bill would enable the local people to meet these responsibilities prior to the escalation of costs that normally accrue on the announcement of public works.

The bill would also provide for cost sharing for water storage in detention structures for the purpose of diluting downstream wastes from industries and municipalities. Water quality is one of the prime problems facing us in our water resource development and utilization in an expanding economy and an increasing population. Water quantity and water quality are inseparable. However, the quality of water can be enhanced by the addition of stored water that will assist in the dilution of the wastes within a stream.

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

The bill (S. 1423) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. MONTOYA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I am most pleased to join in cosponsoring of the bill which has just been introduced by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended. Major changes embodied in this legislation are as follows:

First. Authorization of long-term cost sharing for land treatment to prevent erosion and consequent sedimentation in flood prevention structures.

Second. Provision for use of other Federal funds for land acquisition, rights-of-way and easements.

Third. Establish cost of sharing for water storage to dilute downstream industrial and municipal wastes.

Long-term cost sharing for land treat-

ment is a must for small watersheds throughout the Nation. It would assist farmers in carrying out their responsibilities in preventing erosion which in turn causes sedimentation in flood prevention structures, reducing their effectiveness.

It would enable them to more effectively carry out land treatment needs of their farms, improving use of land and strengthening agricultural economies of these watersheds.

Using other Federal funds to acquire land, rights-of-way and easements would do much to aid carrying out of flood prevention for downstream protection. Local citizens in small watersheds cannot afford costs of obtaining easements and rights-of-way. One negative result of the present situation is that needed structures are omitted or moved further upstream.

Either of these situations may reduce effectiveness and long term benefits of the project because of resultant failure to retard sufficient flood flow.

Provisions of this bill would enable local people to meet these responsibilities prior to cost escalation attendant upon announcement of public works of this nature. These funds can now be used for cost sharing of land for recreation purposes, and expanding their use to flood prevention would create tangible gains.

Without water quality, water quantity would be useless. There is a growing need for water storage to enhance water quality by diluting polluted runoff or by periodic flushing of polluted streams. In this bill there is provision for cost sharing of water storage in detention structures in order to accomplish this.

In summary, then, Mr. President, this will aid small watersheds, prevent or control erosion, store water and insure its high quality. Innumerable farms would become far more efficient agricultural units and everywhere our land would receive the treatment it increasingly deserves and must have.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN HEALTH AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by request of the District of Columbia Commissioners, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the District of Columbia to participate in the health and medical assistance benefits made available by the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, along with a letter of transmittal and a justification of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1424) to enable the District of Columbia to participate in the health and medical assistance benefits made available by the Social Security Amendments of 1965, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1424

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized, within available appropriations and allotted funds, to take such action and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to permit District of Columbia participation in, and to secure for the District of Columbia the health and medical assistance benefits made available by titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, as amended, notwithstanding any other provision of law establishing (1) a durational residency requirement, (2) a means test, (3) per diem or other periodic rates for the in-patient or out-patient care or treatment of the medically needy (by which term is meant those whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical services), or (4) the financial responsibility of relatives of the medically needy, for persons provided health and medical care and treatment by or at the expense of the District of Columbia.

The letter and justification, presented by Mr. MORSE, are as follows:

MARCH 22, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill "To enable the District of Columbia to participate in the health and medical assistance benefits made available by the Social Security Amendments of 1965."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Commissioners to take such action and to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary or required to permit publicly-owned District of Columbia hospitals and other medical facilities to provide health and medical care and services to eligible aged individuals under the hospital insurance benefits program and the supplementary medical insurance benefits program established by title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and to furnish medical assistance to eligible residents of the District of Columbia under the program established by title XIX of such Act, as added by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (79 Stat. 286; Public Law 89-97). Such programs would be conducted in the District pursuant to regulations issued, and policy and procedural guidelines established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 contain health legislation which has a very significant impact on the District of Columbia government and particularly upon its Department of Public Health. The law makes it possible to greatly broaden the scope and to improve the quality of the health and medical services which are available to individuals in the District, particularly to those persons whose ability to obtain adequate medical care is impeded by the inadequacy of their finances.

In further explanation of the purposes of the proposed legislation and to justify its enactment, the Commissioners invite your attention to the attached justification. This justification refers to several provisions of existing District of Columbia laws which must be made inoperative if the District is to participate fully in programs under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, and sets forth information concerning the budgetary implications of the proposed legislation and the financial impact its passage can be expected to have on both the Federal Government and the District Government.

The Commissioners believe it highly advantageous to the District Government and its citizens that they realize the liberalized benefits of the expanded health and medical programs provided by titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, and they strongly recommend the enactment of this legislation during this session of the Congress.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO ENABLE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEALTH AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS MADE AVAILABLE BY THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

In order for the District to meet various provisions of Federal law or conform to standards required under regulations issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to enable its residents to receive the full measure of the benefits available, it is essential that several existing District legal requirements which are in basic conflict with titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act be rendered inoperative. The proposed legislation accordingly authorizes the Commissioners to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to permit District participation in, and to secure for the District the health and medical assistance benefits made available by titles XVIII and XIX of the Act, notwithstanding any existing provision of law establishing (1) a durational residency requirement, (2) a means test, (3) per diem or other periodic rates for the inpatient or outpatient care or treatment of the medically needy, or (4) the financial responsibility of relatives of the medically needy, for persons provided health and medical care and treatment by or at the expense of the District of Columbia. Specifically, the Commissioners are authorized by the bill, notwithstanding existing provisions of law, to meet conditions imposed by applicable terms of the Social Security Act or administrative regulations in the following areas:

1. Permanent language appearing in the first proviso under the subheading "Operating Expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital" in section 1 of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946 (59 Stat. 282; D.C. Code, sec. 32-321), prohibits the use of District of Columbia appropriations for the medical treatment of persons who have not been residents of the District for one year. The proviso reads as follows:

"*Provided,* That hereafter no District of Columbia appropriations shall be available for the care of persons, except in emergency cases, where the person has been a resident of the District of Columbia for less than one year at the time of application for admission".

Neither section 226 of the Social Security Act, relating to entitlement for hospital insurance benefits, nor section 1836 of such Act, relating to eligibility for supplementary medical insurance benefits, impose any durational residence requirement, and section 1902(b)(3) of such Act precludes approval by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of any plan for medical assistance which attempts to exclude any individual who resides in the District. The bill authorizes the Commissioners to provide, by regulation, medicare and medical assistance to any resident of the District otherwise eligible for such services and benefits without regard to the aforesaid durational residence requirement of District of Columbia law.

2. Section 1802 of the Social Security Act provides that any individual entitled to in-

surance benefits under title XVIII may obtain health services from any institution, agency, or person qualified to participate under such title if the institution, agency, or person undertakes to provide him such services. The term "medical assistance", as defined by section 1905(a) of the Social Security Act, not only covers individuals who are recipients of public assistance, but also includes those persons who are medically needy; i.e., those whose income and resources are insufficient to meet all of the costs of hospital, physicians', and related medical services. A proviso to the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 511; D. C. Code, sec. 32–322), however, prohibits, with certain exceptions, the use of appropriations by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health for the medical care of persons who are not indigent. The proviso reads as follows:

"Provided, That hereafter no part of any appropriation for Gallinger Municipal Hospital or the Health Department shall be used for furnishing, other than at rates prescribed by the Commissioners, clinical services, drugs, pharmaceutical preparations, or X-ray service, to persons who are not indigent, except in emergency cases or where the Commissioners determine it to be necessary in the public interest."

Since there are no provisions in either title XVIII or title XIX which require that any person receiving services or benefits thereunder be indigent, it is necessary that the Commissioners have authority, through the issuance of appropriate regulations, to overcome the effect of the aforesaid proviso with respect to persons eligible for treatment under Federal aid programs of health insurance for the aged and medical assistance.

3. Under the subheading "Health and Welfare" in section 1 of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1967 (80 Stat. 1170), the Congress has established ceilings on the rates which the District may pay to various Federal and private hospitals for services rendered to indigent residents. The proviso reads as follows:

"Provided, That the inpatient rate and outpatient rate under such contracts [for the care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control], with the exception of Children's Hospital, and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed $38 per diem and the outpatient rate shall not exceed $6 per visit; the inpatient rate and outpatient rate for Children's Hospital shall not exceed $40 per diem and $6.75 per visit; and the inpatient rate (excluding the proportionate share for repairs and construction) for services rendered by Saint Elizabeths Hospital for patient care shall be $12.18 per diem". (Bracketed explanation added)

Section 1902(a)(13)(B) of the Social Security Act states that a plan submitted for approval under title XIX must provide for payment of the reasonable cost of inpatient hospital services provided under such plan. "Reasonable costs" are determined in accordance with standards approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Presumably, similar maximums will be established under the 1968 Appropriation Act, which is yet to be approved by the Congress. Accordingly, it may become necessary, if District participation in title XIX is not to be jeopardized, that appropriate revisions be made in these rates to meet standards acceptable to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is quite possible, of course, that this problem can be solved by agreement with the respective Appropriation Committees of both Houses through the insertion of appropriate language in the pending District of Columbia appropriation bill, thereby making it unnecessary for the Commissioners to act further therein.

4. The Social Security Act authorizes the furnishing, under title XVIII, of limited inpatient psychiatric hospital services to persons 65 years of age or older, and, under title XIX, medical assistance in behalf of such individuals who are patients in mental hospitals. As heretofore indicated, Federal aid or assistance in these medical programs will be withheld from any State which imposes any durational residence requirement upon recipients thereof. In addition, section 1902(a)(17)(D) of the Act provides that a State plan for medical assistance may not take into account the financial responsibility of an adult child for his parents, or the financial responsibility of a parent for his adult children, other than a child who is blind or permanently and totally disabled, with respect to any medical assistance furnished to such parent or child. Moreover, section 1902(a)(18) of such Act provides that no lien may be imposed against the property of any individual prior to his death on account of medical assistance paid or to be paid on his behalf, and that there shall be no adjustment or recovery from the estate of an individual who received medical assistance, except a person who was 65 years of age or older when he received such assistance, and then only after the death of his surviving spouse, if any, and only at a time when he has no surviving child who is under age 21 or is blind or permanently blind.

On the other hand, section 21–551 of the District of Columbia Code provides that—

"(a) If a person ordered committed to a public hospital by the court pursuant to section 21–545 is found by the Commission, subject to a review by the court, not to be a resident of the District of Columbia, and to be a resident of another place, he shall be transferred to the State of his residence, if an appropriate institution of that State is willing to accept him. If the person is an indigent, the expense of transferring him, including the traveling expenses of necessary attendants, shall be borne by the District of Columbia.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, 'resident of the District of Columbia' means a person who has maintained his principal place of abode in the District of Columbia for more than one year immediately prior to the filing of the petition referred to in subsection (a) of section 21–541."

Section 21–586(a) of the District of Columbia Code provides in part as follows:

"(a) The father, mother, husband, wife, and adult children of a mentally ill person, if of sufficient ability, and the estate of the mentally ill person, if the estate is sufficient for the purpose, shall pay the cost to the District of Columbia of the mentally ill person's maintenance, including treatment, in a hospital in which the person is hospitalized under this chapter. The Commission on Mental Health shall examine, under oath, the father, mother, husband, wife, and adult children of an alleged mentally ill person whenever those relatives live within the District of Columbia, and ascertain their ability or the ability of the estate to maintain or contribute toward the maintenance of the mentally ill person . . ."

No conclusive decision has yet been made on the question of whether the District will qualify as a provider of services under title XVIII or will furnish medical assistance under title XIX to persons 65 years of age or older who are patients in mental institutions. Should it be determined, however, that the District is eligible to provide such services or furnish such assistance, no durational residence requirements may be imposed upon the recipients thereof, and only certain specified relatives may be held responsible for the costs of hospitalization of such mentally ill persons. The Commissioners therefore are authorized by the bill to make regulations overcoming the effect of these conflicting provisions of District law.

5. Under section 2 of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 914; D.C. Code, sec. 3–201), "the term 'public assistance' means payment in or by money, medical care, remedial care, goods or services to, or for the benefit of, needy persons". Should the bill be enacted into law, assistance in the form of medical care or remedial care furnished to needy persons by the District will no longer be subject to the provisions of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, but such care will be governed by regulations issued by the Commissioners in accordance with applicable requirements of title XIX of the Social Security Act.

In any event, Federal sharing in medical aid or assistance under title I (old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged), title IV (aid to families with dependent children), title X (aid to the blind), title XIV (aid to the permanently and totally disabled), and title XVI (the combined adult program), will, pursuant to section 121(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, terminate with respect to any period after December 31, 1969. The District therefore must have authority to participate in title XIX on or before such date, or be placed in the position of having to provide medical care to its indigent and medically needy residents without Federal assistance.

The Commissioners presently intend, if the proposed legislation be enacted, to proceed with the implementation of the District's title XIX medical assistance program by establishing the initial financial eligibility level for participation therein at an annual income of $4,200 for a family of four (adjusted to different figures for family groups of other composition and for individuals). With the eligibility level fixed at this amount, an estimated 217,300 persons in the District of Columbia would potentially be eligible for participation in the District's title XIX program—almost 57,000 more than those currently eligible for medical care under the existing programs administered by the Department of Public Health. With a financial eligibility level of $4,200 for a family of four, a title XIX program could be instituted at no current additional cost to the District, and the level of its expenditures for medical care would remain at the amount presently budgeted for fiscal year 1967 of $30.7 million. The total Federal reimbursement to the District under such a program would be approximately $10.6 million. Under the existing Kerr-Mills program (which would be absorbed into the proposed title XIX program) the Federal Government during fiscal year 1966 contributed $2,250,000 to the District. Accordingly, the net additional cost to the Federal Government of the anticipated program for the District would amount to an estimated $8.4 million.

The District's expenditures for a program of the scope just described, taken together with the Federal reimbursement, would enable the Department of Public Health to develop for the approximately 217,300 persons a comprehensive medical care program which would meet the requirements of title XIX of the Social Security Act, and include inpatient and outpatient care, visits to a physician, surgical procedures, diagnostic services of every variety, skilled nursing home care, home health services, psychiatric care (both inpatient and outpatient), tuberculosis care, the furnishing of drugs, biologicals, prostheses, and other supplies, and the provision of dental, optometric, and podiatric services.

It is the Commissioners' expectation, however, that the District will have sufficient appropriated funds to enable it to raise the financial eligibility standard for a family of four to a figure of $4,780 over a three-year period, and that the initially established level of $4,200 will remain in effect no longer than the end of fiscal year 1968. Accordingly, the Commissioners propose raising the eligibility level to $4,400 for a family of four in fiscal year 1969, to $4,600 in fiscal year 1970,

and to $4,780 in fiscal year 1971, dependent, of course, upon the availability of District funds in those years. The progressive changes in the eligibility standard would, of course, be subject to annual review by the Congress during its consideration of the District's appropriation bill.

With an eligibility level set at the recommended $4,780 figure, approximately 258,400 persons in the District ultimately would be eligible for benefits under title XIX medical programs. The total cost of a program of this extent would be approximately $48.5 million, of which the District would have to bear $36.2 million, or about $5.5 million more than is currently budgeted. The Federal reimbursement to the District under such a program would be approximately $12.3 million, and the net increase in Federal reimbursements (excluding contributions under the present Kerr-Mills program) is estimated at $10.1 million.

TO PROSCRIBE THE MAILING OF CERTAIN MATTER NOT DESIRED BY ADDRESSEES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, for myself and Senators FONG, THURMOND, and BAYH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to proscribe the mailing of certain matter not desired by addressees.

Complaints to the Post Office Department over the receipt of unsolicited advertisements for pornographic and other objectionable materials increased from 128,000 in 1965 to over 197,000 in 1966.

No other subject generates so much mail to nearly every Senator from constituents and their children in every community and every station in life.

No other subject is so blurred in the courts' decisions.

No other subject is so important to the growing fiber of our youth.

No one would deny the direct mail advertisers' right to make a living. But I feel very strongly that citizens also have the right to determine what kind of material they will have coming into their homes and into the hands of their children. I think there is a freedom of choice which must be respected by others, no matter what their business.

This bill does not attempt to outline any kind of censorship or control of the manufacture and distribution of materials that appeal only to perverted interests.

What I do intend is to give the mothers and fathers and other citizens of this country the means to protect the privacy of their homes and the means to enforce their own decisions of what publications and ads they will and will not allow to come through their doors.

Years ago this subcommittee became concerned with the devastating influence of this material on young minds and it gathered several volumes of expert testimony and expert opinion calling for stricter controls and penalties for criminals in the pornography racket.

As a result of those hearings, several measures were enacted into law which afforded increased protection to the public.

As often happens, however, the racketeers and smut peddlers move swiftly to evade these new laws to enable them to get at the lucrative market that is available for these materials. They found loopholes in our laws or they found detours around them, and as we prosecuted them in this country, like so many weeds, they have sprung up beyond our borders out of the law's reach and, today, they are still able to ply their ugly trade through the mails.

Blatant disregard for the privacy of some 10,000 young girls was revealed to this Senate's Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Last December, Mr. Alvin Zumbrun, director of the Maryland Crime Commission told us that a Chicago firm bought 10,000 girls' names at $50 per 1,000 which were traced to a legitimate teen magazine to whose pen pal club the girls had written. The Chicago firm then presented the names in an erotic publication as the names of promiscuous girls who were looking for fast company.

Subsequent telephone calls and letters to the girls rightly enraged their parents and distressed these youngsters. The commission learned that the Maryland girls had not given permission for their names to be so used.

Advised to write to the distributor, parents demanded that their daughter's names be stricken from the list. Registered mail receipts and later mailings demonstrated that these requests were completely ignored.

A 14-year-old Ohio boy wrote to me asking if I could do something to stop this kind of pandering advertising mail which he had received. He said:

> I've sent it back, marked it "refused," even "deceased" but it doesn't do any good.

He was afraid that if his dad ever found out that he was receiving these ads for erotic books and films, his dad would "most likely kill" him.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM told the subcommittee that since ordering a 25-cent collection of stamps from a Boy Scout magazine 10 years ago, his son has been receiving unsolicited ads for erotic materials for the past 7 years. Analysis of the boy's most recent mail reveals that the use of only 4 coded labels brought 17 ads for indecent material from 13 companies in the past 1½ years.

A Maryland Crime Commission investigator responded to two ads and, as a result of becoming part of a mailing list, received in 7 years over 400 pieces of unsolicited advertising mail, about half of which were sex oriented.

This is not a new problem. During the late Senator Kefauver's landmark study of crime and horror comic books, one publisher testified that his company sent "by mistake" a tray of addressograph plates bearing the names of 400 children to the publisher of sex literature. The witness himself advertised and sold highly suggestive materials to children as young as 9 years old.

This is a qualitative sampling of some facts presented in the subcommittee's investigation. It does not begin to give a quantitative picture of this practice. I have mentioned the number of complaints to the Post Office Department. But these, of course, are only a tiny exposed cap to the iceberg proportions of the total business of swapping mailing lists and pandering for the sale of obscenity.

The bill which I introduce today, Mr. President, will not cure all the ills of postal abuse. It will, however, give the postal advertising recipient a method whereby, if he wants to, he may stop the influx of pandering advertisements into his home.

The procedure, if implemented, will operate like this:

First. The addressee will notify the Postmaster General of the receipt of an objectionable pandering ad.

Second. Upon determining that the matter is indeed pandering, the Postmaster General will issue an order, if requested by the recipient, to the sender directing him to refrain from further mailings of such matter to the addressee.

Third. The order will expressly prohibit the sender from making any further mailings of pandering advertisements to the addressee, effective 30 days after receipt of the order.

Fourth. The order will also direct the sender to delete immediately the name of the addressee from all mailing lists owned or controlled by him, and will prohibit the sender from selling, renting, or exchanging mailing lists bearing the name of the addressee.

This bill provides that the children of the addressee be similarly protected at the parent's request.

If enacted, this bill will also give the courts a clear basis for prosecution. This bill deals with only the methods of promoting objectionable sex-oriented materials. It does not involve the courts in a decision of whether or not the material itself is obscene.

Communications from thousands of forthright citizens indicate strong support for this kind of legislation.

The Post Office Department has repeatedly urged Congress to give it such a tool for keeping unwanted smut out of their patrons' mail boxes.

Psychiatrists who treat both children and adults with twisted ideas of human behavior plead for realistic measures to prevent the continued warping of sensitive minds.

Public officials dealing with extreme cases of delinquency and perversion have called for recognition of the influence of printed matter and mail-order gadgets.

And, as I have indicated, many teenagers themselves complain about receiving such materials.

I suspect that even the mailers will support this bill. It will clean up their lists at public expense. They will be able to eliminate names of those unlikely to buy their merchandise and thus get better returns on a mailing campaign.

Today when a person's name, telephone number, and address are handed around for sales and profit, there should be some control by an individual over the most offensive uses of his own name.

We should be able to protect in some measure the gift of young minds which are for a short time entrusted to the care of adults. They are far more important than a single sale, and far more necessary to the development of our Nation than a single advertisement.

Most of my colleagues in Congress share my concern about the invasion of privacy in American homes by smut peddlers.

And, I am sure that most share my alarm at the unchecked growth of the sale of mailing lists which are used indiscriminately in pandering for the sale of lewd publications.

I hope that they will join me in calling for the end of at least part of the indignity to which our citizens are subjected and will act deliberately and decisively to pass this legislation.

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

The bill (S. 1425) to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to proscribe the mailing of certain matter not desired by addressees, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, today, I had the pleasure of meeting here in the Nation's Capital a very distinguished American-educated engineer, the Honorable Seiho Matsuoka, chief executive of the government of the Ryukyu Islands.

Mr. Matsuoka was born in Kin-son, Okinawa, on September 18, 1897. While still a boy, he journeyed to Hawaii to work on a sugar plantation and to attend Iolani School in Honolulu. From Honolulu he went to Los Angeles, and graduated from the Polytechnic High School of that city in 1921. He studied engineering at the University of Southern California and graduated from Tri-State College of Engineering in Indiana in 1924.

Mr. Matsuoka took postgraduate work at Columbia University until 1926 and worked in New York City until 1928. Upon his return to Japan, he worked for the Scientific Research Institute in Tokyo in 1932, became chief of the manufacturing section of the Takasaki Machinery Manufacturing Co., and later was chief engineer and manager of the Kadena Sugar Refinery of the Okinawa Sugar Manufacturing Co.

After World War II, he was a member of the Okinawa Advisory Council and a director of the public works department of the Okinawa Gunto government. In 1951, he formed and became president of the Matsuoka Power Distribution Co. He was appointed chief executive of the government of the Ryukyu Islands on October 31, 1964, and was elected president of the Democratic Party on December 26, 1964. He was elected chief executive of the government of the Ryukyu Islands on March 16, 1966, under the Presidential executive order, as amended.

As a pro-American chief executive on strategically important Okinawa, he has cooperated with the objectives of the U.S. civil administration in the Ryukyu Islands, and has been an able spokesman for stronger friendship between the people of Okinawa and the American people.

His present visit here—March 28 to April 8—is his fourth. He is accompanied by Mr. Yoei Miyara, chief of the liaison and public affairs division, government of the Ryukyu Islands. His first visit to Washington was in 1928, when he was returning to Okinawa from Columbia University; his second in 1951, as a national leader under the U.S. Army-sponsored national leaders program, and his third in 1963, as a tourist on a world tour.

Since the chief executive's arrival on March 28, he has been meeting key Government and congressional leaders to enlist support of an amendment to the Price Act—Public Law 86–629—proposed by the Department of the Army and supported by the Department of State, to raise the present authorized aid of $12 million to $25 million.

In the last session of Congress, the House passed H.R. 12617, an amendment to raise the ceiling to $25 million, but this was not acted on in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In recognition of the urgency for increased assistance for social and economic programs in Okinawa, Mr. Matsuoka has made this special trip to Washington to make an appeal for this increased ceiling in the 1968 fiscal year.

He has prepared a statement of request, in which is given the reasons why it is necessary that Congress amend the Price Act, and emphasizing that the United States, as administering authority, has a responsibility to increase its aid to his islands.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his request be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NAHA, OKINAWA.

The primary purpose of my visit to Washington is to seek the understanding and cooperation of the Congress concerning an amendment to the Price Act (PL 86–629, as amended), which provides for U.S. economic assistance to the Ryukyu Islands, as proposed by the Executive Branch to raise the present $12 million ceiling set in the Price Act to that of $25 million.

The Government of the Ryukyu Islands (GRI) Budget for FY 1967 is compiled and includes many programs and projects to be carried out, on the premise that an additional contribution from the United States in the amount of $5.3 million would be made available through the materialization of an amendment to the Price Act during the current fiscal year.

That represents the action and decision of the High Commissioner who is responsible for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands. If the present $12 million ceiling set in the Price Act is not raised during the current fiscal year, the GRI budget for FY 1967 will have a revenue deficit in the amount of some $5.3 million, forcing us to stop carrying out many programs and projects and resulting in financial difficulties.

The financial programs for FY 1967, which were presented to and agreed by the United States-Japan Consultative Committee, an official organ charged with discussing American and Japanese economic assistance to the Ryukyu Islands, will become meaningless. It will also become difficult to implement the Long-Range Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the Ryukyu Islands which has been jointly developed by the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR) and the Government of the Ryukyu Islands (GRI). In addition, there will be a setback in the achievement of the basic goals of the U.S. and Japanese Governments to narrow the gap existing between the Ryukyu Islands and comparable areas of the Japanese homeland. Furthermore, the long-range plan itself will have to be fundamentally revised.

If the people of the Ryukyu Islands should find themselves in such a situation, they would be sure to feel discontented and criticize the United States for insincerity by viewing that the United States shirks its responsibilities as administering authority, and that the United States administration places an emphasis on the maintenance of the military base but fails to take into full consideration their living and welfare. I am afraid that this might give rise to the political unrest.

Although there has been remarkable progress in the economy of the Ryukyu Islands during the recent years, there exists a wide gap between the levels of many areas of activities in the Ryukyu Islands and those in the Japanese homeland. Therefore, it is obviously clear that whether or not the present Price Act ceiling providing for U.S. economic assistance to the Ryukyu Islands will be raised is bound to have a definite effect upon the Ryukyuan people's future attitude toward and relationships with USCAR.

Therefore, I wish to make a candid appeal to the Congress, in the best interest of U.S.-Ryukyus cooperation and of the promotion of the Ryukyuan people's welfare and well-being, to raise the present Price Act ceiling as soon as possible in response to the strong desire of the Ryukyuan people. I wish to request the Congress to give its special consideration to the matter.

1. Why is it necessary to amend the Price Act?

It is true that there has been the sizable increase in aid from the United States and Japanese Governments to the Ryukyu Islands. There is, however, a wide gap between the levels of the welfare of the Ryukyuan people and of the GRI administration and finances, and those obtaining in comparable areas in Japan, the goal toward which the Ryukyuan people are working.

In reviewing the national income in FY 1966, for instance, we take note that per capita income in the Ryukyu Islands is $426 against $690 in Japan, which shows only 61 percent of per capita income in the Japanese homeland.

The GRI budget has shown a steady annual increase over the recent years, which is attributable to increased aid by the Government of the United States and Japan. The scale of the GRI finances, however, reaches 75 percent of that of a Japanese prefecture in comparable areas, even taking into consideration of such expenditures as go to pay for the GRI functions which would be naturally taken over and paid by the Japanese Government if the Ryukyu Islands were under Japanese administration, and of such aid as is directly administered by USCAR for the Ryukyu Islands. The per capita budget of the GRI is $71 against $101 in comparable areas of Japan.

The Ryukyu Islands lag behind Japan in such social investment areas as education, social welfare services, the construction of roads, harbor facilities, etc.

In the field of education, the construction of better-built school classrooms has been carried on in conjunction with USCAR and with U.S. financial assistance. As compared with the situation in Japan, however, the per pupil floor space in a classroom used by grade and junior high schools of the Ryukyu Islands is only 49 percent and 51 percent of that in Japan, respectively. The per pupil educational expenditures for grade and junior high schools of the Ryukyu Islands reach

only 45 percent and 62 percent of those in Japan, respectively.

In the system of social security, Japan initiated many social welfare services and programs such as social insurance and pensions in the years immediately following the end of World War II. It was with the beginning of FY 1967 that the Ryukyu Islands started implementing medical insurance programs. Thus, there is a wide difference between welfare services and public assistance programs, constituting the other two main pillars in the system of social security, which are being implemented in the Ryukyu Islands, and those existing in the Japanese homeland.

The Ryukyu Islands are far behind Japan in many other fields of activities which include medical facilities and institutions, and harbor facilities.

I strongly request the Congress to raise the present Price Act ceiling and to increase the annual U.S. economic aid to the Ryukyu Islands, so that the United States which, as administering authority, is responsible for the promotion of the Ryukyuan people's welfare and well-being, could achieve the basic goals to narrow the gap existing between the Ryukyu Islands and these comparable areas of the Japanese homeland.

2. The United States as administering authority is responsible for increasing its aid to the Ryukyu Islands.

As confirmed by the leaders of the United States and Japanese Governments, the two countries are cooperating with each other for the advancement of the welfare and well-being of the Ryukyuan people, with a view to narrowing differences which exist between the Ryukyu Islands and the Japanese homeland until such time as the Ryukyu Islands will be permitted to be restored to Japanese administration.

It is the basic matter confirmed by the United States and Japanese Governments to increase their economic assistance to the Ryukyu Islands. In accord with this policy the Japanese Government aid to the GRI budget for FY 1967 amounts to $14.42 million, which shows a twofold increase over the previous year. The Japanese Government aid in FY 1968 will be $24 million, showing a greater annual increase.

In 1962, the late President Kennedy announced new policies toward the Ryukyu Islands. It has not been materialized to raise the present ceiling on U.S. economic assistance to the Ryukyu Islands to $25 million. We were gratified that in 1966 the House of Representatives passed HR 12617 to remove the present ceiling on U.S. economic assistance to the Ryukyu Islands but we regret to note that the proposal was not acted on in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR) and the Government of the Ryukyu Islands (GRI) have jointly developed the long-range plan on the premise that the Price Act would be amended to authorize an increase in the ceiling of U.S. aid to the Ryukyu Islands. In view of this, U.S. economic assistance in the amount of $14.07 million was compiled in the GRI Budget for FY 1967, which was presented to such official organs as the United States-Japan Consultative Committee and the United States-Japan-Ryukyus Technical Committee, and passed by the Legislature of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands. Therefore, the programs and projects are being implemented.

With the end of FY 1967 just ahead, we are already beginning to feel a definite effect on execution of the budget since the proposed amendment to the Price Act has not acquired a definite outlook as yet. As U.S. aid to the GRI has a greater weight over the GRI Budget, it is not easy for us to revise the budget for reasons of our poor financial status.

I believe that it is a matter of great importance for the United States to have the High Commissioner, who is responsible for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, give effect to his position, in order to deepen the already-existing trust, goodwill and cooperation on the part of the Ryukyuan people toward the U.S. administration.

I wish to ask the Congress to show its better understanding and give its full support to the request that I have submitted.

SEIHO MATSUOKA,
Chief Executive, Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, pursuant to the request of Mr. Matsuoka, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 12, 1960, Public Law 86–629, as amended, providing for promotion of the economic and social development of the Ryukyu Islands.

The purpose of my bill is to raise the present $12 million ceiling set in the Price Act—Public Law 86–629—as amended by Public Law 87–746 of October 4, 1962, to $25 million, an amount authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure in programs approved by the President for promoting the economic and social development of Okinawa. This increase is necessary and proper to carry out our responsibility to the people of Okinawa.

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

The bill (S. 1426) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 148

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

WELCOME TO THE LATIN AMERICAN SUMMIT CONFERENCE—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 149

Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) to welcome the Latin American summit conference, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1340) to designate a portion of the San Francisco-Stockton ship channel as the John F. Baldwin ship channel, at its next printing.

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

PROPOSED NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK, STATE OF WASHINGTON—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I would like to announce open public hearings on S. 1321, the bill to establish the North Cascades National Park in the State of Washington. The hearings will be conducted by the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation on April 24 and 25 in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building, and will start at 10 a.m. each day.

The bill carries out recommendations made to the 90th Congress by the President, and is the culmination of 2½ years of study by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture and a field hearing on the study report held in Seattle early last year.

Besides the North Cascades National Park, the bill also establishes the Ross Lake National Recreation Area and the Pasayten Wilderness, and enlarges the Glacier Peak Wilderness.

In addition to the hearings here in Washington, D.C., field hearings will be scheduled in Washington State later this spring. I will make an announcement concerning the field hearings as soon as the dates are established.

Individuals wishing to present their views at the hearings on April 24 and 25 should contact the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 3106 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HEARINGS ON FEDERAL JURY SELECTION BILLS—S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, S. 1319

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator TYDINGS, the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, who is ill today, I wish to announce a second set of hearings for the consideration of S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, and S. 1319. These bills would provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries.

The hearings will be held at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 11, and 10 a.m. Wednesday, April 12, 1967, in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

RESOLUTION OF LOGAN COUNTY, KANS., FARM BUREAU

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the farmers of Kansas and of the Nation are concerned with many problems as stated in a Logan County, Kans., Farm Bureau resolution that I received.

As mentioned in the resolution, every farmer must be concerned about our export market; and this concern is most timely, as we are now negotiating the Kennedy round with the six Common Market countries in Geneva. The six nations of the Common Market, Germany, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Italy, are our biggest dollar customers abroad—$1.6 billion worth a year.

The agreements entered into with these Common Market countries are vital to agriculture and the farmers of our Nation. This is particularly true with respect to wheat, feed grains, and soybeans.

The bargaining days at Geneva are critical, and the fate of the Kennedy round depends, in considerable measure, on whether they are able to work out a deal on grains.

Item II of the resolution deals with a problem that is of vital concern to the farmers—proposed changes in our social security program. These proposed changes will receive serious and detailed consideration by the Congress before final action is taken.

One of the problems confronting those who retire under social security benefits is the limitation on earnings. At the present time the social security benefits of retired people are reduced by $1 for every $2 of income earned over $1,500 and by dollar for dollar on all earnings over $2,700. This amount of earned income for those over 65 should be greatly increased. As a matter of fact, I believe the work income test should be completely eliminated.

The proposed increased monthly benefits and the ever-increasing cost of this program will be given every consideration this session.

I ask unanimous consent that the Logan County Farm Bureau resolution be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

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

[From the Logan (Kans.) County Farm Bureau Association]

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The Logan County Farm Bureau Policy Executive Committee representing the approximately 400 Farm and Farm related families of the Logan County met on Friday, March 17th, to discuss the Kennedy Round of Trade Agreements now in progress. We want to point out to you that Farm Prosperity in Western Kansas is based on exporting our farm products. One bushel of every two to three of our wheat must be exported. We strongly urge you to use the leverage of tariffs on imports of manufactured goods as a weapon to obtain tariff concessions for our farm products. We are also opposed to commodity agreements, which divide up the market on political considerations when substituted meaningful trade agreements designed to reduce trade restrictions thus providing efficient American farmers with unlimited markets. We favor trade negotiations with nations prepared to offer reciprocal benefits to U.S. Agriculture. In any event we insist that G.A.T.T. agreements shall be submitted to the U.S. Senate subject to ratification as a constitutional requirement for treaties.

Item II Pertaining to proposed changes in Social Security or O.A.S.I.:

1. We believe retirees should not be limited on outside earnings. If the government figures $3,000.00 a year or less is "poverty" how can a retiree live on $1500.—one year. O.A.S.I.

2. We further believe that small employers should not have to report O.A.S.I. Taxes more than once a year.

3. We do not want O.A.S.I. Taxes finding to be taken from General Tax receipts.

4. We believe that O.A.S.I. should guarantee to the insured or his estate a return of the money's invested by him and his employer, plus a reasonable interest as would be true in any good commercial retirement insurance plan.

DELBERT L. ROSE.
ALBERT F. HUEFTLE.
R. H. HARRY VAWTO.
H. C. ROSE.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in 1965 Congress enacted a law which provided for an automatic cost of living increase in all civil service retirement benefits whenever the cost of living rises 3 percentage points over the 1965 base period.

At the time this legislation was enacted, I pointed out that this was a one-way escalation, in that should the cost of living drop, the advances would remain in effect.

The first increase under this new escalation cost was triggered last year, with the result that the Government became liable for $739 million in additional benefits.

To illustrate just how these increases affect the stability of the retirement fund, I call attention to my letter of December 2, 1966, addressed to Mr. Andrew E. Ruddock, Director, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, U.S. Civil Service Commission, together with his reply thereto under date of December 14, 1966.

Mr. Ruddock's letter points out that the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement fund as of January 1, 1967, was $48,650,000,000, and that based upon present benefits being paid, if Congress were to make the fund actuarially solvent, it would require a payroll tax of 24 percent divided between the employees and the U.S. Government as the employer.

I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 2, 1966.

Mr. ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUDDOCK: It is my understanding that the cost of living increase for retirees as provided for under the formula of the 1965 law has been triggered into effect. In this connection, will you please advise me:

1. The effective date and the percentage amount of the increase.

2. The number of retirees affected and the total projected cost over their life span.

3. Is this automatic increase applicable to all future retirees? If so, what is the estimate of the projected cost of this cost of living increase over the next thirty years?

4. Does this automatic increase remain in effect over the succeeding months and years even though the cost of living index may precipitously decline later?

5. Without counting the costs of the above mentioned features, what is the present amount of the estimated unfunded liability of the Civil Service retirement fund?

6. What is the present rate of contribution both for employees and the Government?

a. Assuming that the projected cost of supporting this fund was equally divided between employee and employer, what new contributing rate would be required by each to make this fund solvent?

7. How long will the fund remain solvent in the event the retirement fund is not protected either by increased contributions or direct appropriations?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of December 2, 1966, requesting information on the cost of living increase for retirees. The items to follow are numbered to correspond to your numbered questions:

1. The effective date of the increase is January 1, 1967. The amount of increase is 3.9%.

2. The total number of retirees (including survivor annuitants) affected by the cost of living increase, January 1, 1967, will be more than 800,000. The estimated present value, at 3½% interest, of additional benefits to be paid in future years due to this increase is $739 million.

3. This increase is *not* applicable to future retirees. The retiree must be on the annuity roll as of January 1, 1967 in order to be eligible for the increase. However, survivors of retirees who received the increase will also receive the 3.9% increase in their benefits, when they come on the annuity roll. The cost of this increase in future survivor benefits is included in the above estimate of $739 million.

4. This increase does remain in effect in future years. It is not taken away or reduced if the index declines later.

5. Without counting the costs of the cost of living increase, the estimated unfunded liability of the Civil Service retirement fund, as of January 1, 1967, is $48,650,000,000. Of this total, approximately $2,142,000,000 is due to benefits provided by Part III of Public Law 87–793, which are to be paid contingent on special annual appropriations.

6. The present rate of contribution is 6½% of pay for employees (7½% for Members of Congress), matched by an equal contribution from the employing agency.

a. Assuming that the cost of supporting this fund on a level cost basis was equally divided between employee and employer, it is estimated that a contribution rate of approximately 12% of pay for each would be required to support the fund on a long-range basis.

7. It is estimated that the fund would be exhausted in 1987, assuming only continuation of current contribution rates by employees and employing agencies.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on September 20, 1966, President Johnson issued a "freeze order" on civilian employment by the U.S. Govern-

ment. Under that order it was indicated that the administration was rolling the Government's civilian payroll back to the level of July, 1966.

However, instead of holding employment at the July level, the administration has actually increased the number of Government employees by a total of 90,902 since the date of this freeze order. These increases were as follows:

October 1966	24,488
November 1966	36,728
December 1966	7,588
January 1967	5,721
February 1967	16,377
Total	90,902

This 90,902 increase since the executive order comes on top of an earlier increase in the civilian payroll of 35,677 employees during July, August, and September.

This means that 126,579 civilian employees have been added, in direct contradiction to the terms of the administration's freeze order of September 20, 1966.

Based on the estimate that each new civilian employee costs the Federal Government a minimum of $6,000 per year, the Federal Government is now paying about $750 million annually to meet the payroll of additional civilian employees which the administration itself as recently as September 20, 1966, said it did not need.

THE LATE SENATOR VANDENBERG

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, a special tribute is planned for tomorrow to honor the memory of a great son of Michigan, a former Member of this body who rose in stature to be recognized in history as a great statesman of the world.

I refer to the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, who began his distinguished service in the Senate on March 31, 1928, 39 years ago last Friday.

Since 1964, a room in the Senate wing of the U.S. Capitol has been designated as the Vandenberg Room. However, that room has never been appropriately dedicated or marked with a plaque to provide permanent notice concerning the significance of its designation.

At a small luncheon to be held tomorrow in the Vandenberg Room, a bronze plaque will be unveiled. The plaque, to be affixed to the wall, will read:

> This room is dedicated to Arthur H. Vandenberg, United States Senator from Michigan, March 31, 1928, to April 18, 1951, President pro tempore of the Senate January 4, 1947 to January 3, 1949.

Mr. President, Arthur Vandenberg grew from humble beginnings to become a giant among men. The son of a harnessmaker of limited means, he found his ambition for a legal education cut short by family obligations and poor health. He turned to newspaper work, where his outstanding talents were quickly recognized. At the age of 22, he became editor of the Grand Rapids Herald and served in that position until 1928, when he was appointed to the U.S. Senate.

The record of Senator Vandenberg's public service stands as a monumental example of statesmanship in the finest tradition of the Senate. The impact of his great leadership and his many accomplishments continues to be felt around the world today.

Senator Vandenberg labored unceasingly for the United Nations as an instrument of peace. He played a leading role in the establishment of that world organization.

The Greek and Turkish aid program; the Economic Cooperation Act, known as the Marshall plan; the North Atlantic Treaty; the Inter-American Pact of Rio—all bore the mark of his influence. Arthur Vandenberg guided the Marshall plan through the Senate and saw it become a reality. The implementation of the Atlantic Pact was the subject of his last speech in the Senate.

On the domestic scene, Arthur Vandenberg fathered the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. He introduced the first resolution looking toward the control of atomic energy. He guided legislation which established the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

RECOGNITION

As early as 1932, Senator Vandenberg was the Republican nominee for President pro tempore of the Senate. His name was proposed five times thereafter, but because the Democrats were in the majority he did not attain that position until the Republicans won control of the 80th Congress.

Arthur Vandenberg was one of the few men in history who refused the nomination as the candidate of his party for Vice President. Always a man of action, he preferred the opportunities for involvement on the Senate floor to the limitations placed on the Vice President as presiding officer of the Senate.

During World War II, Arthur Vandenberg symbolized our Nation's response to the world's need for leadership and statesmanship. But he was an implacable foe of war, and he explored every avenue and policy that might lead toward peace.

It is well known that Senator Vandenberg was not always an internationalist. Indeed, he was a leader and a symbol of isolationism for many years prior to World War II. On January 10, 1945, Senator Vandenberg rose in the U.S. Senate and delivered an historic address that echoed around the world. In that speech, he articulated the reasons for a dramatic shift in his own position, and he pointed the way toward a new era in American foreign policy.

He said:

> Since Pearl Harbor, World War II has put the gory science of mass murder into new and sinister perspective. Our oceans have ceased to be moats which automatically protect our ramparts.

Then, he made the point:

> I want maximum American cooperation, consistent with constitutional process and with collateral events which warrant it, to make the basic idea of Dumbarton Oaks succeed. I want a new dignity and a new authority for international law. I think American self-interest requires it.

He concluded his historic address with a plea for unity:

> We cannot drift to victory. We must have maximum united effort on all fronts. We must have maximum united effort in our councils. And we must deserve the continued united effort of our own people.

Shortly after the speech was delivered, Columnist Walter Lippmann observed:

> It cannot be said of many speakers that they affect the course of events. But this may well be said of Senator Vandenberg's speech if the President and his lieutenants will recognize promptly and firmly its importance. For this speech can, if it is understood and appreciated, break the vicious circle in which American foreign policy has been revolving so ineffectually.

As the Senator's son, Arthur Vandenberg, Jr., later wrote:

> The speech was an immediate sensation . . . It was the overall impact of the Senator's declaration that made the speech a turning point, that brought him a sudden and tremendous surge of popular support and led to the emergence of a new and unique figure in the history of American foreign policy.

THE MAN

It should not be overlooked, Mr. President, that Arthur Vandenberg was a very warm person. He had a lighter side which endeared him to his colleagues and friends.

It is little known that Arthur Vandenberg composed and played melodies of his own. When it came to quartet singing, his baritone voice was a fine addition.

For his own amusement and that of his friends, he often turned out linear drawings—impromptu and freehand. Sometimes his drawings were done during committee meetings, without any sacrifice of the vigilant attention that he always gave to committee business.

There was a quiet dignity to the man, but underneath that dignity was the humor, understanding, and compassion which often are the attributes of great men.

On a desk piece in his personal office, Senator Vandenberg kept before him this motto:

> And this, too, shall pass.

After his death, one of his colleagues, Senator Milliken of Colorado, recalled:

> . . . (Senator Vandenberg) told me that it (the motto) gave him great comfort.
>
> He recalled instances when it was difficult for him to get into his office because of sacks of mail stacked high with letters of denunciation and again with those of praise.
>
> He suggested it is well to remember that criticism and praise are transient phenomena of high office, and that by keeping the motto in mind, the twin evils of deep shock over hostility and excessive joy over praise may be avoided.

Thus it was, when tensions reached near unbearable heights, he could remind himself that: "this, too, shall pass."

VANDENBERG PHILOSOPHY

While Senator Vandenberg was the very symbol of bipartisanship when the Nation's vital interests were at stake, he was, at the same time, an articulate leader of his party.

In a Lincoln Day speech on February

10, 1949, he addressed himself to the question: Should Republicanism be liberal or conservative?

He stated:

What is a conservative? At one point the dictionary says "one who seeks to prevent loss, decay, or injury and who protects and preserves." In that sense I want my Party to be conservative. I want it to respond to the deepest instincts of our Republic. But at another point, the dictionary says a conservative is "one opposed to the change of progress." In that sense, I do not want my Party to be conservative. If it is static, it will die. It will promote and not prevent decay for itself and its country. This is not a static country nor a static age. . .

Then Senator Vandenberg continued:

What is a liberal? He may be an earnest soul, unimpeachable in his fidelity to the roots and anchors of the American system, who wants the maximum measure of life, liberty, and happiness for our total people. In that sense I want my Party to be liberal. On the other hand, he may seek the substitution of socialism for free enterprise, and paternalism for individual responsibility. In that sense I do not want my Party to be liberal. I am not interested in equality of servitude . . .

Senator Vandenberg drove his point home with these words:

. . . I want the Republican Party to be the common denominator of sound conservatism and sound liberalism. I want it to travel down the high center road.

He continued:

Let me borrow Lincoln's familiar analogy. When asked how long a man's legs should be, he replied: "Long enough to reach the ground." I want the Republican Party to be conservative enough to save every time-tried fundamental upon which the unique and precious character of Americanism depends, ever faithful to the admonition of the prophet Isaiah: "Look ye to the rock whence ye are hewn." But within these landmarks, I want the Republican Party to be liberal enough to march with the times, to dare new answers to these problems, and to use the power and strength and initiative of Government to help citizens to help themselves when they confront problems beyond their resources and control.

I want the oak to stand. I want the branches to grow.

As a Senator, Arthur Vandenberg was the model of a completely rounded representative in our republican form of government. While keeping in close touch with the needs and wishes of his constituency, he dared to lead the people he represented and the Nation. Because of these qualities of leadership, the people of Michigan elected and reelected Arthur Vandenberg. The length of his service, 23 years, has not been equalled by any Michigan Senator who has followed him.

Arthur Vandenberg was the product of an America in which men could rise or fall on their own qualities, talents and efforts.

He was steeped in the American tradition and its meanings. When moments of historymaking decision were at hand, he not only recognized them, but also was ready, armed with courage and great ability.

The Senate and the world are much richer today because Arthur Vandenberg came to the floor of this Chamber 39 years ago.

Although battles still rage in far-off Vietnam, there is every reason to believe that the condition of the world is much better today because Arthur Vandenberg served his country in the U.S. Senate.

VANDENBERG PLAQUE

The bronze plaque to be unveiled tomorrow at a luncheon in the Vandenberg Room will serve as a small but constant, reminder of the contributions made to history by this great American.

Unfortunately, for health reasons, Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr., who served so ably at his father's side as administrative assistant, will not be able to attend the luncheon. However, we are glad that Senator Vandenberg's daughter Barbara, now Mrs. John Bailey, as well as his daughter Elizabeth, now Mrs. Myron Sands, will be on hand for the occasion.

Nearly a score of years has elapsed since his death. But the name of Arthur Vandenberg is still on every tongue in the Senate as a synonym for "bipartisanship."

As with Abraham Lincoln and other great statesmen, Arthur Vandenberg belongs to the ages. His name is indelibly written in history, and it can be said that:

He held his place—
Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
Held on through blame and faltered not at praise.
And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar green with boughs
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

* * *

UNIVERSAL ADHERENCE TO CONVENTION OF POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN CAN BE MAJOR BOON FOR HUMANITY—XLVI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again I rise to plead for Senate ratification of the human rights conventions that have been languishing awaiting Senate action for from 4 to 17 years in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It was not until the 19th century that the then novel concept of the political equality of women gained any real acceptance. The United States did not constitutionally establish this principle of equality until 1920 through the ratification of the 19th amendment.

The signal contributions made by American women to our society and our culture are legion. The truly fantastic growth and development of the United States during the past half century must be attributed in large part to the creative force of American women.

Our own society has prospered and our own culture has been enriched through the active involvement of women. Certainly our American experience is not unique. Other nations have similarly benefited through the full equality of their female citizens.

But why should the United States, with this right constitutionally guaranteed, ratify an international Convention on the Political Rights of Women?

Mr. President, the answer to this question is apparent to all who will see. Pope Paul VI, in an eloquent message last week addressed to all men of good will, deplored the ever-widening gap between the rich nations and the poor nations. Surely the weight of all evidence compels us to agree with the pontiff's statement.

The underdeveloped nations must develop and grow. This is not merely a humanitarian or utopian wish, but it is clearly in our own national interest. The prosperity and security of these nations will aid immeasurably in achieving international stability and promoting world peace. This objective is most assuredly in our national interest.

But these underdeveloped nations face an insurmountable burden if they continue to utilize only half their human resources.

Women, in these societies as in all societies, are the ultimate trainers of the men. Women, as mothers, are the first and frequently the most important teachers of all.

No genuine economic or political progress will be achieved in these countries as long as one-half their population are doomed to second or third-class citizenship without proper education or appropriate dignity in their family, their community, or their national life.

The extension of the franchise to women is an indispensable element in their education, both political and otherwise. The universal recognition of the political rights of women will constitute a major move toward narrowing the gap between the developed and the underdeveloped nations.

The United States can emphasize to these nations, both old and new, the value of our own national experience by ratifying the Human Rights Convention on Political Rights of Women. By ratifying this convention, we will not only be doing a great service for these nations who look to us for our formula of national success. But we will also be very definitely acting in our national interest by promoting both national stability and world peace.

SENATOR METCALF CALLS FOR ACCEPTANCE OF RESIGNATION OF CHARLES LUCE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, yesterday I suggested that Mr. Charles Luce, the Under Secretary of the Interier, resign immediately because of the fact that he has accepted a position as head of Consolidated Edison and there are very patent and flagrant conflicts of interest.

Knowing the integrity and high standards of ethics of Mr. Charles Luce, I was not surprised to learn, after I made that statement, that Mr. Luce, on March 27, the day before the board of directors of Consolidated Edison met to offer him the position of president of Consolidated Edison, submitted his resignation to Secretary of Interior Udall. Mr. Udall re-

quested Mr. Luce to stay on as Under Secretary of the Interior for a time. I am not surprised to learn that Mr. Luce did do what I believe is the honorable and necessary thing in submitting his resignation. I am somewhat surprised, in view of the very palpable conflict of interest involved that Secretary Udall did not accept the resignation.

If, at the time of confirmation, Mr. Luce had been a holder of Consolidated Edison stock he would have had to dispose of it before he could have been confirmed because there would have been a conflict of interest between his duties as Under Secretary of the Interior and some activities of the investor-owned utility. He would have had about as much chance, even with a block of stock, to influence Consolidated Edison policy as I have with my small holdings of stock in the Montana Power Co.

However, now, as president of Consolidated Edison, as a very important individual, he has very differing loyalties than he had before as Under Secretary of the Interior in carrying out his public job.

I believe in justice to Mr. Luce and in justice to the reputation of the Department of the Interior that Secretary Udall should accept the resignation of Mr. Luce immediately and clear up this conflict of interest.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 1, 1967, the Advance, which is the journal of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, published an excellent summary of the issues regarding the truth-in-lending bill. This is but one of many examples of labor union and consumer group support for truth in lending. I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

CREDIT IS BIG BUSINESS: TRUTH IN LENDING TO HELP CONSUMER

If you borrow $1,200 from a lending agency to help finance the purchase of a new car, and you agree to pay it back in 12 equal monthly installments at a charge of $6 per $100 borrowed, what is the total interest charge?

Just as thousands of other individuals would you probably guessed wrong. It's not just six percent as you are led to assume, but actually 11.08 percent. The cost to you is almost double what you think it is.

Consumer credit has become one of the nation's biggest businesses. Nearly every worker, at one time or another, is a consumer on credit. Yet the truth is that very few individuals borrowing money or entering into installment contracts to finance a purchase are able to determine the true annual rate of interest they are paying.

A recent survey, which included only consumers with college educations, revealed that at least four out of 10 are unaware of the true annual interest rate they are paying in credit charges. Probably closer to eight out of 10 consumers today don't know the actual rate of interest they are being charged.

The manager of a noted lending institution recently commented that some stores and lending institutions today victimize the buying public with a fantasy of accounting where percentages multiply and divide, where extra charges are hidden in small print, where sharp practices and rackets inflate the cost of credit, and impose enormous financial burdens on the debtor.

And in a class by themselves are out-and-out credit traps which are barely removed from con-game practices. For example:

A working man purchased an inexpensive television set at its advertised price of $123.88 and contracted to pay for it with 24 monthly payments of $17.50 each. He later discovered to his horror that the true interest rate is an astounding 229 percent per year. To protect his job when the creditor threatened to garnishee his wages, the man was forced to continue payments. The $123.88 television cost him $420.

In another case, a man borrowed $1,000 from a small loan company after being told that the interest rate would be 4.5 percent. The actual rate turned out to be 29.5 percent, or more than six and one half times the advertised rate. He had signed the contract, with all its small print, and therefore had to continue paying the loan.

CHECK ANNUAL RATE OF INTEREST

While shady credit companies and some stores engage in outright dishonesty, even more substantial lending agencies and stores tend to hide the true costs of borrowing or extended payments from their customers.

A number of major banks, competing with each other for customers in a market of rapidly increasing credit rates, are enticing the general public by advertising loans at their discounted rates. If the advertised rate is 4½ percent, the actual rate is nine percent since the borrower is constantly reducing the size of the loan with regular monthly payments. In other words, the borrower is paying interest on the full amount of the loan, but he has the use of the full amount only until his first payment. By the time of his last payment, he is paying interest on the full amount but only has a small fraction of the amount in his possession.

The gimmick used by department stores in general, both large and small, is even more costly to the consumer. Charge account plans, known by a variety of names, usually charge what they term a "reasonable 1½ percent rate of interest" per month on the unpaid balance of the account. While on the surface this charge may appear to be "reasonable," it figures out to a very profitable interest rate of 18 percent annually for the store.

It's this type of behavior, all part of the recent increase of consumer credit deception, that has prompted the Federal Trade Commission to propose a series of guidelines to control some of the most flagrant abuses in retail installment selling and advertising.

PROXMIRE TRUTH BILL

The goal of the proposal, says the FTC, is to give buyers sorely needed information required "to make meaningful price and credit comparisons between competitive products" which is virtually impossible at present. It would outlaw price tags and advertisements which, for example, state: $5 down and no payments until next year." The consumer would have to be told how much extra such a privilege will cost them.

The proposed guidelines seek to give the consumer a fighting chance by requiring retailers to disclose the total cost and the finance charges on all installment plans. They would not apply, however, to regular charge accounts or to automobile credit buying, both of which, the FTC says, are covered by other regulations.

But an even better program is possible; a program which has been proposed many times on the federal level of government.

"Truth-in-lending" legislation has been introduced in the 90th Congress by Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), the ranking Democrat on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It is a slightly watered-down version of the proposal Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D-Ill.) introduced in the past three Congresses before his defeat last year.

The Douglas bill met with strong opposition from lenders and retailers, and during six sessions of Congress never emerged from committee. (Its companion bill, "truth-in-packaging," was passed last year.) The bill would simply have required lending institutions and retailers to disclose the true annual interest rates and total cost for consumer credit.

It would have made it possible for consumers to comparison-shop for credit just as they would with any other important purchase. And, while the measure would not have set rates for credit, it would have kept the cost of consumer credit within reason under the pressure of comparison shopping.

Primary objection to the legislation by creditors was that it would be extremely difficult to inform the consumer of the exact cost of credit.

TRUTH IN LENDING IN CANADA

They can do it in Canada. The Province of Alberta enacted a law requiring that all credit transactions state the annual interest rate. Officials then discussed with mathematicians and financial publishers which formula should be used by all creditors so that rates would be comparable, and retail and loan clerks would not be required to make difficult computations. Recently, J. E. Mason, Alberta Supervisor of Consumer Credit, wrote. "We find the actuarial formula as recommended by mathematicians is most accurate, and publishers assure us that this can applied to produce rate charts in much the same format as those presently in use by creditor employers."

In fact, Mr. Mason reports that credit associations and grantors have cooperated in working out this method.

DOLLARS AND CENTS FINANCE CHARGE

Now, however, the Proxmire bill is advocating a compromise approach that would allow lenders to merely give the approximate annual interest rate. This is intended to satisfy the argument that "truth-in-lending" requirements would be unworkable, and therefore afford the bill a better chance of overcoming the massive opposition.

As it now stands, the Proxmire bill would have only two basic requirements that lenders must meet. First, the total finance charge in dollars and cents must be stated. And second, the total must also be expressed as an approximate annual percentage rate on the unpaid balance of the total amount to be financed. These are simple requirements.

"These modest provisions for all disclosures to consumers of the cost of credit are the consumer credit reforms at once urgently needed and most ardently desired by the public," Proxmire has noted.

"Polls conducted in their districts by Congressmen last year," he said, "showed conclusively that more people want the Congress to pass the "truth-in-lending" bill than agree on any other single piece of domestic legislation.

"Full disclosure to consumers of the cost of credit will help put a stop to the practices of the dishonest few who prey upon the poor," said Proxmire. "It will protect the ethical lender and businessman from unscrupulous competitors; it will invigorate competition, encourage efficiency and make cheaper credit available, and will help to stabilize the economy by discouraging inflationary purchases when rates are high and encouraging purchases when rates are low."

The prospect for passage of "truth-in-lending" legislation during this session of

Congress is encouraging. A number of key Congressmen have displayed an increased understanding of the measure, particularly after hearing from home constituents.

Senate hearings on the proposal are due to begin in late spring.

INSTANT CREDIT IS A GIMMICK

The urgent need for consumer protection with a federal "truth-in-lending" law has been further pointed out by the findings of a recent investigation conducted by the Talman Federal Savings and Loan Association of Chicago into the new "instant credit" card gimmick. A growing number of banks have been issuing cards which provide the holder with "instant credit" at participating stores. The results of the investigation were published in an advertisement in the *Chicago American*.

The investigation discovered, among other things, that both the customer and the store pay the bank for its services. Since the store is usually not willing to bear the cost of the service, it is reflected in the price the consumer pays for merchandise. In most instances, prices in participating stores can be expected to average five percent more than in non-participating stores.

The "instant credit" feature, the study revealed, is actually a loan from the bank. Consumers can expect to pay an actual annual interest rate of 18 percent on the unpaid balance of the loan, payable at 1½ percent per month.

In addition, the fine print on the application form usually includes a number of binding agreements which can become dangerously expensive for the card holder.

One of these is an "escalator clause" under which the bank can increase its service rates on written notice to the card holder.

Another is that the bank holds the applicant responsible for any unauthorized purchases made with the card until the bank receives written notice that the card is missing. A telephone call will not protect the holder from being bankrupted by a thief in case the card is stolen or lost.

EDITORIAL

As the articles on these pages demonstrate, consumer credit has become an essential feature of the American way of life, but without safeguards that would serve to protect the consumer. Today, outstanding consumer credit totals $95 billion. The interest costs on consumer credit amounted to nearly $13 billion in 1966.

The consumer has the right to know the cost of this key item in his budget just as he knows the price of other commodities he buys. But in many instances interest charges are stated in confusing and/or misleading terms.

The present method of stating or showing charges forces the consumer to be a mathematician in order to understand the rate he is being charged. As a matter of fair play to the consumer, the cost of credit should be disclosed fully, simply and clearly.

We believe the Proxmire bill would succeed in accomplishing this and we support the measure. So do most consumers, whether questioned in professional polls or replying to queries from their elected representatives.

Yet one thing is certan. Unless consumers continue to make themselves heard, "truth-in-lending" will remain a dead issue. "Truth-in-packaging" was passed because consumers spoke up. Now is the time to let every legislator know that the electorate is watching; that the voters want this measure passed during this session of Congress.

TIME FOR TRUTH IN LENDING

(By Jane O'Grady, ACWA legislative representative)

The 90th Congress could become the Consumer's Congress. The chief attraction of consumer legislation to this Congress concerned about holding the line on federal spending is that it doesn't cost any more. It simply requires self-regulation on the part of American industry in the manufacture and marketing of its products and services.

In the 89th Congress, a consumer bill was passed which required manufacturers to label packages accurately and prominently. Another consumer bill which passed in the 89th Congress called for federal safety standards in automobiles. Both laws were costless in terms of taxpayer's dollars.

OPPOSITION TO TRUTH BILLS

These measures may sound simple, uncomplicated, and obviously necessary now that they have become law, but their passage in Congress was marked by fierce opposition on the part of the giants of industry—from the cereal manufacturers to the "Big Five" of the auto industry.

The President has now sent a Consumer Message to the 90th Congress. It covers a number of areas of concern for the health and safety of the American consumer. The major feature of the message was the recommendation for passage of S. 5, the "truth-in-lending" bill introduced in the 90th Congress by Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.). This legislation would require a lender of money to show the dollars and cents cost of any loan and the annual rate of interest the borrower would be paying.

PEOPLE FAVOR LEGISLATION

In spite of the fact that public opinion polls all over the country have shown that 85–95 percent of the public is in favor of truth-in-lending legislation, the bill on the same subject, introduced by Senator Douglas (see story) repeatedly got stuck before a Senate subcommittee and never saw the light of day.

The opposition to regulation of the credit business has been and will remain intense. But public knowledge and concern for this legislation is growing stronger. The prospects for passage of a "truth-in-lending" bill in the 90th Congress can now be rated as fair-to-good.

Hearings will be scheduled on S. 5 in mid-March before a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency committee. The House of Representatives, for the first time, will also be getting actively involved in similar legislation.

If Consumers clamor to be heard in both House and Senate, the 90th Congress could be persuaded to pass consumer legislation—with "truth-in-lending" as top priority.

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, to many of us, who long have felt concern that crime and punishment should bear more direct relationship to each other, it has appeared ever more evident that an atmosphere of permissiveness is deepening, so that crime is all too often associated with the term "excuse."

And the ill results for our society are fully apparent with every report of increasing totals of crime throughout the Nation.

The editorial in the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register, of March 23, expresses this sentiment quite well. The editor, in his remarks, "Crime Totals Always On Rise," points out that the courts of our Nation also must begin realizing that crime cannot continue to go unpunished without allowing lawlessness to run rampant in our country.

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

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

CRIME TOTALS ALWAYS ON RISE

There are times we feel sure when the reader gets the impression that editorial writers are hung up too much on the same topics. Always, it must seem, we are commenting on war, crime, education, politics, taxes, government and the like.

Well we suppose there is something to this criticism but when you come right down to it these do appear to be the burning issues of the day and thus do merit considerable discussion and debate. The discouraging aspect of this daily outpouring of millions of words on these same topics is that despite the unending commentary the problems stay with us.

Take for example this worry over an ever-increasing crime rate. By now there have been reams of copy written pointing up the fact that various Supreme Court decisions in recent years have aided and protected the criminal at the expense of honest, law-abiding citizens. These same discussions note how the police have been hampered in trying to track down those who break the law. Still the crime rates rise, the court decisions stand and the police go about their work in a constant quandary.

Recently two massive reports on crime and what to do about it were prepared under government sponsorship. One was a two-volume affair on crime in the District of Columbia while the other was presented by the President's Commission on Crime and dealt with the overall problem in the nation. Chances are very few citizens ever will read these voluminous documents and even if they did they wouldn't know what they as individuals could do to achieve implementation of the suggestions. So the robbers and muggers and thieves and rapists go right on committing their criminal acts and editorial writers continue bemoaning these conditions and urging action. And this is exactly what we are doing here again today.

The trouble with so many of these reports is that they talk more about long-range solutions and the sociological approach to crime than they do about what is happening right now in neighborhoods throughout the country. They harp on the need for more aid to the poor and the rehabilitation of the criminal while some fellow has a gun stuck in the back of a helpless store owner. They talk about cleaning up the slums while at this very hour some thug who molested a woman scoffs at the police because they dared ask him what he was doing at the time of the crime without first describing in detail his constitutional rights. This fellow knows he is home free because the courts will uphold him.

We are not saying that everything possible should not be done to tackle the crime problem at its roots, even where long-range measures are required. However, something must be done about the immediate problem or many citizens won't be around to enjoy the benefits of the long-term devices to reduce crime. Others will have lost large sums of money to criminals while waiting on a slum clearance or anti-poverty program to improve the "environment" in which some criminals are allegedly spawned.

Just the other day we read of a specific example of what is happening on the crime front which dramatically points up the seriousness of the problem and why newspapers devote so much space to discussion of crime. In Washington, D.C., in 13 months from January of 1966 through January 1967, the Peoples Drug Stores experienced no fewer than 31 armed robberies and 62 burglaries with more than $100,000 stolen. This is

only one business chain in one metropolitan area. This sort of thing is multiplied over and over again in cities throughout the country.

The professional sociologist's approach to crime may be an answer to some of this problem but there is a critical urgency for more effective steps to be taken now to deal with those individuals who have no respect for the lives and property of others. We must untie the hands of the police and give them public support in their attempts to deal with the criminal element. The courts also must begin realizing that crime cannot continue to go unpunished without allowing lawlessness to run rampant in our country. Sorry if we seem stuck on this topic but we can't help it.

PATRICK V. McNAMARA FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 83, Senate bill 343.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 343) to provide that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Mich., shall be named the Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a U.S. Senator from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966.

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. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I rise to indicate my strong support for S. 343, a bill introduced by Senator HART and myself, to name a new Federal building in Detroit, Mich., as the Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building in honor of the late Senator McNamara.

Senator McNamara, who represented the State of Michigan in the U.S. Senate from 1955 until his death on April 30, 1966, was a man of great personal integrity and devotion to all that he believed was right.

To designate the new Detroit Federal building in Senator McNamara's name is altogether appropriate and fitting. Senator McNamara not only served Michigan well but he served the Senate well as chairman of the great Committee on Public Works—the committee which authorizes such public buildings as the new Detroit Federal building.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate Public Works Committee has taken early action on the bill to provide that the new Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Mich., shall be named the Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building. I am delighted that the Senate is given an opportunity to vote on it today. I do not expect any opposition.

Our late colleague was a tower of strength here in this body. He was a vigorous fighter for a better life for all our citizens: better schools, civil rights, economic development, welfare of senior citizens, highways—to name only a few of his many accomplishments.

A fine building in the heart of Detroit, housing the activities of the Federal Government there, will be a singularly appropriate reminder of Senator Pat's life and good works. I hope the Members of the House will agree.

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

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

S. 343

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Michigan, shall be named the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a distinguished member of the United States Senate from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966. Any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building."

THE 75TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF FORMER SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, while the Senate was in recess, our esteemed and often-missed former colleague from Illinois, Paul H. Douglas, observed his 75th birthday. The anniversary, coinciding with the celebration of Easter, was an event which rightfully called for stocktaking by those of us who served with him—and who both differed and agreed with him in our mutual efforts to advance the interests and welfare of our fellow Americans and the Nation we love deeply.

With his background of academic knowledge and educational experience, Paul Douglas brought to this Chamber an extraordinary dedication, amazing perspicacity, and an overwhelming capacity for tedious and meticulous attention to legislative detail. His understanding of economics was impressive beyond challenge, so earnest was he in determination to improve the climate in which equity and opportunity are paramount and flourish.

The Douglas concern for welfare of his fellow man was a prime motivation in his discharge of Senate duties and his assumption of legislative responsibilities. In varied situations, he was an effective congressional gadfly and a respected guide. Many of us differed strongly and vehemently with some of his concepts, but none of us doubted his sincerity or his integrity. There were many occasions when it was rewarding to join him in his crusades. Frequently his penetrating mind prompted reappraisal of positions or intentions and thus provoked more sagacious evaluation of issues and proposals.

The devotion of a man who left an agreeable academic place at middle age and courageously enlisted as a Marine Corps private to serve with distinction and selflessness in the Nation's defense forces is the stamp of a unique and true American. Paul Douglas personified a spirit of conviction and righteous belief which rarely motivates human beings. His military record constitutes an episode which clearly foreshadowed his subsequent endeavors in these Halls which lately have been the subject of respectful discourse.

While the observance of the birthday of this long-time colleague now is behind us, I desire to extend belatedly my congratulations to Paul Douglas on an eminent career in demanding and varied fields, to express my delight he has resumed the role of a versatile educator, and to voice the hope that many years ahead will be fruitful, gratifying, and most enjoyable for him.

SENATOR BROOKE ON VIETNAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], having returned from southeast Asia, addressed the Senate on Vietnam. It was his maiden speech. Remarkable because of the clarity of his thought and powerful because of the force of his logic, the Senator's speech was received by his colleagues and by the American people as a highly constructive contribution to a tragically complex American and world problem.

Newspaper comments across the Nation were uniformly favorable. I thought the views of the distinguished American columnist Mr. Roscoe Drummond were particularly perceptive.

I ask unanimous consent that his column, entitled "Senator BROOKE on Vietnam," appearing in many American newspapers, including the New York Herald Tribune-Washington Post, Paris edition, on March 30, 1967, be incorporated 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:

SENATOR BROOKE ON VIETNAM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It has been many years since a maiden speech has propelled a United States senator to the forefront of national influence.

That was the kind of speech which Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts delivered the first time he rose to address the Congress and the country.

Everything combined to make it a speech to be listened to and heeded—substance, timing, and issue.

It wasn't brilliant oratory; there were no unforgettable phrases, no slurring epithets; it contained nothing that was absolutely new on the course of the Vietnam war or the prospects for peace.

How, then, could a speech without any of these ingredients command the attention of all of Washington officialdom—whether they were disposed to agree or disagree—and so impress editors that it was reported on front pages nearly everywhere?

There's a reason. The reason is that it was not the speech alone which made Sen. Brooke meaningful, but it was the manner of the man himself which made the speech meaningful plus the circumstances which led to its delivery.

The core of what Sen. Brooke had to say was (1) that Ho Chi Minh has shown he is "unwilling to negotiate in any meaningful way" and that (2) in consequence the United States has no other course than to keep up the bombing pressure on North Vietnam.

Others have said this with equal clarity and force, but Sen. Brooke's words fall with special impact on his colleagues and, I think, on public opinion because:

1—Sen. Brooke shows that he has the courage, capacity, and willingness to change his mind—not because he was pressured by others, but because his own honest thinking required him to do so.

2—He moves his position from that of being a critic of U.S. bombing of the North and of believing that by stopping it we could get peace talks to concluding that continuing the bombing is compelled by Hanoi's rejection of meaningful negotiations. He does this not on the basis of theoretical argument but by going firsthand to get the facts on the spot. He listened and questioned not Americans alone, but many Asians. He did not speak until he had gone to Southeast Asia to get the facts, and when he spoke he did not ignore the facts he found.

3—When he speaks, he speaks carefully, with evident respect for those who may disagree with him, and it is clear that his primary purpose is not to impose his thinking on others but to explain his thinking so that others can examine it on its merits. That is the art of persuasiveness at its best.

4—Sen. Brooke does not leave unsaid what needs to be said and what he can say better than many. This is his warning to Ho Chi Minh not to count on disunity among the American people to help him win the war.

Sen. Brooke informs Ho that our commitment is both to an "equitable peace" and a willingness to persevere with military means "so long as it is necessary."

He is the right man saying the right thing at the right time.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not have an opportunity to hear the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts, but I did read his remarks in the RECORD. I want to join my friend, the Senator from California, in paying respects to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] for the logic of his speech and the excellent job he did in making his report to the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like the RECORD to show that I join my colleagues in the high praise of the speech made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. It was an outstanding one in many particulars.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

PROTECTING THE PUBLIC INTEREST—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last March 21, I testified before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency in support of Senate bill 510, the bill which I have offered with the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

This proposal would require greater public disclosure in the use of "cash tender offers." I believe this legislation will effectively fill a significant gap in the laws regulating American security markets and protecting the rights of stockholders from the so-called corporate raider.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony I gave to the committee be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

PROTECTING THE PUBLIC TRUST

(Statement by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL Before the Subcommittee on Securities of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mar. 21, 1967)

In early March of 1792, when the stock market was facing its first major decline, Thomas Jefferson wrote to a friend: "the credit and fate of the nation seem to hang on the desperate throws and plunges of gambling scoundrels."

Jefferson was referring to a small organization of investors—"The Six Per Cent Club"—that had carelessly speculated on debt securities issued by the Federal Government and had operated with great mystery behind the scenes. They had overextended themselves in the expectation of sharply rising prices and were left with obligations that could not be met. Neither the government nor the market was prepared to deal with the situation. Indeed, were it not for Alexander Hamilton's intervention and encouragement, the panic that resulted could well have brought complete disaster to Wall Street and the Nation.

The activities of "gambling scoundrels" who operate with "great mystery" are thus not a new phenomenon to the securities markets of America. To be sure, we have come a long way from the days of "The Six Per Cent Club" and the coffee-house stock transactions that characterized the early market trading of a new born Nation.

Numerous safeguards have been provided to protect the welfare of the investor from self-seeking promoters, slick manipulators and others who would take advantage of the public for personal gain. There are laws to curb such manipulations of the market. There is enforcement behind those laws to make them effective. The stock exchanges regulate themselves with strict systems of rules to protect the public. Under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the exchanges are in turn regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Despite these great advances under which the securities markets have grown and expanded over the years, there still remains a significant gap within which those who would misuse the public trust and hide under a blanket of secrecy can continue to carelessly speculate with the "credit and fate of the nation". S. 510, the proposal you consider today, is aimed at filling much of that gap in investor protection.

The cash tender offer has become an increasingly favored method of acquiring corporate control. Last year, for example, the *Wall Street Journal* reported 107 cash tender offers, most of which involved a bid to take over control of a company. The offer normally involves a bid by an individual, group or company to buy a specified number of shares of a corporation's stock from the public at a specified price set above the going market price. Those accepting the offer are said to "tender" their stock for purchase.

This method of obtaining corporate control is not only cheaper and faster than a proxy fight, but offers the added advantage of almost complete secrecy; an advantage, I might add, which is totally inconsistent with the disclosure pattern generally prevailing in the American securities markets.

The competence and integrity of management and controlling persons are of vital importance to stockholders. And yet, the prospective purchasers on a cash tender offer need not and often, do not, reveal their intentions, their commitments, or even their identities to the corporate shareholders. Not only is the shareholder prevented from making an informed investment decision, but both he and the corporation may easily become the unknowing victims of the so-called "corporate raider".

Today, there are those individuals in our financial community who seek to reduce our proudest businesses into nothing but corporate shells. They seize control of the corporation with unknown sources, sell or trade away the best assets, and later split up the remains among themselves.

The tragedy of such collusion is that the corporation can be financially raped without the management or the shareholders having any knowledge of the acquisitions. Using the cash tender offer as a vehicle, the purchases can be made in so-called street names or, even more commonly, by Swiss banks for an undisclosed account number. The "corporate raider" may thus act under a cloak of secrecy in obtaining the shares needed to put him on the road to a successful capture and liquidation of the company.

Recently, the ease with which such a "corporate raid" can be attempted was brought forcefully to my attention. Columbia Motion Pictures is an organization renowned for its significant contribution to the entertainment industry. It and its subsidiaries constitute a diversified entertainment enterprise employing many thousands of persons at an average annual payroll of over $24 million, and average annual gross receipts of over $170 million. Since a significant portion of Columbia's operation is located in California, it represents an important element in my State's economy. Any potential threat to its existence is, of course, an equal threat to its California-based personnel, and to the myriad of related firms who do business with Columbia.

In September of 1966, a French bank made a public tender to purchase a large amount of Columbia stock. Without revealing its true intentions, the bank, after it had obtained the shares, prepared to join forces with a few other dissident shareholders in an attempt to gain absolute control of the corporation. If this attempt had succeeded, Columbia would have found itself under the control of a combination including significant foreign interests, without prior notice to the company, without an opportunity for examination into the circumstances surrounding the tender offer, and without any regard for the rights of its stockholders.

Fortunately, the threat of takeover involved in this transaction was resolved by a private agreement between the parties. But such agreements offer little assurance that similar future attempts at such secretive takeovers will not succeed.

The legislation which I have co-sponsored and which you consider today is aimed at doing away with such secrecy. It requires that the following essential information concerning the cast tender offer be filed with the S.E.C.:

1. The identity and background of the person, or group, making the tender offer.

2. The size of the holdings of the person or group involved.

3. The source and amount of the funds used or to be used to acquire shares.

4. The financing arrangements made for these funds and how these arrangements will be liquidated.

5. Any side agreements that have been made with respect to the stock.

6. The purpose of the tender offer.

7. The plans of the offeror—if he wins control of the company—whether to liquidate it, sell its assets, merge it with another company, or to make major changes in its business or corporate structure.

I do not pretend to be an expert in the securities area and thus I must leave the exact mechanics of such legislation in your experienced hands. My sole interest in supporting S. 510 is to insure that whatever legislation comes to the floor of the Senate effectively prevents secretive security transactions and provides the shareholder with the information he needs to make a sound investment decision.

Legitimate businessmen certainly have nothing to fear from full disclosure on cash tender offers. The stockholders have a right to know who they are dealing with, what commitments have been made, and the intentions and plans of the offeror. Our securities markets must be founded not on those whom Jefferson termed "gambling scoundrels" who operate in "great mystery", but on those shareholders who make informed decisions based on a full disclosure of pertinent facts.

Today, there are more than 20 million individual Americans who actively participate in this Nation's investment community. The American people have placed a tremendous trust in the strength, integrity, and vitality of our securities system. It is our responsibility and, more importantly, that of this Subcommittee, to protect and safeguard that public trust through effective Federal laws and regulations. I believe S. 510 represents a fulfillment of that responsibility to the American people.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS SUPPORTS THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of Nebraska's outstanding businesswomen is Sarah Jane Cunningham of McCook, Nebr. She is a very distinguished citizen and an able lawyer. At the present time, she is president of the National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., of America.

On March 15, 1967, her statement was received by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee supporting the United Nations Convention on the Political Rights of Women. I ask unanimous consent that her statement be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC., OF AMERICA

(By Sarah Jane Cunningham before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Subcommittee on the United Nations Conventions, Mar. 15, 1967)

My name is Sarah Jane Cunningham, and I submit this statement before this subcommittee in my capacity as President of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., of America. The Federation urges this subcommittee to recommend that the Senate ratify the United Nations Convention on the Political Rights of Women. This subcommittee formally has before it two other United Nations Conventions, the Convention on the Abolition of Slavery and the Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, although transmitted to the Senate, is not before this subcommittee. Although supporting in principle each of these latter conventions the Federation will address itself only to the Convention on Political Rights of Women, for it is in this area that the Federation believes it can speak with a greater authority.

The Federation is a national federation composed of fifty-three state federations, which, in turn, are composed of 3800 local clubs. These clubs are in operation in every state of the United States and in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. We represent approximately 178,000 business and professional women. In the national legislative platform adopted at the Federation's annual convention in July 1966 the Federation adopted a policy to support measures within the framework of the United States Constitution to make effective the United Nations. It is pursuant to that policy that we appear today.

The first General Assembly of the United Nations in 1946 adopted a resolution calling upon countries which had not already done so to fulfill the purposes and aims of the Preamble and Article I of the United Nations Charter by granting women the same political rights as men. The draft resolution was submitted by Denmark and (a) recommended that all member states which had not already done so grant to women the same political rights as to men, and (b) invited the Secretary General to communicate the recommendation to the governments of member states.

The question of drafting a convention on the political rights of women was first discussed at the third session of the Commission on the Status of Women, a subsidiary body of the U.N. Economic and Social Council, meeting in the spring of 1949. The Commission requested the Secretary General to examine and report on the possibility of a convention on the granting of political rights to women. The purpose of such a convention would be (a) to offer guidelines to countries which had not yet granted women equal political rights, and (b) to encourage those countries to grant such rights. In accordance with the Commission's request the Secretary General formulated a draft proposal providing that (1) women should be entitled to vote in all elections on the same conditions as men; (2) women should be eligible for election to all publicly elected bodies established by national law, on the same conditions as men; and (3) women should be entitled to hold public office and to exercise all public functions established by national law, on the same conditions as men. The main provisions of the final text were substantially the same as those of the original draft. On December 17, 1952 the draft Convention was adopted by the General Assembly.

The Convention consists of the Preamble and 11 articles. The first three articles are substantive and establish rights for women that in this country today seem routine.

Article I provides that women shall be entitled to vote in all elections on equal terms with men without any discrimination.

Article II provides that women shall be eligible for election to all publicly elected bodies established by national law, on equal terms with men without any discrimination. Article III provides that women shall be entitled to hold public office and to exercise all public functions, established by national law, on equal terms with men, without any discrimination. The remaining eight articles are procedural.[1]

On July 22, 1963 President Kennedy transmitted to the Senate the Convention on the Political Rights of Women for its advice and consent. As of January 1, 1967, 51 nations had ratified this Convention.

The provisions of Article I, the right of women to vote on equal terms with men, reflects the principle established by the 19th amendment to our Constitution which provides:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

This amendment "by its own force supersedes inconsistent measures whether federal or state." *Breedlove v. Suttles*, 303 U.S. 277, 283 (1937). Clearly the provisions of this article coincide with fundamental rights already guaranteed by our Federal Constitution. Furthermore, there is no possibility that this convention will alter the existing balance between the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the jurisdiction of the States.

Articles II and III establish the eligibility of women to be elected and to be appointed to public office[2] established by "National Law." Again these article coincide with the principles of our Federal Constitution. Although the number of women elected or appointed to public office in the United States

[1] Article IV contains provisions regarding signature and ratification, Article V provides for accession, and Article VI provides that the convention shall enter into force on the 90th day after deposit by each state.

Article VII relates to reservations and provides that any reservation submitted at the time of signature, ratification, or accession will be communicated by the Secretary General to all states which are or may become parties. The convention does not enter into force as between the state making the reservation and any other state which notifies the Secretary General within 90 days from the date of such communication that it does not accept the reservation.

Article VIII provides that any state may denounce the convention by written notice to the Secretary General to take effect 1 year after the date of receipt of the notification by the Secretary General. The convention will cease to be in force when such denunciations have reduced the number of parties to less than six.

Article IX provides that disputes concerning interpretation or application of the convention between contracting parties, not settled by negotiation, shall be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision at the request of one of the parties unless they agree to another mode of settlement.

Articles X and XI provide for the performance of depository functions by the Secretary General of the United Nations.

[2] The Federation agrees with the interpretation of the phrases "public office" and "public functions" in Article III as expressed by President Kennedy in transmitting the Convention to the Senate. President Kennedy stated: "In the event that the Senate advises and consents to accession to the convention, it is recommended that it indicate that such occasion is subject to the understanding that in Article III the phrase "public office" does not include military service and the phrase "public function" is coterminous with "public office."

is not great,[3] their *right* to be elected or so appointed is universally recognized.

Direct constitutional and statutory prohibitions of office holding by women have practically disappeared. The only Federal civilian position for which sex is specified by statute (29 U.S.C. § 12) is the Director of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, who must be a woman. In general, State constitutions and statutes either expressly or impliedly guarantee the right of women to hold public office or are silent as to sex.[4] Again there is nothing in Articles II or III that contravenes any provision of the Federal Constitution or conflicts with State provisions. They merely reflect expressed values of the United States.

The Federation strongly believes that the ratification of the Convention on the Political Rights of Women by the United States will be consistent with our Federal Constitution, will not alter the existing balance between the Federal and State Governments and will contribute to the effectiveness of the United Nations. As noted, it is a policy of the Federation to support measures consistent with the Federal Constitution which will effectuate the purposes of the United Nations. The Convention on the Political Rights of Women is such a measure.

It has been said that the rights secured by this Convention have long been recognized in our country and therefore ratification by the United States is unimportant. Yet women in many countries throughout the world do not enjoy similar rights. Have we no legitimate interest in the rights of citizens of other nations? In the United States today the rights of women, civil as well as political, and the rights of men are approaching parity. Yet in the not too distant past a substantial gulf existed between the political and civil opportunities of men and women. We have now closed that gulf almost completely. In many parts of the world today that gulf is still substantial. We are presented here an opportunity to contribute to its narrowing.

Our nation has been a leader in the establishment of political rights for two centuries. Many of the rights enjoyed by citizens of other nations had their birthplace in our country. Yet our leadership has generally been by way of example. We now have an opportunity to lead actively and purposefully by means of participation.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs therefore urges this committee to recommend to the Senate that it advise and consent to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

[3] In Congress today only 1 out of 100 Senators and 11 of 435 Representatives are women. Only 2 women have been cabinet officers in the Federal Government; only five have served as ambassadors and three as ministers. No women has ever been appointed to the United States Supreme Court. No woman presently is on the United States courts of appeals and only 3 serve as district court judges.

[4] An example of an express guarantee is Article VI, sec. 1 of the Wyoming Constitution, which provides: "The rights of citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of this state shall equally enjoy all civil, political and religious rights and privileges." Article IV, sec. 1 of the Utah Constitution is similar. See also Arizona Constitution, Article VII, sec. 2. Delaware Constitution, Article XV, sec. 10. New Mexico Constitution, Article VII, sec. 2. Massachusetts Constitution, Article LXIX, sec. 1. A Wisconsin statute provides: "Women shall have the same rights and privileges under the law as men in the exercise of suffrage, . . . holding public office . . . and in all other respects . . ." The New Jersey Constitution, Article X, sec. 4 provides: "Wherever in this Constitution the term 'person,' 'persons,' 'people' or any personal pronoun is used, the same shall be taken to include both sexes."

Similarly, the New Mexico Constitution, Article VII, sec. 2, in addition to guaranteeing the right to hold public office without regard to sex, provides: ". . . wherever the masculine gender is used in this Constitution, in defining qualifications for specific offices, it shall be construed to include the feminine gender . . ." For similar language construction rules, see 1 U.S.C. 1; Maryland Constitution, Article XV, sec. 10; Mississippi Code Annot., Sec. 704; West's Wisconsin Stats. Annot., sec. 6.015(1).

Presumably, women may also qualify for public office on the same terms as men under provisions referring to eligibility of qualified electors for public office. See, for example, Connecticut Constitution, Article VI, sec. 1, 3; North Carolina Constitution, Article VI, sec. 7; South Carolina Constitution, Article II, sec. 2; Montana Constitution, Article IX, sec. 11; Virginia Constitution, Article II, secs. 18, 32.

THE TAXPAYER'S STAKE IN GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY, ECONOMY, AND TAXATION SYSTEMS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of reading an article entitled "Ohio's Taxpayer—An Examination of His Stake in Government Efficiency, Economy, and Taxation Systems," written by Charles A. Calhoun, executive director of the Ohio Public Expenditure Council, and published in the Ohio Banker for February 1967.

The article is extremely interesting and well written and should have the close attention of all Ohio taxpayers.

While the statistical data do not apply to taxpayers other than those in Ohio, the general principles and responsibilities as set forth in the article apply equally to all taxpayers throughout the 50 States.

In order that Senators and other persons may have the opportunity to study the article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

OHIO'S TAXPAYER—AN EXAMINATION OF HIS STAKE IN GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY, ECONOMY, AND TAXATION SYSTEMS

The Ohio Public Expenditure Council was established in the early fall of 1941 by business leaders throughout Ohio who were vitally interested in the economy of our state. They were fearful that the taxpayers, ere long, would be unable to carry the ever-increasing tax burden and free enterprise would be placed in jeopardy unless something were done to check local expenditures as well as federal nonessential expenditures.

This group of civic-minded business leaders represented virtually all segments of industry and commerce throughout the State of Ohio. The banking profession also played and continues to fill a very important role in the establishment of the Ohio Public Expenditure Council.

The primary purpose of the Council is to help the taxpayer help himself toward better government at less cost. Individual citizens need help in understanding the facts, figures and issues of government programs and proposals. It is only natural for taxpayers to become irritated with a governmental service in which they are not well informed.

With government as vast and complex as it is today, many taxpayers are confused. They do not know how to begin working towards efficiency and economy in government. In this respect the Ohio Public Expenditure Council is of immense help to the taxpayers and citizens of Ohio. Towards this end, the Council is first and foremost a research and educational organization, studying and analyzing the revenues, expenditures and fiscal problems of the governmental taxing units in Ohio.

Since accurate facts are the most potent instrument—both for citizens and public officials—in meeting governmental fiscal problems, the Council exerts every effort to bring the real facts, disclosed by its research staff, to the attention of public officials, taxpayer groups, the news media, Council members and other interested citizens. In addition, the staff provides assistance, as well as research and other materials, to taxpayer associations, public officials and other civic groups with whom it co-operates. It exercises no control over the policies, programs or finances of these groups.

The Council has no connection or tie of any kind with a political party or group. It operates on the principle that in a democracy, informed public opinion is the only instrument which is genuinely effective in improving conditions relating to governmental expenditures and taxation. The Council is not a "lobbying" or "pressure" group, and it studiously refrains from any activities political in nature.

The Ohio Public Expenditure Council works in close co-operation with other state and national tax organizations.

By co-operating with the Tax Foundation, through its New York and Washington D.C. offices, close association is maintained with the thirty-eight state taxpayer organizations similar to the Ohio Council.

With the rapid increase in Ohio's population (an increase of 984,845 or 9.8 percent since the last federal census) have come many new and challenging fiscal problems to local governments—especially counties, cities and school districts. The majority of taxes, excluding federal taxes, paid by the average company or corporation, represents income for the operation of county, municipal, school district and township services.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL TRENDS

Local government expenditures tend to grow nearly twice as fast as the national economy, while property tax collections do well to keep pace with economic growth. Since revenue requirements rise faster than the yield of existing taxes, the deficiency can be bridged only by additional taxation and increased intergovernmental aid or reduced spending policies.

The 107th General Assembly, which is currently in session, will be faced with many problems relating to local government finances. The following points are presented as a reflection of certain phases of local taxation and expenditures in Ohio during the past decade about which OPEC feels citizens should be informed.

1. The total assessed valuation of all eighty-eight counties has climbed from $22.0 billion in 1956 to an estimated $33.1 billion in 1966. This represents an estimated increase of $11.1 billion or 50.5 percent in the ability of local taxing units to support the various services of government within the past ten-year period.

2. The 1955 valuation of real property exempted from taxation in Ohio amounted to $2,124,788,601. The corresponding total reported on the 1965 tax list and duplicate amounted to $3,450,922,470. This represents an increase of $1,326,133,869 or 62.4 percent.

A closer examination of real property exempted from taxation on the 1965 tax list and duplicate reveals that $2,415,512,525 or 70 percent was located in Ohio cities. The use of exemptions from property taxes without regard for their secondary effects has changed the distribution of the property tax burden and indicates an urgent need for a detailed study, by the state, of exemptions from real property taxation.

3. Total property taxes levied for collection in 1956 amounted to $573.0 million for all taxing units in Ohio. In 1966 the corresponding figure had jumped to over $1,235 million. This represents an increase of $662.0 million or 116 percent in taxes levied on real estate, public utility and tangible personal property during the past ten years.

4. The average property tax rate in Ohio has increased from 26.08 mills in 1956 to 37.59 mills applied for collection of property taxes (real estate, public utility and tangible personal) in 1966. This is an increase in the average rate of 11.51 mills or 44.1 percent.

5. Shared taxes and revenues by the State of Ohio with local governments amounted to $402.5 million during the 1955–56 fiscal year. By the close of the last fiscal year—June 30, 1966—the corresponding total had risen to $967.8 million. This represents an increase of $565.3 million or 140.4 percent in subsidies, shared taxes and revenues allocated to Ohio's local taxing units by the state.

6. Per capita assessed value for Ohio's eighty-eight counties averaged $2,777 in 1956. Ten years later (1966), the average per capita value had increased to an estimated $3,391 for each person in the state.

7. The gross debt of local governments in Ohio amounted to $1,654 million in 1956. By 1966 the corresponding gross debt figure had increased to $3,005 million. The per capita debt for all local governments in Ohio increased from $208 in 1956 to $310 in 1966.

8. The percentage of property taxes levied by local subdivisions over the past ten years has exhibited some startling changes. The following figures indicate the percentage of taxes levied by local governments:

1956 percentage of property taxes levied

State	0.77
County	13.09
Townships	2.73
Schools	60.82
Corporations	22.59
Total	100.00

1966 percentage of property taxes levied

State	0.54
County	12.00
Townships	2.44
Schools	68.52
Corporations	16.50
Total	100.00

9. An analysis of tax delinquency in Ohio during the past decade discloses the constant upward trend in this area of local governmental financial problems. Total delinquent tax and unpaid special assessments, after final tax settlements in 1955, amounted to $39.4 million. The corresponding delinquency totaled $72.4 million by the time final tax settlements were completed in 1965. This represents a net increase of $33.0 million or 83.7 percent during the past ten years.

Various types of statistical data—pertaining to counties, cities and school districts—are provided for Council members and other interested citizens. Comparative statistics can be used as an analytical tool to "highlight" significant differences in taxation and expenditure policies between comparable taxing units.

A major function of the Council is that it serves as a clearinghouse to which citizen groups throughout the state can turn for useful materials, accurate data and competent counsel in solving the numerous problems of public finance with which they may be confronted in their respective areas. To accomplish this function, it is necessary to ascertain the assets and liabilities of the taxing unit in question; determine the future requirements for operating revenues; project the annual debt retirement needs; and, establish a capital improvement plan on the basis of project priority. In some instances it has even been necessary to establish an orderly plan whereby the taxing unit could meet its unpaid operating obligations and still maintain its service program. This service has been provided by the Council for any local taxing subdivision which seeks this type of help and desires assistance in solving its fiscal problems. Because of the tremendous amount of work involved, the Council must, of necessity, assess a fee for this special type of research and analysis.

SOUND LOCAL BUDGETING

One of the most important factors in local government expenditure control is the careful appraisal and proper administration of expenditure budgets or spending programs. This is probably the weakest link in the financing of local government. The Council staff has found that too much importance is frequently attached by local government officials to a defense of expenditures already made and not enough to the proposed expenditure program.

During the coming months local government budgets will be prepared and adopted (July) and property tax levies will be determined for the 1968 calendar year. Property taxes levied (real estate, public utility and tangible personal property) for collection and expenditure in 1966 amounted to over $1,235 million in Ohio. This represented an increase of $63 million plus or 5.4 percent over the previous year while the assessed valuation figures showed a state-wide growth in the tax base of only 3.4 percent during the corresponding period.

Although each budget will vary, it can be expected in most instances that the growth of the tax base, by itself, will not offset proposed increases in taxes, and many taxpayers will be asked to pay an increased tax rate (millage levy) on existing asssessed valuation.

Unsound budgeting practices can weaken control over expenditures and thereby encourage governmental waste and extravagance. What constitutes excessive spending and taxation is a matter of judgment. Without accurate firsthand knowledge of conditions and requirements, such a determination should not be attempted. The decision is best left to the citizens and taxpayers who live within the boundaries of a specific governmental taxing unit; are recipients of the services provided by that unit; and, must support, by taxation, the cost and services furnished by the agencies of local government.

One of the most important steps for the taxpayer in the local budget making process is the public hearing where one can express his views either for, or against, the proposed expenditures and property tax levies. It is not necessary, however, for a taxpayer, or group of taxpayers, to wait until the public hearing to confer with local officials about the budget.

A citizen need not be an expert in finance to learn about the operations and programs of his local government through budget analysis. The budget provides a means by which the citizen can become informed about the finances of his local government and express informed views on proposed tax and expenditure programs. Moreover, it permits him to do so at a time—before expenditures are authorized and the tax rate approved—when such action on his part can be most effective.

To date, I am sorry to state, there has been an almost complete lack of interest by the public in local government operating budgets. Both citizens and officials have a stake and an interest in active participation of citizens in the budgeting process.

The problem which seems to plague most regions of the state is: "What can we do about the continually increasing property taxes?" As has been pointed out, during the past decade (1956–1966), total property taxes have increased over $662 million or 116 percent in Ohio. Average property tax rates have increased 11.51 mills or slightly in excess of 44 percent during the corresponding period.

Only when taxpayers have determined to participate actively and aggressively in public affairs and then inform themselves on the actual needs of the municipalities, school and counties; and when armed with facts based on research and analysis, go forth to do battle for efficient government, then, and only then, can they be assured that waste and extravagance will cease. Notice as to the availability of local budgets is provided by the governing body and is published and publicized through the local news media. Are you planning to attend a budget hearing this year?

APPEAL PROCEDURE NEEDED

To aid the taxpayer and citizen toward the goals just described, it is the opinion of the Ohio Public Expenditure Council that a taxpayer appeal procedure is needed in Ohio budget law.

Taxpayers, unfortunately, are not accorded the same treatment as tax spenders under present budgetary law. It is important to note that the taxing authority of any subdivision which is dissatisfied with any action of the budget commission may, through its fiscal officer, appeal to the State Board of Tax Appeals within thirty days after it receives the official certificate or notice of the budget commission's action. The authority is granted to local public officials under Section 5705.37 of the Revised Code.

The decision of the Board of Tax Appeals must be substituted for the findings of the budget commission. This is not, however, the end of the legal road for the local taxing authority. If it is dissatisfied with the decision of the Board of Tax Appeals, the taxing authority may, within thirty days after the Board's decision, appeal to the Court of Appeals or directly to the Supreme Court of Ohio. If the Court decides that the decision of the Board is unreasonable or unlawful, it must reverse and vacate the decision, or modify it and enter final judgment in accordance with such modification.

However, taxpayers have no appeal rights which are in any way comparable to the appeal process granted local taxing officials. If, after the conclusion of public hearings and the adoption of a local governmental budget in Ohio, a taxpayer or group of taxpayers still object to any item or items in the budget, what recourse is granted to them under present budget statutes? All they can do is file an action in the Common Pleas Court, of the county in which their property is located, to enjoin the illegal levy or collection of taxes. An alternative method permits the payment of taxes under protest and then the filing of a suit in the Common Pleas Court for a refund. If relief is denied in the Common Pleas Court an appeal may be made to the Court of Appeals. However, this is the end of the legal road for the taxpayers. The Supreme Court may, but it is not required to take their case. And if the taxpayer does win his case to recover tax money paid under protest, he can only get it back if the county has not disbursed it in the meantime. Section

2723.05 of the Revised Code provides that only such taxes as are unexpended and in the possession of the collecting officer may be refunded.

It is quite evident that this long and costly procedure in order to challenge an action by the county budget commission needs corrective amendments by the Legislature. In addition, it should be pointed out that a little taxpayer cannot bear the financial burden of paying his taxes under protest and then pursue a long process of litigation to recover his money. And, if every taxpayer were to pay under protest and file a suit to get his money back, the Courts would be completely overwhelmed by litigation.

Some form of corrective legislation is necessary to give the taxpayer an urgently needed "appeal procedure" in the case of disputed local government budgets. In addition, the statutes should be made to clearly define the power and authority of the Board of Tax Appeals. The Board should be granted the clear-cut power and authority, by the General Assembly, to issue an enforceable order instructing a particular county budget commission to alter or revise its budget and tax levies in order to comply with all statutory and legal requirements.

Other sections of the Ohio statutes needing a thorough study for possible legislative amendments are those pertaining to current expense and permanent improvement funds, and to the creation and transfer of public funds.

During the past twenty-five years, the Council's staff has witnessed numerous situations where local governmental taxing units have accumulated surplus revenues in excess of expenditure requirements. Oftentimes these surplus funds have been used to launch new spending programs or to finance a new capital improvement facility.

The taxpayer should be fully protected and given the necessary statutory rights and authority to easily appeal disputed acts by local budget commissions.

MODERNIZING LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The various forms of government and some needed procedural revisions for local governments should be given some study by the present legislative session. For example: Non-charter cities and villages operate under state laws, most of which were adopted after the turn of the century. Permissive legislation authorizing alternative forms of county government has not yet been approved by any county taxing unit in Ohio. Critics claim there are deficiencies in the existing law that tend to discourage its adoption. More study is needed to determine if further refinements are needed in the law.

The 106th General Assembly adopted S. J. R. No. 5 permitting the creation of urban service authorities in areas with a city of at least 50,000 population. This proposal, which would have amended the Constitution of Ohio, was defeated by the voters in November of 1965. With urban problems becoming more critical, it seems important that the legislature re-examine this proposal or a similar one.

In order to effectively meet the challenge of our times, review, as well as revisions, of state laws, dealing with the structure of local government is necessary.

Local governments must be modernized in order to provide the most efficient and economical type of operation for the tax dollars spent. Fearful that this would only cause their communities to grow and consume more tax dollars, many citizens, too often in the past, have viewed with apathy-or even hostility-attempts to modernize and revitalize our state and local governments. Political factors, of course, are strongly involved. Unfortunately, many of our state and local governments, in recent years, have been unable or unwilling to meet their responsibilities in full with the result that increased demands have been placed upon—and acted upon—by the federal government.

COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

A highly important factor in the cost of doing business is taxes. Of all the expenditures which a business makes, those for taxes are least controllable by the business itself.

As more and more businessmen seek constructive solutions to their local business eliminate problems, there is a continuing need for still better research and study. In this work, the Ohio Public Expenditure Council can be-and has been-of assistance and guidance. Financial data pertaining to Ohio's 3,000 plus local taxing units can be obtained from the Council's library. This information can be extremely useful in appraising various local governmental taxation and expenditure problems.

Business and industry, in their role as taxpayers, can render a valuable service by uniting with other taxpayers, corporate and otherwise, who constitute the membership of taxpayer organizations across the country. In this way they can lend their assistance to organized efforts to achieve better and less costly government.

There is small indication today that the future growth in existing state and local tax revenues will be sufficient to meet the rising cost of government, the expansion of essential services and the amortization of maturing indebtedness. Faced with these future fiscal problems, each taxpayer will be confronted with numerous difficulties which now loom upon the horizon. The Ohio Public Expenditure Council will continue to help its members and local taxpayer groups to secure a complete understanding of all taxation and expenditure problems.

MISS PATRICIA VAN HAAFTEN, TUCSON, ARIZ., NAMED NATIONAL "MISS RURAL ELECTRIFICATION"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, over the years the rural electrification program has brought electric power to the Arizona countryside and, with it, a new era for the rural folks. In addition, the seven rural electric cooperatives of Arizona have contributed substantially to the development of their areas and promotion of the State, in general.

Through their efforts a new honor has been brought to the State. At the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in San Francisco last month, an Arizona girl was named the national "Miss Rural Electrification." The young lady is Miss Patricia Van Haaften, of Tucson, a sophomore music major at the University of Arizona and the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. C. Van Haaften who are seasonal members of the Trico Electric Cooperative.

Arizona is proud that this outstanding example of Arizona youth will have the opportunity to represent her State and the country's nearly 1,000 rural electric systems throughout the Nation during the coming year.

I ask unanimous consent that an article relating to Miss Van Haaften's selection be printed in the RECORD.

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

SAN FRANCISCO, February 22.—A pretty University of Arizona sophomore tonight captured the hearts of the judges and the crowd of the national Miss Rural Electrification contest.

Nineteen year old Patricia Carol Van Haaften won the title before a crowd of over 6,000 persons attending the 25th anniversary meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association being held here.

Patricia is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. C. Van Haaften, of 45 Plaza del Encanta, members of the Trico Electric Cooperative in Tucson. Each girl entered in the local, state or national contests must live on an electric line serviced by a rural electric cooperative.

Along with the crown and the opportunity to represent the nation's nearly 1,000 rural electric systems for the next year, she received a $2,500 scholarship which she will use to further her musical education at the University of Arizona.

The Miss Rural Electrification trophy will sit among several other awards the Tucson miss has won in the past. She was first runner-up in the Miss World contest in 1965, Tucson Model of the Year for 1965, Symphony Junior Patroness and was presented at the Symphony Cotillion Ball in 1964. She also won first prize for "The Most Beautifully Dressed Doll" at the Tucson Salvation Army Christmas party for underprivileged children.

In addition to her talents for impressing beauty contest judges, she has won prizes for her oil paintings, likes to cook, and makes many of her own clothes.

Last night Pat and the other contestants received an additional thrill when they were presented to Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey and had the Vice Presidential bracelet put on her wrist by Mr. Humphrey.

FREE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING THREATENED

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as many authorities in labor-management relations last year predicted, 1967 will be an important year for free collective bargaining, a concept that is very much worthy of preserving. The rash of strikes and threatened walkouts that have already hit the Nation, in some cases paralyzing important segments of our economy, are only a prelude of things to come, particularly in the next month to 6 weeks. During this period, union agreements in such important industries as rubber, trucking, and railroads will be up for renewal; failure to settle the differences voluntarily, before costly strikes adversely affect the Nation's economy and threaten its security, will perhaps weaken collective bargaining to such a degree that compulsory arbitration, which is unwanted by both labor and management, or greater Federal participation will be the end result. Clearly, the public interest must be protected.

Recently, the respected syndicated columnist David Lawrence wrote an article which, I believe, explains the problem with rare clarity and insight. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

SERIOUS STRIKE WAVE HELD LIKELY

(By David Lawrence)

A wave of serious strikes is likely this year. All signs point to interruptions in work which will cost the nation plenty of money apart from the inconvenience and indirect

damage to persons not involved in the disputes.

Oddly enough, even though this threat to the economic stability of the nation has been intermittent for many years, nothing has been done by Congress, as the representative of the people, to provide a constructive alternative.

James J. Reynolds, under-secretary of labor, made a significant observation a few days ago on the whole problem that faces the country. He said:

"This year, and particularly the next month to six weeks, will be a crucial testing ground for free collective bargaining as an institution in our society."

Union agreements in rubber, trucking and railroads will come up for renewal in a few weeks. In September the three auto companies face strike threats. Major contracts involving 3.1 million workers will expire this year.

It has long been conceded that workers have a right to organize unions. Large groups with the strike weapon in their hands however, are able to disrupt the economic system by forcing higher prices which the public is sometimes unable to meet. Then demand declines and the result is unemployment among union workers in other industries as well.

An examination of the collective-bargaining process, moreover, reveals that it has weaknesses which have gone unremedied. Collective bargaining, especially when carried on by powerful labor unions, is indeed a gambling game. It is a form of collective deception in which each side tries to outsmart the other.

Often the negotiations are prolonged. The tendency is to assume that the first offer is not the last and that, if pressed further, management representatives will go a little higher each time. Then, when the company finally says the limit has been reached, the labor side more often than not considers this a bluff and keeps on threatening a strike or actually orders one so as to emphasize a refusal to accept what has been proposed.

Repeated efforts have been made in recent years to get legislative action on these problems. Compulsory arbitration has been advocated, but both labor and management have offered objections. The government has sometimes stepped in when the "public interest" has been threatened. Such action, however, has been limited to situations in which interruptions to transportation or electric-power facilities have been threatened. Existing laws provide for "cooling-off" periods and for "fact-finding boards," but these moves have come to be viewed as part of the gambling process. Final offers are not made until the government has used up its measures requiring the use of advisory or mediation tribunals.

Picket lines, established by one Union, are respected by other labor groups, even though the latter have no connection with the dispute and have not attempted through their leaders to form a judgment as to whether the striking union is right in what it is doing.

Present-day theory is that, when a picket line has been formed, it is as valid as if it had been authorized by a court order. Nor is there any method available by which the proposals of management and labor can be examined instantly as to their fairness and equity if a strike is threatened or called. Collective bargaining remains a form of collective bludgeoning, and the innocent bystander pays the penalty.

Why isn't something done about it by Congress? The simple answer is that the labor unions, with 17 million members, control a majority of both houses by means of campaign contributions. The other 100 million persons of voting age have never banded themselves together to elect a Congress that will prescribe a system of collective bargaining to protect the rights and equity of all the citizens.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION SYSTEM IN AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the March 1967, issue of American Education, published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, included an article about the educational television system in American Samoa, written by Martha L. Fiedler.

Since the Congress has authorized a considerable investment in this ETV system in American Samoa, the report should be of interest to all Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

ETV GOES WAY OUT AND BRINGS THE WORLD TO SAMOA

(By Martha L. Fiedler)

Far off in the South Pacific, somewhere between New Zealand and Easter Island, is American Samoa—a name forgotten since the war, a place cut off in time and distance from the rest of the world.

Its islands, a proverbial paradise of dense jungles and white sand beaches fringed with palm trees, offered a precarious feast-or-famine existence to the people—and to the children, a life of the same dull monotony in a world that ended at the Pago Pago harbor.

But education is changing the picture. Up-to-date education, overnight change. Instruction as modern as today, via television.

Governor Rex Lee is the man who brought the world to Samoa. He developed the idea and carried it through. Two graduating classes—the first one pictured here—have received their diplomas since his project began.

When Lee came to Samoa in 1961, he was appalled at the conditions he found, particularly the wholly inadequate school system. Fewer than half the children went to school, in buildings that were either delapidated fales or hot, tin-roofed barracks of vintage years. Teachers were untrained and barely literate in English, the language of instruction and of the few teaching materials available. Textbooks from the States described a life the children couldn't imagine.

"It was obvious that what was needed was a sudden and explosive upgrading," he reported. And right away, he launched a major sales promotion campaign: selling the idea of educational television to the Department of the Interior and to Congress. With Secretary Udall's support, Lee went to Congress and received $40,000 for a feasibility study.

The study, conducted mainly by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, verified the Governor's prediction: educational television would be the fastest, most effective, and, in the long run, most economical way to bring Somoa's educational system to reasonable standards—and to introduce the people to the world beyond the harbor.

With $1,583,000 from Congress, construction of the ETV facilities began. The whole labor force and almost all the supervisory staff were Samoan. Similarly, Samoan understudies, like the young man above, are learning all the trades of the educational television system so they can increasingly assume the positions now held by stateside personnel.

Putting up the transmitter tower on Mount Alava, 1600 feet above Pago Pago harbor, called for real ingenuity. The decomposed lava covering the steep mountainside would not support a road to move the heavy equipment, and the air currents at the summit were too hazardous for carrying material by helicopter. Finally, crews erected an aerial tramway spanning the harbor to the top of the mountain.

While some crews worked on the transmitting equipment, others built the receiving facilities: 26 new consolidated schools to replace the old isolated village schools. The buildings, arranged in clusters, resemble native grass-rooted open fales. The single Samoan high school was remodeled and three new ones are being added.

Originally, three television channels beamed 90 lesson programs each week to youngsters in grades 1 to 6; in September 1965 service expanded to three more channels for the high school classes. Technically, the reception has been good. But how is the reception in the minds of the people?

For the children, two years of watching the magic box has scarcely dimmed its fascination. They like their TV teachers, who talk about things the children understand—pigs and canoes and papayas—not unknown quantities like bears and bicycles and skates. Their teachers are learning, too, how to get the most out of this demanding medium—gladly spending evening hours to make sure they are ready for the preparatory and follow-up classroom work.

And for their parents, television has meant an instant widening horizon—even in the developing stages of the adult education program. No longer does the news of the world bypass Samoa: it has been re-routed to the nearby school.

There were those who thought Samoa had been isolated so long it could never catch up. Former director of education J. C. Wright countered, "Whatever we are doing cannot help but be better than what we are replacing." He was right. ETV has refreshed Samoa like a breeze through a fale.

ALASKA'S CENTENNIAL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Alaska is celebrating its 100th birthday this year.

One hundred years ago on March 30, 1867, the treaty providing for the purchase of Alaska from Russia at 2 cents an acre was signed in Washington, D.C., by Secretary of State William H. Seward and Baron Edouard Stoeckel, minister from Russia to the United States.

Just 5 days ago Alaskans renewed their link with the past. For many years at Sitka, which was the Russian capital of Alaska, Alaskans have commemorated what is officially known as Seward's Day.

This year the events were elaborate and very special. Many communities throughout Alaska are preparing to welcome thousands of visitors to help them celebrate this 100th birthday. Sitka's birthday party was crowned by the first day ceremony for the Alaska Purchase Commemorative airmail stamp. Harvey H. Hannah, Deputy General Counsel for the Post Office Department, retold the history of that purchase in a most interesting speech. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

On the same day the Alaska Centennial-Civic Center Building was dedicated

at Sitka, and it was my great honor to make the dedicatory address. I ask unanimous consent that those remarks also be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY HARVEY H. HANNAH, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, AT THE FIRST DAY CEREMONY FOR ALASKA PURCHASE COMMEMORATIVE AIR MAIL STAMP, SITKA, ALASKA, MARCH 30, 1967

It is a pleasure for me to be with you today in Sitka, and to participate in these ceremonies that introduce the Alaska Purchase postage stamp. It is appropriate that these ceremonies take place in Sitka, for it is here that Alaska's recorded history began. It is here that the indigenous cultures of the Eskimo and Indian first met and fused with cultures of the East and West. The birthplace of Alaska's history, Sitka was also its crossroads for over two hundred years.

"North to the Future" is the theme of your Centennial Exposition, which you are celebrating throughout 1967. This is an appropriate theme, for, as one writer has put it—

"The future is a great land; a man cannot go around it in a day; he cannot measure it with a leap; he cannot bind its harvests into a single sheaf. It is wider than the vision, and has no end."

Other Alaskan cities—Anchorage, Ketchikan, Juneau, and Fairbanks—will feature this theme in local exhibits. The Federal Government's exhibits will complement these, and help direct people's attention and thoughts to future development, exploration, and growth.

Sitka, on the other hand, will direct men's thoughts to the past, to the history of this land, to the cultures of the people who settled, survived, and died in search of dreams as numerous as the surrounding hills. This emphasis not only is good—it is essential. For it is only in the remembrances of things past that the present becomes more viable and more meaningful. Just as a man is historian to a people, a city is historian to a State. To the extent that Sitka, as historian to Alaska, records, displays, and preserves the facts and legends of Alaska's history, to that extent will it enrich the cultural legacy to succeeding generations.

History records that when our Government purchased land in the 19th century that immeasurably increased our boundaries, adverse criticism prevailed over complimentary praise for the actions of our statesmen. The Alaska Purchase in 1867 had been preceded by the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and the Gadsden Purchase in 1853. The Louisiana Territory added over 900,000 square miles to our country, and cost $15 million initially and another $8 million before all claims were finally settled in 1925. The Gadsden Purchase added 29,640 square miles and cost $10 million. Out of the Louisiana Purchase thirteen States were carved, and from the Gadsden Purchase we added to what later became New Mexico and Arizona. The Alaska Purchase added 586,000 square miles, cost $7,200,000, and gave us the largest State in the Union. No other purchase, however, precipitated so much vitriolic criticism, nor inflamed so many passions, as the purchase we commemorate here today.

"Seward's Folly" entered into the dictionary of American idiom to commemorate the Secretary of State whose vision prevailed over the myopic view of so many of his countrymen. Newspapers belittled both him and the land he bought, referred to by one Congressman as "a pig in a poke." Debate in the House of Representatives was violent and prolonged, and at one point it appeared that its members might refuse to appropriate the money necessary for its purchase. Congressman Ferris of New York, the home State of Secretary of State William Seward, suggested acidly that the Government pay some nation $7,200,000 to take Alaska off our hands. The United States Senate ratified the purchase treaty by a margin of only one vote.

Once the treaty was signed, however, our Government took a keen interest in what had been purchased. "What was in the poke?" the Secretary of the Treasury wanted to know, and at his request, the Department of the Army of the Alaska Territory took inventory of the property of Sitka, Ft. Kodiak, English Bay, Ft. St. Nicholas. Unalaska, St. Paul's, and George's Islands. One of the things that disturbed the Secretary of the Treasury was a rumor that Prince Maksoutoff, representing the Russian-American Fur Company, was selling warehouses, stores, dwellings, flour mills, and other shops to Sitka residents *after* the United States had purchased the Territory and its physical possessions. The rumor turned out to be true: this is precisely what the Prince had done, collecting from people who wanted to own their homes and shops some $22,500 in gold and silver coin. Some dwellings were sold for a dollar, while others, such as one purchased by Lewis Sloss, sold for as much as $1,500 in coin.

The Commanding Officer's report listed and described every piece of property in Sitka. Accompanying the report was a large map of Sitka, drawn on oil-skin, and signed by representatives of both governments. The scale of the map is in fathoms, each fathom measuring seven feet. Existing buildings are outlined in black ink. Russian Orthodox Church property is colored yellow, private property blue, and Government property red. At issue were some 48 buildings and dwellings which the Prince had sold to the inhabitants of Sitka. Our Government had no doubt that these dwellings and buildings belonged to the United States. At the same time, however, it took no measures to inflict hardship on those individuals who had legitimate claim to their property.

I am informed that a copy of this hundred-year-old oil-skin map, together with a copy of the detailed report of the Commanding Officer, dated February 26, 1869, will be presented to the City of Sitka in May. These are two more important documents of historical importance that belong here, where they originated. As such, they shed additional light on the history of your city and State, and will complement other documents of historical and cultural importance in your possession.

The ceremony transferring Russian America to the United States was dramatic. It had been a rainy, drab October in 1867, but the sun burst through the overcast on the morning of the 18th. At the hour of three, ninety Russian sailors and 180 soldiers from the Siberian regiment that garrisoned Sitka marched to the parade ground and stood at attention before the 90-foot flagstaff that flew the imperial emblem.

Then, to the beat of drums, the Americans came ashore. They were headed by the Commissioner, General Lovell Rousseau, and Commanding Officer, General Jefferson Davis, with 250 troops.

A Russian marched to the flagstaff to lower the Russian flag. It refused to come down. He tugged on the rope the flag wrapped itself more firmly around the staff. It became necessary to rig a bosun's chair and send a man aloft to cut it down. It then fluttered on the bayonets of the soldiers beneath.

So great was the tension that Princess Maksoutoff, wife of the Governor, fainted. But the ceremonies continued. The American flag went up, and the guns of the USS Ossipee and of the Sitka garrison roared in alternate salutes. In deference to the feelings of the Russians, Commissioner Rousseau tried to prevent a demonstration by the Americans. But they gave a resounding "three cheers," standing, as a witness wrote, "on American soil."

Although this was a time of rejoicing for Americans, it was a time of sadness for those Russians who were present. For Sitka, we should remember, was home to many Russians, and through Sitka came thousands of Russians into the Oregon Territory and California. The many Orthodox Churches that exist today in a long thin line from Sitka to San Francisco remind us of how extensive their exploration and settlement of our country was at one time, and of their contribution to our culture.

The history of Alaska, known to you and millions of other Americans, is one of our country's most exciting chapters. This vast and beautiful country has had more than its share of violence. Untold wealth has been taken from its seas, its mountains, its forests, and its soil, and a disproportionate share has been returned. It has given us legends and folk stories that will forever remain a vital part of our country's literature. It nurtured one of America's most enjoyable poets, Robert Service, and one of our country's finest writers, Jack London. It preserved, fortunately, a great deal of the culture of its oldest inhabitants—the Eskimos and Indians. The land assimilated all who came to it, and from this synthesis of people, this blending of diverse cultures, has emerged a people and a state unique in the history of our land.

The Alaska Purchase Centennial stamp which was selected from many entries by the Post Office Department's Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee, bridges a great span in your history. For the format and design look both to Alaska's past and to its future. This commemorative stamp emphasizes what is perhaps the most distinctive visual aspect of Alaska's history—the totem pole. Long before the first Russian and Spanish explorers navigated Alaska's network of waterways, Alaskan Indians had carved, painted, and placed these unique forms of art over the countryside. Totems are to Alaskan Indian culture what painting and music are to the culture of our Western civilization—a form of art through which man attempts to synthesize his spiritual feelings and intellectual aspirations. It is most appropriate that this commemorative stamp features such an important cultural legacy from the past.

The stamp was designed, I would like to point out, by a former resident of Alaska—Mr. Willard R. Cox, a gifted artist now living in California. Mr. Cox based his design on a totem in the Alaska Museum in Juneau.

Your Alaska commemorative stamp also looks to the future. Consider, if you will, the words "United States Air Mail" appearing beside an ancient totem. Once it was the thunderbird that dominated your skies, according to legend, flashing fire and emitting earth-shaking thunder. Today, the thunderbird has been replaced by the airplane. The airplane is your way of life. You board aircraft as casually as we take taxicabs. In fact, I have heard it said, perhaps with some exaggeration, that here in Alaska children learn to fly before they learn to walk. In any case, the airplane is Alaska's traffic artery which unites its people in their collective efforts to develop and settle this rich land.

Sixty million of these attractive stamps have been printed.

Those of you who may not be too familiar with the Department's commemorative postage stamps program might be interested in a brief description of how—and why—new stamps are selected for issuance. Seven words summarize this: "Many stamps are requested; few are chosen." Each year Postmaster General O'Brien receives literally

hundreds upon hundreds of requests that certain new stamps be issued. But we can only issue about fifteen commemorative stamps a year. This means, obviously, that only events of widespread national interest and importance qualify as subjects for commemorative postage stamps. The Alaska Purchase Centennial met these criteria.

In this thorny problem of selecting the fifteen most noteworthy new postage stamps, Postmaster General O'Brien turns to his Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee for assistance. This is a committee of eleven persons who combine their knowledge of art, history, philately, and printing to make their recommendations for the design and subject matter of new stamps. Mr. O'Brien has said that the contributions of this committee have been considerable in improving the design quality of our new stamps.

I hope you will agree with me that their selection for the Alaska Purchase postage stamp was a splendid one.

DEDICATORY ADDRESS: ALASKA CENTENNIAL-CIVIC CENTER BUILDING BY SENATOR E. L. BARTLETT

In gathering here today to dedicate this magnificient Centennial-Civic Center, we, in fact, honor all the men of vision who have well served Alaska and, therefore, the nation.

It is, of course, most fitting that these ceremonies be held on March 30, for on that day, one century ago, in Washington, Secretary of State William H. Seward and Baron Edouard Stoeckel, Russian minister to the United States, signed the treaty providing for the purchase of Alaska. I might add that it is equally fitting, at least as far as this Alaskan is concerned, that we hold this ceremony at 10:00 a.m., rather than carrying tradition to the point of celebrating the moment of signing. You may recall the signing took place at 4 a.m.

The fascinating story which led up to the signing of the treaty is well known, but bears repeating for it is a story of men with the strength of their visions, a story of men who had faith in the potential of the great northwest and in the American civilization, even as today our men of vision have faith in the future of Alaska and the nation. Standing here in this Centennial year, at this benchmark in history, we can look back and see how far we have come, and, because the distance we have come is great, we have a good idea of form if not the exact shape of the exciting road ahead.

While in 1860 Secretary of State Seward could only predict that the Russian outposts along our coast would yet become the outposts of his own country—"monuments of the civilization of the United States"—we can see that indeed Alaska *is* a monument, *is* a testimony to the civilization of the United States. We can also see that these monuments, far from being mere outposts, are bustling growing cities important to and part of the United States. And lifting our eyes from the present to the future, we can see these same monuments growing larger as the resources of Alaska become more important to the nation and to the world.

It does not take a great deal of vision to predict that Alaska's timber industry will grow. The proof of that vision is in the current activity in that industry and in the prediction that world demand for timber will outstrip world supply by the year 2000.

It does not take a great deal of vision to appreciate the value the great stocks of fish off our coasts will have in war on world hunger, both as a source of food and of an additive in the form of fish protein concentrate.

It does not take a great deal of vision to predict the future and importance of oil in Alaska. A quick trip over Cook Inlet and the Kenai Peninsula is the proof of that vision.

It does not take a great deal of vision to predict that the tourist industry will continue to grow. The existence of the Centennial observance and the interest the federal government has taken in the celebration is the proof of that vision.

Perhaps it does take a bit more strength to support a vision of a vast exploitation of our mineral resources, particularly in the far north, but I draw my strength for this vision from two sources—faith in the great resoucefulness of present and future Alaskans and knowledge of activity on the federal level which could give our miners the tools they need to unlock this buried storehouse of treasure.

We are living in a very exciting period in Alaska. The spirit of the pioneer is still with us, still needed as it was a century ago, but while Seward and his contemporaries could speak only of outposts, fish and fur, we can talk also of cities, oil, minerals and tourists.

Men of a century ago could only predict, as Senator Charles Sumner did, that in approving the Alaska purchase the Senate's most important work would be creation of a republican form of government, schools free to all and equal laws, before which every citizen would stand erect in the consciousness of manhood. We can point with pride to our democratic government, to our fine schools, to our growing universities. We have pursued a policy of equal laws for all our people, though we have not yet solved the problem of equal opportunities for all our people. Perhaps this challenge—the challenge to make available all the benefits of our society to all its citizens—is the greatest challenge facing Alaska today, for until we meet that challenge, the promise implied in extending our society to the great northwest will not have been kept and, I might add, the hope of economic development not fully achieved. Also, as we look toward the future we must remember and protect the great heritage nature bestowed on Alaska. In meeting the challenge of economic development we must not let progress mar the rugged beauty from which we Alaskans draw our inspiration.

But for a few minutes, let us look to the past and recall some of the events which led to extending the promise of this nation's way of life to the great northwest.

Seward, to whom this day is dedicated, was a former New York Whig who had been Lincoln's principal opponent for the presidential nomination in 1860. During the Civil War years he capably conducted the efforts of the Lincoln administration to prevent European powers from intervening on the side of the South. Following the war, he succeeded in obtaining the withdrawal of French troops from Mexico, which helped bring about the downfall of the French puppet regime there.

Seward himself "was a very conspicuous prophet of territorial expansion," wrote Frederic Bancroft in his life of the Secretary of State. His lively imagination and enthusiasm, his belief in vast national enterprises, his fondness for optimistic speculation, and his understanding of certain currents and traits of civilization in this hemisphere—all tended to lead him into predictions of the future influence and extent of the United States.

It was rumored that as early as the British-American discussions of the 1840s over the Oregon boundary the Russian Government offered to give Alaska to the United States. Its cession, according to remarks attributed to Robert J. Walker, former United States Senator from Mississippi and Secretary of the Treasury under James K. Polk, would have been dependent upon the United States maintaining the Oregon boundary at 54°40'. This latter latitude was the southernmost limit of Russian Alaska. The boundary, however, was set at 49°.

As early as 1860, Seward had predicted that the United States would one day acquire Alaska.

There were many motives behind the move to purchase Alaska, one of which, strangely enough—or perhaps not so strange in light of recent events—stemmed indirectly from Russia and fish. The purchase of Alaska more or less furthered the purposes of the Monroe Doctrine. Had we not shown an interest in acquiring Alaska, it is possible and even probable that Great Britain would have done so.

While such areas as Alaska, which were already occupied by European powers, were specifically excluded from the provisions of the doctrine, it would not have been in accord with the spirit of that declaration for the United States to witness, with approval, any extension of British control over the North American Continent.

The pretensions of the Russian Government, during the Monroe administration, to exclude all but Russian vessels from the northwest coast of America north of 51 degrees precipitated the original diplomatic controversy out of which the Monroe Doctrine developed. Had this attempt to extend Russian territory southward succeeded, the Russians would have controlled the entire northwestern coast down to the northern tip of Vancouver Island.

So I suppose one could say that while we are most displeased by Russian fishing activities today, we should be thankful for past favors resulting from other unwise activities by Russian fishermen.

What motives did the Russians have for selling Alaska? The answer is, in part, that they sold it to the United States for somewhat the same reason that Napoleon sold the Louisiana Territory—to avoid the possibility that it might fall into the hands of Great Britain.

The Russians did not possess a navy that could have competed on equal terms in war with the British Navy. At the same time, Alaska bordered on the British dominions in Canada. The British Hudson's Bay Company was becoming increasingly active in the northwest fur trade, and was already attempting to penetrate Alaska.

The first intimation of a possible transfer of the territory was made in 1854 at the time of the Crimean War—a war in which Great Britain and Russia found themselves on opposing sides. The Russian American Company, then in control of Alaska, proposed that a "make believe" sale of the territory be made to a San Francisco concern known as the American Russian Commercial Company.

However, an agreement was reached to recognize the neutrality of each other's possession in North America and the plan for a fake sale was not "completed".

The real promoter of the sale of Alaska appears to have been the Grand Duke Constantine, brother of Czar Alexander II. In 1857, some 10 years before the sale actually took place, he wrote a letter to Gorchakov, the Russian Foreign Minister, urging the transfer of the Russian-American possessions to the United States on the grounds that the colonies were of small value to Russia and that the Russian Government needed the money which might be obtained by the sale of Alaska and the contiguous area. Incidentally, had the Grand Duke's proposal been brought to fruition, the United States would also have acquired the Kurile Islands. Russia, pointed out the Grand Duke, had a more legitimate interest in penetrating the Amur River area, to the north and east of Manchuria, than in Alaska.

The first positive American offer for Alaska was made by Senator William M. Gwin, of

California, on behalf of President Buchanan, toward the end of 1859.

The offer was $5 million.

To the Russian minister this seemed a large sum, more than the colonies were then worth or would ever be worth from the point of view of revenue, and probably as much as the United States would ever be willing to give.

Without directly recommending the sale, Minister Stoeckel in his official report indicated a few arguments in its favor. He mentioned the decline in importance of the fur trade, the disadvantages to the Russian Government should it be forced to take over the affairs of the company, the danger that Alaska might be seized by any strong naval power during a war, and the fact that by selling Alaska to the United States the British could be prevented from assuming a dominant position on the Pacific.

Among the documents in the Russian archives is one from an unknown writer, probably the Russian Admiral Popov, dated February 7, 1860. The writer pointed out that it was easy enough for Europeans to scoff at the Monroe Doctrine and "Manifest Destiny," but if they were better acquainted with the Americans they would know how seriously these ideas were taken in the United States. The Americans, it was reported, were all filled with the idea that America was only for Americans. They had taken California and Oregon, and sooner or later they would acquire Alaska. It could not be prevented, and it would be better to yield with good grace and cede the territory to them.

Such was the status of the question on the eve of the Civil War. The growing national crisis following the election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency put an end to further discussions. Senator Gwin, who had been the principal representative of President Buchanan in the negotiations, was a Confederate sympathizer. Buchanan and his policies had been repudiated at the polls. Throughout the Civil War years the United States understandably became too engrossed in its own domestic problems to be interested in the Alaska question.

By 1866 the Russian Government was finally determined to sell Alaska, and the American Government was once more interested in buying it. In December, 1866, the Czar, following a meeting with the Grand Duke and other governmental leaders, authorized Baron Edouard Stoeckel, the Russian Ambassador, to offer the Russian colonies in America to the United States. Stoeckel was instructed not to take less than $5 million. He was given a map upon which the frontiers were traced. Beyond that, everything else was left up to him.

Stoeckel arrived in Washington in March, 1867, and called on Secretary of State Seward, as was customary. Seward requested that the citizens of Washington Territory be granted permission to fish in Alaska waters. Stoeckel replied that his government could not possibly grant it.

Finally, Seward came to the point and inquired whether Russia would sell Alaska to the United States. Stoeckel had gained his object; America had taken the first step in the transaction.

Seward discussed the question with Andrew Johnson, then President, and the Cabinet, and several days later reported that he was authorized to negotiate. During March, 1867, Stoeckel and Seward met several times. Stoeckel refused to consider anything less than $7 million, to which Seward finally agreed. However, the United States would not accede to several Russian stipulations regarding the manner of payment and obligations of the Russian-American Company. The Russians settled for the payment of an additional $200,000. During the night of March 29–30; 100 years ago, the treaty was signed.

Today we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the signing of the treaty. Throughout the year-long centennial celebration, thousands of visitors will come to find out what Alaska is all about, and what they will learn is that this great land was built by men with the strength of their visions and that this land still has and needs men with the strength of their visions.

In this exciting year let each Alaskan rededicate himself to working to make the promises implied in the purchase of the territory come true. If we do, the meaning of this celebration will long outlive the building we dedicate today.

THE ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM IN SALEM, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. George D. Porter, supervisor of adult education of the Salem public schools, Salem, Oreg., on March 3 brought to my attention an article which appeared on the front page of the Capital Journal for Saturday, February 25. The article, which appears under the byline of Mr. Alfred C. Jones, sets forth the program in that county being carried on under the adult basic education authorities provided by the Congress in recent years.

In his letter to me, Mr. Porter said:

Because I assume you receive many criticisms of the way federal money is being spent in Oregon, I direct your attention to the article in the enclosed front page of a recent issue of the Capital Journal. This is an excellent example of the cooperative spirit that exists between a school district, and a federally funded project in which the educational aspects of the project are being left to educators.

We are pleased to be called on to provide education to these adults, and we feel that you in Washington want to know just how that federal money is being used.

It is just such letters as those from Mr. Porter which, in my judgment, enable us as Senators to comprehend the impact of the programs we authorize through legislation. It is for that reason that I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SALEM PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
ADULT EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
Salem, Oreg., March 3, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE LYMAN MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Living in a city that is Republican oriented I hear much criticism of federal money that is being spent on many activities. Most of these criticisms I brush aside because I realize that these folk would rather have the money used on their pet projects.

When it comes to the expenditure of money from the federal level on the local level, I am committed to the idea that the money should be funneled through the State Department of Education and school districts. Such a procedure is currently in effect with the Adult Education Act of 1966 which is contained in the Amendments to the Elementary & Secondary Education Act. In our Adult Education Program we must watch our expenditures closely in order to keep within the meager budget made necessary by the small amount of money available to us from the federal level.

Because I assume you receive many criticisms of the way federal money is being spent in Oregon, I direct your attention to the article in the enclosed front page of a recent issue of the Capital Journal. This is an excellent example of the cooperative spirit that exists between a school district, and a federally funded project in which the educational aspects of the project are being left to educators.

We are pleased to be called on to provide education to these adults, and we feel that you in Washington want to know just how that federal money is being used.

I believe sincerely that education is the solution to most problems facing us today, and I would hope that you on the Washington scene will look favorably upon any appropriations of money for adult education activities as they are presented in the Congress of the United States in the coming months.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. PORTER,
Supervisor of Adult Education.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, Feb. 25, 1967]

TITLE V PROGRAM AN EDUCATIONAL BOOTSTRAP

(By Alfred C. Jones)

"Jack" may not know what Title 5 stands for. But he knows what good it's doing for his family's hopes and dreams.

He's a young driver of logging trucks, who works only a few months during a year, whose education ended in junior high, whose chances of rising above his present level seemed slim.

"Jack" was referred by the Marion County Welfare Department Feb. 2 to the Title 5 program administered by the Salem School District's Adult Education Division.

He is one of 41 who "appreciate" being able to prepare to take the tests of General Education Development (GED) that is the accepted equivalent of a high school diploma.

They meet five hours a day, five days a week, in the basement of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, some still struggling to be able to concentrate for more than a few minutes, but all are serious about the opportunity.

The GED preparation is one of several sides of the Title 5 program of the Economic Opportunity Act.

"Jack," starting at the eighth-grade level, was nervous about returning to books after so long a time, but he ventured into spelling, vocabulary, reading, English and mathematics.

With understanding teachers, Mrs. David Lockard and Mrs. John Varley, and sympathetic boost from 40 others strongly motivated, "Jack" by now is working at a 12th grade level.

"It's helped me a lot," he said, "I'm learning to understand what I read, too, and I find I'm able to learn math. What I would like to do is to learn a trade, like drafting."

His wife, also, is making a new start in reading materials he brings home and has started reading newspapers and taking a new interest in life, he said with a smile.

Two other phases of the Title 5 program of the Economic Opportunity Act are being conducted under the Salem District's guidance. One is the adult basic education course (31 in two classes meeting by day in St. Paul's Episcopal Church basement) and 36 in a special typing class of women who meet six hours a week at South Salem High School in the evening to learn office procedures and shorthand.

Title 5 is a year-around program. Persons referred by the welfare department can

enter at their own level of ability, receive individual attention and progress to the point of being able to pass civil service examinations.

"We find that a large percentage are in need of basic education or high school equivalency preparation," said Floris C. Berland, project specialist.

"We have marvelous teachers and this is important for people at this time in their lives. There is a mountain of problems behind each one of our students," Mrs. Berland said.

Title 5 classes are an adjunct of the welfare department. They provide, in addition to welfare grants, tuition, books, a training allowance of about $12 a month, transportation money of about $10 a month, baby sitting money as required, eye glasses if needed, cosmetic dentistry for those whose teeth spoil their appearance for employment, and one purchase of clothing to make them more employable.

As their self-image and self-respect rise with achievement and with association with teachers and other students, they are motivated to keep themselves presentable, Mrs. Berland said.

"We are fortunate to have George Porter and the Salem School District already here, for we feel education should be handled by educators."

Students of post-high school ages come from Woodburn, Scotts Mills, Stayton, Mill City, St. Paul and other areas, most of them "anxious to be independent."

Porter told about one of the students stopping him in the hall at St. Paul's and exclaiming, "Guess what! I passed my GED test!"

"Think what is happening," Porter said, "when one person is able to get off welfare and make his own way in the world, to improve and achieve."

"The seed is sown so that they will never be the same," added Mrs. Berland.

These students gain self-assurance "in a short time," said Mrs. David Lockard, teacher in the GED class. They have lacked skills and been unable to continue school, so they are pleased to learn they can do the class work and that "the door really is open," she said.

About 145 different persons have begun classes in the past year, Porter said, including 45 last summer in special classes. These are in addition to 959 tuition students in the district's regular adult education division night classes.

REPORT ON THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, with quiet pride and little fanfare, the Peace Corps recently observed its fifth anniversary. It has been my privilege to know and work with its Director, Jack Vaughn, and to talk and visit with many volunteers in several Latin American nations.

Perhaps the most valuable aspect of the Peace Corps approach is its contributions to communication and community development. Volunteers, like few Americans before them, have been able to immerse themselves in other cultures, to speak the language, and to develop a genuine rapport with their hosts. In so doing, they are in a position to encourage and help with community improvements on a cooperative basis.

A recent editorial published in the New York Times rightly paid tribute to this fine organization. I ask unanimous consent that this well-deserved comment be printed in the RECORD.

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

REPORT ON THE PEACE CORPS

In the case of the Peace Corps, familiarity has bred the sort of public indifference that goes with the acceptance of an established institution. The corps' fifth annual report was submitted to Congress by President Johnson recently with almost no general attention.

Imaginative ideas are rare in any age. This one was first put forward by Senator John F. Kennedy a few weeks after he won the Democratic Party nomination in 1960. The Peace Corps began operating the following June when he was President. By now, more than 20,000 Americans have served; and over 7,000 have completed overseas tours.

The Peace Corps attracts unusual young men and women who enjoy the unique experience of immersing themselves for two years or more in an alien culture. The basic service they perform in underdeveloped regions is "to help people of these countries meet their needs for trained manpower." In a world where the United States is not generally popular, partly because of Vietnam and partly because its immense wealth and power arouse suspicions of "imperialist" designs, the Peace Corps workers are the best kind of diplomats.

They are in no sense a brainwashed outfit. Last month, hundreds of former members asked Mr. Johnson to stop the bombing of North Vietnam.

As the annual report just issued points out, the biggest contribution in the Peace Corps comes from educated middle- and upper-class citizens. They help the United States by doing practical, useful, unselfish and much-needed work in uncomfortable circumstances and for very little pay.

It was an act of faith to believe that thousands of young Americans would be willing to volunteer. With a sixth anniversary approaching, the Peace Corps deserves attention and applause, and what is more important, money and support.

REMOLDING THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, is the post office purely a public service which should be operated for the benefit of the users of the mails without regard to costs? Or is it a business which must be operated under the iron law of the balance sheet?

It is apparent to me that the answer lies somewhere between these two extremes. While it is true that our present postal structure is a combination of these two approaches, it seems that the marriage has produced an offspring incorporating the worst characteristics of both principles.

Because it is sometimes viewed as a business—a business which constantly operates at a loss—the postal service often has been starved for the funds it needs to make capital expenditures on its deteriorating physical plant. And because it is also looked on as a public service, postal rates for the various classes of mail have grown increasingly inequitable.

The blame for this unhappy situation does not lie entirely with either the executive branch, which runs the postal service, or the legislative branch, which controls the purse strings and generally oversees postal operations. Both must share the blame. And both should be willing to seize the opportunity presented by Postmaster General O'Brien and President Johnson for remolding the postal service in a form better suited to make the most of its dual nature.

In the final analysis, Postmaster General O'Brien's proposal may prove to be only a jumping-off point—only a launching pad for changes which will be quite different from the revisions he has outlined. I am not ready to endorse the specifics of the Postmaster General's blueprint, nor will I reject them out of hand.

But I will keep an open mind on the subject. I will follow with interest the debate which I sincerely hope his proposal stimulates. And I will take an active part in that debate.

By his bold proposal, the Postmaster General once again has demonstrated his eminent leadership qualities. I congratulate him for opening a new avenue of thinking about our postal problems.

ALLIS-CHALMERS MANUFACTURING CO., A LEADER IN FUEL CELL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Wisconsin is very fortunate in being the home of Allis-Chalmers, a corporation well known to you and to the rest of the country.

The year 1966 recorded a record total sales for the company of over $857 million—a 20-percent increase over the 1965 record.

The company's sales have increased a remarkable 57 percent in the last 3 years. I doubt whether many other companies in the Nation can boast of such a record.

Increases in sales are meaningless unless one considers that their net earnings also increased commensurately by 18 percent over the 1965 total—another new high.

Mr. R. S. Stevenson, the chairman and chief executive officer, and Mr. W. G. Scholl, president and chief operating officer, have led Allis-Chalmers to a position of leadership in the economic fabric of the country and the world.

Their efforts have moved the company forward in the fields of farm and light industrial equipment, the electric utilities market, earthmoving, mining equipment, material handling equipment, motors, pumps, and many others.

Wisconsin is proud of Allis-Chalmers.

Now I have been informed that the company is a leader in the development of fuel cells. These are necessary to the future use of manned and unmanned spacecraft.

Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine of January 23, 1967, has published an article entitled "Allis-Chalmers Pushes Fuel Cell Efforts." Although it is not written for the average layman, I believe it is worthy of being printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

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

ALLIS-CHALMERS PUSHES FUEL CELL EFFORTS

(By Roderick D. Hibben)

MILWAUKEE, WIS.—Both Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration

are pushing here for the advancement of fuel-cell technology for the next generation of manned and unmanned spacecraft. Feeling of both is that although neither post-Apollo or manned orbiting laboratory missions have been sufficiently detailed, achieving certain technological goals now is desirable.

Added to this, the fuel cell as a source of auxiliary space power for certain short-duration missions could become a key pacing item for any future programs planned.

Charged with implementing technological goals set by NASA and the Air Force is Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co., a leading fuel-cell developer. The company also is making fuel cells for the Navy and Army.

Allis-Chalmers on Feb. 1 expects to deliver an advanced liquid-cooled hydrogen-oxygen four-fuel-cell unit to the USAF Aero Propulsion Laboratory. The four-cell unit will be the forerunner of the first full-size breadboard cell, a 28-cell stack, including controls, which develops 2.5 kw. The cell is scheduled to be delivered May 1, 1967. The power density of the 2.5-kw. unit will be about 1,100 w.-hr./lb. or more than 30% higher than existing fuel cells. The power density figure includes weight of the fuel-cell reactants, but without reactant tankage. The 1,100 w.-hr./lb. power density figure compares with about 300 w.-hr./lb. achieved three years ago.

Although each type of fuel cell is cooled differently, individual cells for both Air Force and NASA fuel cells being developed by Allis-Chalmers are electrochemically the same. In these cells, individual cells are called capillary or trapped electrolyte cells. In the Bacon cell used by Pratt & Whitney in the Apollo fuel cell, the electrolyte is free.

The General Electric Gemini fuel cell used a solid electrolyte.

The work by Allis-Chalmers for USAF Aero Propulsion Laboratory is on radiation- and liquid-cooled fuel cells.

The fuel cell under development for NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center is gas-cooled.

The radiation-cooled fuel cell is a 200-w. unit developed for the Air Force under a $598,968 contract for use on unmanned spacecraft. Five units are being delivered. The 200-w. hydrogen-oxygen fuel cell was tested for zero-gravity operation and a static system for removal of the cell's by-product, water, worked during a Titan 3C flight launched Nov. 3 (AW&ST Nov. 14, 1966, p. 30).

The cell performed successfully, providing power to a dummy load for five and a half days in zero-g, according to the Air Force.

In addition, the automatic thermal control system on the cell maintained it at a constant 200F temperature despite thermal cycling caused by the earth's dark-light side. During the flight the cell was started and stopped four times by ground tracking station commands. The procedure was to take the cell off load for about 3 min., then turn it back on the load.

Allis-Chalmers is developing the 2.5-kw. advanced liquid-cooled fuel cell for the USAF Aero Propulsion Laboratory under a three-year contract begun last July and intially funded at $900,000. One 2.5-kw. module is to be delivered at the end of each year, the first late next year.

WORK SPONSORS

The company's work for NASA is sponsored by both the Marshall Space Flight Center and the Manned Spacecraft Center. Marshall is funding two contracts to advance fuel-cell technology under a cumulative $1,050,000 contract awarded last year. One contract calls for improving heat control and moisture removal techniques. Better reliability, performance and compatibility of the fuel cell with space systems associated with the more severe lunar environment will also be a part of the first contract. The second Marshall contract is for testing of an eight-stack fuel cell to determine its operating characteristics. A full-size hydrogen-oxygen, capillary matrix fuel cell producing 2 kw. will be run as part of this effort to see whether accurate reliability predictions can be made.

The Manned Spacecraft Center will sponsor a follow-on program to Allis-Chalmers 2-kw. gas-cooled fuel cell. The program will increase its lifetime to 2,500 hr. and add to system reliability. Power density will remain at the 800-w./hr./lb. figure of the earlier prototype, which attained a 1,100-hr. lifetime, during which an Apollo flight load profile was conducted with the unit. Cumulative contracts with NASA are about $5 million, with $4 million more expected during the next year.

A 30-POUND FUEL CELL

The radiation-cooled fuel cell developed for unmanned satellites for the Air Force by Allis-Chalmers weighs 30 lbs. Design requirement was simplicity. This is achieved by eliminating an external radiator, blowers and fans. Each fuel-cell module is self-sufficient, requiring no auxiliary subsystems other than the reactants supply. Concept of one basic 200-w. module makes it possible to combine the cell in different building-block configurations for specific power and reliability needs.

Feature of the cell that permits elimination of an external radiator, blowers and fans is the use of a variable emittance thermal control system. With the system, the temperature of the cell is regulated by varying the emittance of the module.

The cell is constructed so that low-emittance outer louvers cover completely high-emittance surfaces of the fuel cell. During use in orbit, the louvers open and close like venetian blinds, changing the radiant heat transfer from the module. The louvers are operated by thermal actuator. As the temperature of the module increases, the louvers expose more and more of the high-emittance inner surface. When the temperature falls, the louvers close, reducing the amount of surface exposed and conserving heat generated within the module to maintain the desired operating temperature range of 190F to 220F.

The variable emittance technique of thermal control is designed to reduce parasitic power consumption needed for control functions. Under low-power output conditions or during fuel-cell startup, some parasitic power is required to maintain operating temperatures. Module electrical controls use less than 3-w. power, according to Allis-Chalmers.

The capillary fuel cell consists of nine elements. The outside water removal plate is followed by a support plaque, water transport matrix, support plaque, hydrogen plate and electrode, electrolyte matrix, and an oxygen electrode and plate.

The hydrogen anode of the cell contains a platinum catalyst, while the oxygen cathode uses a silver one. The water removal plate, the oxygen and hydrogen plate are gold and nickel-plated magnesium. The water and electrolyte matrix use asbestos, while all support plaques are nickel.

MAGNESIUM PLATES

Each fuel cell employs a porous cathode and anode separated by an asbestos capillary matrix impregnated with potassium hydroxide electrolyte. The magnesium plates serve as support electrodes and matrix.

They distribute reactant gases and remove water vapor. They also are conducting paths for electrical and thermal energy produced.

During cell operation, reactant gases are fed to the cell cavity as power is produced. Periodic purging removes any build-up of inert gases. Interval, duration and rate of purging depend on the purity of the gases and on the amp.-hr. output, according to Allis-Chalmers.

Another important feature of the Allis-Chalmers capillary fuel cell is its static system for removal of the cell's by-product, water. This system permits water produced by the electro-chemical combination of hydrogen and oxygen to vent directly from the module as vapor. An asbestos capillary water transport matrix in the system is positioned between the hydrogen-supply cavity and the water removal cavity supported on both sides by porous nickel plaques.

POTASSIUM HYDROXIDE

Potassium hydroxide in the water transport matrix is maintained at a higher concentration and lower vapor pressure than the potassium hydroxide electrolyte in the cell matrix. The consequence is that water formed by the fuel-cell reaction dilutes the electrolyte in the cell matrix, causing an increase in vapor pressure of the electrolyte in the pores of the hydrogen electrode.

The resulting difference in pressure between the cell-matrix electrolyte and water-transport matrix causes excess water to travel by diffusion through the hydrogen gas to the water transport matrix. Here, water condenses and diffuses in a liquid state through the potassium hydroxide-filled cavity to the outer surface facing the water removal cavity. It then vaporizes because of low pressure maintained in the cavity and is vented from the module as superheated vapor. Approximately 40% of the waste heat of reaction also is carried away.

Vapor pressure in the water-removal cavity is automatically controlled by a temperature-compensated vacuum regulator designed to vent water vapor to space whenever pressure increases beyond the desired setting. It automatically maintains the preset electrolyte concentration from 190F to 220F, the cell operating temperature range.

The 30-lb., 200-w. Allis-Chalmers radiation-cooled fuel cell is 15¾ in. high and 7 x 7 in. in cross-section. The 28 cells in each module combine to operate between 22 v. and 30 v. Redundancy in the fuel cell in the event one individual cell fails is accomplished by series-parallel electrical connections. In this type of connection two individual cells are hooked up in parallel. The two cells in turn are then connected in series, with another two cells also connected in parallel.

Hydrogen-fuel consumption rates for the fuel cell are typically about 0.1 lb./kw. hr. and 0.8 lb./kw. hr. of oxygen.

This would be for a 500-600 w. hr./lb. unit.

In matching the auxiliary space power system to specific missions, several considerations are necessary. First thing is generating a mission profile depicting power consumption versus mission time. In the 30-day to possibly 90-day mission time envisioned for the fuel cell, representative curves usually show large spikes or peak power periods lasting for short periods, with relatively medium constant power drains between the peaks.

Average power consumption on a representative mission is usually about one-half peak power onboard.

For these reasons a modular fuel-cell arrangement in which one set of fuel cells takes care of the spikes or high power level consumption periods is favored chiefly for its inherent reliability.

FUEL CELLS STUDIED FOR SPACE RESCUES

Fuel cells and the related technology are being studied by Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co. for possible use in space-rescue missions and in long-duration environmental control systems. For the latter, the company is looking at an electrolysis unit called a Bosch reactor for NASA's Langley Research Center.

The unit would convert carbon dioxide and hydrogen to water and carbon for four men in a spacecraft cabin for more than a one-year mission. According to Allis-Chalmers, hydrogen peroxide and hydrazine appear promising for use in possible future space-rescue missions requiring power, mainly because these fuels can be stored easily for long periods without the evaporative losses inherent in cryogenic-fueled cells.

Hydrazine fuel cells also are being built here for land use for the Army. The cell is a 600-w. unit weighing 60 lb., including a 12-hr. fuel supply. A 7.2-hr. fuel charge operates the cell for an additional 12 hr. The Army is interested in using the cell to run communications equipment in remote areas.

In its study of other types of fuel cells, Allis-Chalmers has dropped many cells which once appeared promising. In general, hybrid fuel cells with either electrical, radiative or thermally regenerative schemes have been discarded by the company because of the formidable technical problems involved.

In a recent study prepared for the Air Force by Aerospace Corp., it was concluded that for long-duration, manned-space missions at the 2-10-kw. power level, fuel cells are too heavy and require excessive resupply costs. It was decided that a radioisotope source coupled to rotating machinery using the Brayton cycle would best suit this kind of mission and power level.

PROGRESS IN POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in passing the Federal Water Pollution Control Act several years ago, and in subsequent improvements in that program, Congress has repeatedly emphasized the need for a cooperative local, State, and Federal approach.

Evidence that this type of coordinated effort can be effective is presented in an editorial entitled, "A Milestone in City's River Cleanup," which appeared in the Kansas City Times of March 18, 1967.

As reported in the editorial, once the needs were made known, the citizens of Kansas City responded in a manner that is everlastingly to their credit. Their $75 million investment in remedial treatment facilities ranks as the highest made to date by any city, and will be exceeded only by the citizens of the St. Louis Metropolitan Sewer District, who are proceeding in an equally commendable local-State-Federal program to the extent of $95 million.

Fifty miles to the north of Kansas City, the city of St. Joseph is making similar progress in its program working toward a cleaner Missouri River. The people of our State are proud of the record we are making in cleaning up our waters.

In recognition of this progress, unequaled so far as we know, and as a notable example of the effectiveness of the local-State-Federal water pollution control program, 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:

A MILESTONE IN CITY'S RIVER CLEANUP

Kansas City's days of abusing its greatest single natural resource, the Missouri river, are swiftly drawing to a close. Within a month, dumping of raw sewage into the valuable stream that flows past the city's front door will virtually cease. The start of operations of the sewage treatment system so resoundingly approved by the voters in 1960 will restore to the waters of the Big Muddy a degree of cleanliness not known for decades.

The Northeast pumping station south of the river and the Buckeye station on the north bank will send collected wastes to the treatment plant near the Blue river mouth for disposal, with the sludge residue ultimately being burned. The two stations, given final inspection last week by city, state and federal officials, form with the Blue river plant the key units of a system that now has cost 40 million dollars.

The primary treatment now to be provided removes all solid wastes and 35 per cent of the total pollution, the remainder being in solution. Secondary treatment to take care of these remaining wastes is an expensive second phase still down the road a way.

A historic artery of travel and commerce in the 19th century, the Missouri river in this century has become a priceless source of water supply, ample far beyond the area's foreseeable needs. This at a time when the rapid growth of water demand is posing acute problems for many of the nation's other cities. Yet it took firm federal government pressure to crystallize the idea that continuing contamination of such a resource was a senseless act and unfair to downstream neighbors, as well.

Once the full story was told at public hearings, the citizens faced their responsibility by approving a 75-million-dollar general obligation bond issue to clean up the river by a 4½-to-1 margin. The citizens are now and will continue for a long time paying out those bonds through service charges on their water bills.

When that day comes the Big Muddy will not suddenly become a pure, blue stream. It never was. But the millions of valley residents who rely on its water supply will know that Kansas City has done its part to protect this vital boon of bountiful water.

R. VEAL & SON—A TYPICAL SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a great many businesses in this country began as small family ventures. The family reputation for quality and reliable workmanship has enabled many of these firms to grow and flourish from one generation to another.

Many successful American family enterprises prospered because they had a regular local clientele. They were never known nationally but, nonetheless, were solid business enterprises.

Today, small businesses face more competition than ever before. New products which are nationally advertised are making continual inroads into older established markets. Improved production methods, better marketing and the need for export markets, are forcing many old-line family enterprises into reviewing their operations. R. Veal & Son, a small furniture manufacturer of Albany, Oreg., exemplifies this type of operation.

This small business was established in Oregon's Willamette Valley in 1865. Its first product was rawhide chairs which were often found in many pioneer homes in Oregon and throughout the West.

The Veal family has been operating this business since 1885, first at its original location in Stayton, and since 1888 at its present location in Albany where the business relocated for better transportation facilities.

This family company has gradually expanded from a small enterprise, until it now produces a full furniture line.

The Veals have always been very proud of its high standards. Skilled craftsmen were challenged to uphold the tradition of superior workmanship, and their distinctive early American design.

In 1962, the present proprietor, Clarence R. Veal, fearful that his system of operation might be antiquated and less efficient than that of his competitors, called the Portland office of the Small Business Administration to assist him in appraising his overall business situation.

The SBA appraiser, after reviewing the company's methods of production, informed Mr. Veal that the company had, indeed, neglected to make the necessary improvements in plant operation and had failed to upgrade machinery in order to produce at maximum efficiency.

SBA specialists suggested to Mr. Veal that he could preserve the old skills and fine workmanship and yet make use of modern laborsaving devices that would reduce costs and increase production. An SBA loan of $140,000 enabled the firm to put SBA's recommendations into operation.

The increased efficiency resulted in increased production. The company was now able to maintain adequate stocks of finished products and fill orders without undue delay.

With production increased, the proprietor began to feel the need for expanded markets. Once again Mr. Veal sought SBA assistance. He had read about SBA's Service Corps of Retired Executives, known as SCORE, and how these advisers had helped many another small firm by offering them professional guidance.

Expert management advisory services are not available in the small town of Albany, where the Veal firm is located. But Mr. Veal was convinced that by utilizing the services of a retired, experienced businessman, selected by SBA, he might be able to learn how to improve his marketing procedures.

The SCORE adviser SBA selected was Charles E. Snell, a former general merchandise manager for Meier & Frank Co., Portland. Mr. Snell had 40 years of experience in the field of retailing furniture and was well qualified for this assignment.

He was only too happy to put his experience and talents to use in helping this small firm. He was well acquainted with the Veal company's early product. His grandmother had several Veal rawhide chairs in her home.

Mr. Snell helped Mr. Veal to analyze his firm's break-even point, and showed him that to make a satisfactory return on the investments, sales would have to be increased 20 percent.

Taking Mr. Snell's advice, Mr. Veal now makes his product known at the furniture market meeting in San Francisco. The company's sales force was

revitalized and regular meetings were scheduled. The company was encouraged to bid on Government contracts, to expand into fields of commercial furniture and to consider sales to the motel and hotel market.

The firm was encouraged to study the possibility of locating export markets. It employed an export manager who is making the company's products known in Canada, South America, and the South Pacific.

The company is currently studying the furniture requirements of foreign markets, and what type of furniture will endure under various climatic conditions.

Veal & Son had expanded too rapidly for personal supervision. It had 85 employees and its plant covered 5 acres of land. Mr. Snell was able to show the proprietor how a modern factory manager could keep close control over all phases of the operation, and at the same time delegate authority to qualified assistants. As a result, Mr. Veal now spends little time with minor details, and devotes his talents to top level supervision.

As a result of the changes suggested by SBA's SCORE adviser, Veal & Son is now enjoying increased sales—and is looking forward to greater sales in the future.

Just recently, Mr. Veal discovered that with the installation of new machinery, more power would be needed. Again SBA provided guidance. An SBA specialist suggested the installation of an auxiliary gas-fired boiler firebox. This was done, and fuel costs dropped one-third of their previous cost.

Clarence R. Veal expressed his thanks in a letter to Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, dated February 21, 1967. Mr. Veal said, in part:

I do want to express our thanks for the SCORE program of the Portland Regional Office, and to its coordinator . . .

In spite of a difficult market situation in the area we serve, we were able to increase our 1966 sales and shipments 6 percent over 1965. We believe this was made possible by the merchandising program set up with the advice and under the supervision of Mr. Charles Snell. Mr. Snell, whose fine reputation is well known throughout the furniture industry, was made available to us through SCORE program. Under his direction we were able to get up a low cost "result getting" advertising program that was the key to our merchandising plan.

We also want to express our appreciation of the other help we have received from SBA through their lending office and its fine staff.

Mr. President, the story of this small family owned and operated furniture factory in a small Oregon town, and the assistance that SBA provided, is not unique. I know that in the State of Oregon many similar examples can be provided. SBA has helped more than 900 small Oregon firms with long-term loans aggregating nearly $50 million. The impact of this program is readily apparent.

In Oregon, through its SCORE program, SBA has assisted 150 firms by providing them with expert retired businessmen as counselors.

Nationally, SBA's impact becomes truly impressive. Some 70,000 small firms have received loans aggregating more than $3 billion.

Over 75 percent of the number of these loans—and about 75 percent of the total dollar value of these loans—has been made in the period beginning with 1960.

President Johnson is firmly committed to the proposition that small business must be kept strong and flourishing. He has urged that small business be made one of the biggest growth industries in the Nation.

Under the direction of SBA Administrator Bernard L. Boutin, this is what SBA is undertaking to do. Mr. Boutin is not looking to the past but to the future. He knows that in recent years small business has been losing ground to big business through corporate mergers. The need for managerial and technical aid in small firms is also increasing.

Administrator Boutin has said that:

For a healthy economy it is necessary that the small business sector grow at least porportionately and if possible at a greater rate than the average growth for all sectors of the economy combined.

I concur in this, and I congratulate the Small Business Administration for its constructive and forward looking programs.

The help that SBA has been able to provide for this small Oregon firm is not unique. It is part of President Johnson's determined efforts to assist small business at all levels and in all parts of the country.

President Johnson knows well that virtually all businesses were at one time small. They have grown and prospered because their owners had determination and ability, but also, because in America the Government has been concerned to see that small business is not crushed and driven to the wall by the giants of industry.

As President Johnson has said, it is part of the American dream that a man can own and build his own business. Most Americans, I think, want to be their own boss.

President Johnson wants to keep this American dream alive. He has given the Small Business Administration authority to help small businesses with loans, technical and managerial assistance, and with help in selling their products and services to the Government.

In America there are today thousands of small firms similar to this small firm in Oregon of which I have been speaking. These firms are prospering and have a bright future.

This is indeed a tribute to the effectiveness of the Johnson administration's programs. The Small Business Administration deserves the support of all Americans.

MENTAL HEALTH AND THE COMMUNITY

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, one of the most vital and difficult problems facing our States and our Nation is that of providing first-class care for our mentally ill. The people of northern Virginia have been in the forefront of the effort in my State to provide better institutions and better programs for mental health. In this fine tradition the Alexandria Mental Hygiene Clinic, the Alexandria Bar Association, the Alexandria Clergy Association, the Alexandria City Public Schools and the Alexandria Medical Society are sponsoring a series of symposiums on "Mental Health and the Community." The third of the symposiums, on Wednesday, March 22, 1967, was held at the T. C. Williams High School in Alexandria and was addressed by the Honorable Otto Kerner, Governor of Illinois, a leader in the development of progressive State mental health programs. Governor Kerner was introduced by the Honorable Mills E. Godwin, the distinguished Governor of my State. I ask unanimous consent that the speeches of these distinguished Governors be printed in the RECORD.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GOV. OTTO KERNER, OF ILLINOIS, BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, OF VIRGINIA

It is always a pleasure to come to Northern Virginia and I am particularly glad to be back at the T. C. Williams High School, where just two weeks ago we held the final regional education conference in a series of eight across the State of Virginia.

At that time, as some of you who were in the audience may recall, I paid tribute to the leadership of Northern Virginians in providing a first-rate education for the young people of this area.

Tonight I would say that no less is true of your efforts in the realm of providing mental health facilities for your citizens.

As you have in so many areas, in this area you again hold up an example for other regions across our State. It is significant and typical that as splendid as have been your efforts in this regard, you do not find them pleasing enough to cause you to slow your momentum.

This Symposium which you are holding under the auspices of leading organizations in this area is ringing testimony to your dissatisfaction with the status quo and to your desire to make available to your people the most modern scientific instruments and techniques available in the mental health field.

It gives me great pleasure to present your speaker for the evening. The excellent mental health program in effect in Illinois today is testimony to his continuing concern and interest.

Governor Kerner has distinguished himself as a soldier and as a statesman, governing one of the most populous states in our Union.

I have been impressed with his career of public service, and particularly with his record as governor since 1961, and I am sure that after this evening, you will share my great admiration

---

REMARKS OF GOV. OTTO KERNER, OF ILLINOIS

It was very generous of Doctor Shankman to invite me to join you in this series on "Mental Health and the Community." As many of you are aware, this particular topic has been one of prime interest to me for many years.

I speak tonight as a citizen and governor who wants to contribute what he can, where he can, in behalf of mental health.

"Mental health," in a general way, describes programs designed to help a host of human beings in trouble—the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, those addicted to alcohol and drugs.

In recent years, advancements in mental health have given us hope for even more progress in the future. The most significant advance to date is that the public appears to be aware of the problems and is ready to support attempts to solve them.

Today, due in large part to nationwide efforts of mental health associations and others, the public knows that:

—mental illness is a sickness;

—the mentally ill can be helped;

—some mental retardation can be prevented;

—the mentally retarded, like the mentally ill, can be helped.

I am certain the public now appreciates the basic problems, and expects its leaders to accelerate efforts to solve them.

Speaking of problems—and, at the outset, I want to declare my enthusiasm and wholehearted support for the Illinois mental health program under the direction of Dr. Harold M. Visotsky—we, like you in Virginia, do face problems.

When inviting me, Dr. Shankman said he would be pleased if I would give a talk similar to the one that I made for a session of the National Conference on Community Mental Health Programs held in Chicago in December 1965. This will give me an opportunity to re-state some of my own philosophy, our state's community mental health concept—and, hopefully, our commitment.

I will give you the point of view of the Governor of a state that is working hard to improve its community mental health programs. Much of my material will relate to matters of methods and procedures. However, I wish also to discuss something at least as important as technique—the matter of commitment to this cause for which we are gathered.

We must continue to expand our efforts in behalf of improving mental health programs. Such commitment is needed. Regardless of our progress to date, we still have much to do. We must be prepared to undertake and maintain hard and long-term efforts.

I would like to relate some of our experiences in Illinois—to point out some issues we face, and some possible answers.

In the 1950s, Illinois began to seek new answers to two old problems—the geographically isolated and physically neglected state institutions. A $150,000,000 building bond issue was proposed.

In 1958, the proposal failed by a slim margin. In 1960, the bond issue proposal met with overwhelming voter approval. To provide something more lasting than just the traditional material improvements, Illinois now sought to utilize the bond issue funds within a new treatment philosophy characterized, in part, by early detection and intensive treatment of mental illness in the home community.

The central figure in early developments was Dr. Francis Gerty, my first cabinet appointment. Both of us came to Springfield in January of 1961, two months after the bond issue passed.

As a start, the state was divided into eight zones with regional planning areas that could concentrate on local and specific community needs. The zones would be the same for all Illinois agencies with programs in health, education and welfare.

In six of the zones, comprehensive state mental health centers costing $50,000,000 were planned. These centers were to become the administrative bases for decentralized state mental health services. Each zone director would be essentially a director of mental health for his area. And each zone director would plan and coordinate a comprehensive mental health program utilizing both governmental and community resources. The centers, in addition to their own inpatient and out-patient services, would be the crucial link between the community and state mental hospitals.

Before retiring in 1962, Dr. Gerty recommended a successor with vision and ability. He is our current director of mental health, Dr. Visotsky, who had some ideas of his own.

Dr. Visotsky wanted to initiate concepts and experience relating to the prevention and rehabilitation of the mentally ill in the community as well as in special treatment facilities.

He also was concerned with programs of "intervention"—efforts to reach and help disturbed people at the point of crisis and before actual breakdown. In addition, state hospitals would become community centered as rapidly as possible, coordinated with the zone centers. They would have their own programs of out-patient treatment and prevention and intervention.

And all of this would be integrated with locally owned and operated facilities—local clinics, local day-centers for the retarded, local psychiatric units of general hospitals and local comprehensive treatment centers. We would work at the local level with programs allied to mental health problems—poverty and public aid programs; regional offices of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services and the state educational system, and local associations for mental health and mentally retarded.

Today, our zone programs are in operation. Our first zone center—the Charles F. Read Zone Center in Chicago—was opened in July 1960. During the last year, three additional zone centers were completed. They are located at Rockford, Decatur, and another to serve the vast Chicago area. Construction of the remaining zone centers—at Springfield, Champaign, and Peoria will be completed in a few months.

Within the last three years, three new facilities for the mentally retarded—those at Dwight, Centralia and Harrisburg—have been placed in full operation.

Lest you think we have abandoned our traditional mental hospitals—where we are treating some 28,300 patients in addition to some 9,800 residents in our state schools and centers for the mentally retarded—I assure you that we are not.

For example, during the last three years, construction has been completed on bond issue projects amounting to $95,000,000, in addition to zone center construction.

These include more than 75 new buildings at older facilities. Also, during the last few years Illinois launched modernization and repair projects at older mental health institutions totaling more than $20 million.

This spring, additions to institutions and rehabilitation projects will be started. Some $38 million has been designated for this work.

There also is an immediate need for the construction of new facilities for the mentally retarded.

In the last three years, 1,200 beds have been added through three new facilities, and another 800 institution beds have been made available through community placement programs. Despite this, state facilities for the retarded today are filled and more than 2,300 mentally retarded persons are on the waiting lists.

New buildings do not guarantee effective treatment. In my visits to institutions, I am constantly and pleasantly amazed at the developments in dynamic treatment programs.

In Illinois for several years we have had during Mental Health Week a Governor's Mental Health Luncheon. One of the highlights of this annual affair, for me, is the privilege I have in presenting the Francis J. Gerty Awards for "team emphasis" projects, services and programs in the facilities of the Illinois Department of Mental Health. Yesterday I was informed by Dr. Visotsky's office that this year there are more than 100 entries for these awards—one in each of the following five categories—treatment, family relationships, administration, community endeavors and open.

Public support for mental health is reflected in citizen assumption of financial responsibility for programs. In 1966, four of the five local tax referendums were passed. Some 10 additional communities are actively planning referendums, and many others are considering them.

The Department of Mental Health has assisted local communities and the federal government in the planning and administration of more than $2 million in federal construction grants under Public Law 88–164 for community services.

Two mental health centers were approved for hospitals in Rock Island and Chicago. Agencies at Monmouth, Rolling Meadows, Oak Lawn, Palatine and Springfield received mental retardation grants. An additional $2.7 million has been earmarked by the federal government for the current fiscal year.

Manpower requirements for an intensive treatment program are quite different than for a custodial program. The intensive treatment efforts allied to community centered concepts require more specially trained personnel.

We must expand and upgrade programs for training and education at all levels. And, in turn, expand financial support and involvement by universities and other training resources.

Part of our manpower task will be to encourage these resources to become oriented to community concepts in their own right. Toward this, our zone centers in Illinois and other mental health services will be available to universities and colleges as field laboratories for the training of mental health personnel. All training need not take place in an institution remote from the problem area.

Despite serious staff recruitment and retention problems caused by acute shortages of trained personnel in Illinois and the nation, we have been able to retain both quantity and quality of staff at mental hospitals and at facilities for the mentally retarded.

The staff-patient ratio generally has improved, due to increased recruitment and to the declining number of state hospital patients.

For example, the physician-patient ratio in state hospitals has improved from one physician for 110 patients in 1962, to one physician for 69 patients in 1966.

Although nationwide demand for top mental health professionals is particularly acute, the Illinois community mental health program has become outstanding in its ability to attract highly qualified professional men for key positions.

Recent wage increases in both professional and sub-professional categories have aided both staff recruitment and staff retention efforts.

In the last six years, the state has been able to recruit approximately 7,400 new staff members for its mental health program, bringing present staff of the Mental Health Department to some 19,900 persons.

The long range manpower strategy of the Department of Mental Health is to encourage increased staffing for community-owned services. These services, working cooperatively with those of the state, will play a vital role in the effort to decrease further the flow of patients to state hospitals and to provide adequate care and treatment for those who need it after state hospitalization.

I believe perhaps the most important thing that we at state and national levels can do toward getting local communities involved in mental health is expanding information efforts to help local communities recognize their responsibilities.

Our mental health program wishes to join hands with any governmental official or private citizen at any level—local, state, or federal—who will work cooperatively toward

doing something more adequate than our efforts to date about the accumulation of human beings in state hospitals, jails, slums and ghettos. To a large extent, such accumulations in such places are both the cause and result of mental health problems. These places—both spawning grounds and burial grounds for the mentally unhealthy—represent a failure of enlightened government to respond to the needs of all its citizens.

Communities must stop writing off the enfeebled aged, the retarded and mentally ill children, the alcoholics and the host of other groups crippled by mental illness. Substandard care and substandard treatment of people is not permissible from a moral point of view. The long-term cost to our society's productivity and creativity is immense.

We must do more to help people help themselves. We must continue our commitment to work for the mental health of our citizens until they are no longer exiled from the community when they become handicapped.

TEACHER CORPS PRAISED BY EDUCATORS AND COLUMNISTS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, as Congress prepares to consider the Teacher Corps supplemental appropriation bill and the new authorization for fiscal year 1968, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the remarks of several prominent educators and columnists.

In a recent issue of Life magazine, the editors urged the continuation and expansion of the Teacher Corps. The noted columnist Mary McGrory described the beginnings and development of the Teacher Corps in her March 12 column.

I have received letters from Dr. George Denemark, dean of the school of education at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, and from the principal of the North Fifth Street School in Milwaukee. Both these educators have been involved with the work of the Corps in Wisconsin, and their letters describe their enthusiasm for the program.

I ask unanimous consent that these letters and columns; an article written by Ron Van Doren and published in the NEA Journal; the recent testimony of John Lumley, legislative director of the NEA, before the House Committee on Education and Labor; and assorted comments by school officials throughout the United States be printed in the RECORD.

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

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
NORTH FIFTH STREET SCHOOL,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 20, 1967.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: The National Teachers Corps interns who have been a part of our teaching staff since September are making a decidedly significant contribution through their work with children. At the same time they are developing understandings and skills that will enable them to work successfully with the disadvantaged.

We have long known that children with serious emotional problems would be greatly benefited by individualized instruction. Twenty-six children are seen daily in tutoring situations by the four members of our teaching corps. This forty minute period in a one-to-one relationship or as a member of a small group represents a most valuable advantage for each child involved both in terms of individualized learning opportunity and the psychological help given the child in the small group inter-change.

Each intern works with class-sized groups in a student teaching situation for a quarter of a day and participates in classroom activities for the entire day on Thursday of each week. This daily contact with the children is enabling them to develop competence with techniques in their training period, that are now usually attained by teachers in service. Interns who develop confidence in their own ability to work successfully with disadvantaged children will be a genuine asset to our profession.

In addition, Mr. Whang and Mr. Lawhorn are offering a forty-five minute supervised physical education program after school, two afternoons each week. Miss Owens and Mrs. Roth are setting up a study program for mothers to assist them in helping their children with homework and to encourage them to appreciate the importance of their interest in promoting the progress of their children.

These community-oriented projects will further deepen the interns' understanding of the disadvantaged. At the same time, they will be supplying enrichment experiences of real benefit to children and their parents.

The success of this program is significantly sharpened by the constant guidance and evaluations of such experienced team leaders as Mr. Litscher. Teachers in training rarely have this concentrated a degree of guidance.

Those of us who have worked with Central City children for years have been aware of a need for specialized preparation for the teachers of our children.

The approach inaugurated by the National Teachers Corps is truly an encouraging one. Efforts seem to be directed toward setting up a program that will seek creative solutions for the problem of preparing teachers for their vital task.

Very truly yours,

GLADYS CAUGHLIN,
Principal.

TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE BY JOHN M. LUMLEY, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF FEDERAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

We have supported, and continue to support, the National Teacher Corps as an innovative experimental program to provide teachers for urban and rural schools with large concentration of children from low-income families. We believe that the transfer of this program from the Higher Education Act to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is a wise and constructive action. NEA's support of the program is based on the principle of assisting school districts with large numbers of disadvantaged children to secure highly qualified teachers. We believe that the amendments proposed in HR 6230 are sound.

1. The amendment concerning intern reimbursement is valid.

2. State agency approval is vital.

3. Clarifying the local control provision as provided in Sec. 115 is essential.

4. Authorizing the Teacher Corps to accept gifts is proper.

5. The inclusion of programs for migrant children are valid improvements—provided the appropriate state education agencies' approvals are secured.

6. We question the advisability of including the federally operated Indian schools in the Teacher Corps program. Improvement of the B.I.A. schools is a federal responsibility that should be met by direct appropriation. (See attached survey.)

NEA QUESTIONNAIRE ON TEACHER CORPS

Questionnaires were mailed to the 111 school districts participating in the National Teacher Corps program. We received a response from 79% of the superintendents and 50% of the principals. A copy of the tabulated results is attached.

1. How do you rate the preservice (summer) training program of the Teacher Corpsmen assigned to your school or school system?

Excellent:	
Superintendents	31
Principals	59
Adequate:	
Superintendents	44
Principals	73
Inadequate:	
Superintendents	6
Principals	12
Uncertain:	
Superintendents	7
Principals	46

2. How do you rate the inservice (follow-up) training that the Teacher Corpsmen are receiving at the cooperating college or university?

Excellent:	
Superintendents	39
Principals	73
Adequate:	
Superintendents	39
Principals	82
Inadequate:	
Superintendents	5
Principals	15
Uncertain:	
Superintendents	5
Principals	33

3. What do you see as the greatest benefit from the Teacher Corps program?

A source of personnel available now for work in schools serving the poverty areas:	
Superintendents	42
Principals	84
A future source of qualified teachers for work in schools serving the poverty areas:	
Superintendents	41
Principals	97
Other (please explain):	
Superintendents	5
Principals	19

4. How do you rate the motivation of Teacher Corpsmen compared with other beginning teachers in the schools serving the poverty areas?

Corpsmen are more highly motivated:	
Superintendents	60
Principals	111
No difference is observed between corpsmen and other beginning teachers:	
Superintendents	20
Principals	56
Corpsmen are not as highly motivated:	
Superintendents	4
Principals	21
Uncertain:	
Superintendents	4
Principals	8

5. In general, how would you describe the cooperation of corpsmen with your regular school staff?

Corpsmen are working well with the regular staff:	
Superintendents	79
Principals	176
Corpsmen are not working well with the regular staff:	
Superintendents	3
Principals	10
Other (please explain):	
Superintendents	6
Principals	12

6. What is your impression of the attitude of your regular staff toward the corpsmen?

Very enthusiastic:	
Superintendents	30
Principals	54

Favorable:
Superintendents ---------- 50
Principals ---------- 117
Unfavorable:
Superintendents ---------- 3
Principals ---------- 7
Neutral:
Superintendents ---------- 5
Principals ---------- 18

7. Please explain briefly your answer in question 6 above: (The following statements are indicative of the responses of the superintendents and principals.)

(a) "There have been many requests by regular teachers to have NTC members work with them in their classrooms."

(b) "Regular teaching staff is grateful for additional assistance, however, some teachers are envious of the fact that corpsmen are released two days a week to attend classes at the university while making the same salary."

(c) "The regular staff and the community are very enthusiastic."

(d) "Our teachers are pleased with the teacher corps and are real proud of the help the corps has given them. We would like to see the programs continued."

(e) "At first there was distrust and suspicion. Most of it is gone. Still there is envy and it is based on the payment received to go to school."

(f) "At first they did not understand the purpose of teacher corps. This is understandable in view of all the delays involved. Congress could improve this for the future years by passing appropriations sooner."

(g) "Our staff is highly pleased with the enthusiasm and progress in two schools now using the NTC program. Both pupils and teachers are happy in the unusual accomplishments of this enriching approach to learning."

(h) "The interest of the corpsmen not as great as was anticipated. The cooperating college did not send us the team that we requested; therefore, we had to make numerous changes when they arrived in our system."

8. What are your plans for next year?

Plan to ask for additional corpsmen:
Superintendents ---------- 49
Principals ---------- 67
Plan to keep the present corpsmen for the second year and then to ask for replacements:
Superintendents ---------- 26
Principals ---------- 74
Plan to keep the present corpsmen for the second year, but I do not think I will ask for replacements:
Superintendents ---------- 5
Principals ---------- 14
Plan to dismiss the present corpsmen at the end of the first year:
Superintendents ---------- 2
Principals ---------- 3
Other (please explain):
Superintendents ---------- 5
Principals ---------- 33

NOTE.—If you are a *principal*, please answer Questions 9 and 10, skip Questions 11, 12, and 13, and continue with Question 14.

If you are a *superintendent*, please skip Questions 9 and 10 and continue with Question 11.

9. How many Corpsmen are now assigned to your school?

——— Number of Corpsmen.

10. Including the Corpsmen now in your school how many Corpsmen could you use efficiently to supplement the services of your regular staff?

——— Minimum number.
——— Maximum number.

11. How many schools in your system now have Corpsmen?

——— Number of schools.

12. How many Corpsmen are now working in your system?

——— Number of Corpsmen.

13. What are your *additional needs* for Corpsmen?

———Estimated number of additional schools.
——— Estimated number of additional Corpsmen.

14. Please give your evaluation and any other comments you care to make about the effectiveness of the Teacher Corps as a program for training teachers to work in poverty areas. (The following statements are indicative of the responses of the superintendents and principals.)

(a) "We believe the NTC can help us to do a better job in preparing children for productive learning. We think the school must do more than offer the students the traditional curriculum during the regular school day. Corpsmen can introduce these pupils to the world outside the routine and provide learning situations during the school day that are appropriate for the individual and small groups."

(b) "The National Teacher Corps members are highly motivated, concerned with the individual child, demonstrate concern. Good model for traditional teachers. Establish rapport with students."

(c) "The Teacher Corps members are much more highly motivated to work in poverty areas than the average teachers."

(d) "It is a very good program for training teachers to work in poverty areas."

(e) "Unlike teachers who are hired directly from teacher colleges of other teacher training institutions, Teacher Corps personnel have been prepared for some difficult situations which they are likely to find in the inner city schools. Because they treat the children with more understanding, they are more likely to reach the children and to do a more effective job than the teacher trained in a traditional manner."

15. Please give any additional comments about the usefulness of the work the Corpsmen are doing now. Include here your comments about any new services or programs that have been possible this year because of the help of the Corpsmen. (The following statements are indicative of the responses of the superintendents *and* principals.)

(a) "Our Corps members have served our area well in the short time we have had them. The interns have performed invaluable services in remedial programs for individuals and small groups. The contact with the community and its problems have been useful both to the community and to the Corps members themselves."

(b) "Such activities as home visits, creative writing, tutorial services, remedial reading instruction, and 4–H Club work are some of the services being performed by the Corpsmen. We find the members most willing to accept responsibility and to have a good attitude toward the children."

(c) "The Corpsmen on the whole are doing community work and have been able to greatly enrich and assist in our Title I work."

(d) "Use of NTC has enabled us to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio."

(e) "The shortage of teachers has been such that we had five classrooms without teachers from September to Christmas. We integrated the Corpsmen with a language arts remedial program under Title I. They have introduced new methods into teaching. They work both with the parents and with the children. They are very devoted and conscientious with the children. I only wish we had 25 instead of 5 that I might put them in all our schools. We have not had a single incident or problem with the Corpsmen. Please help to get more adequate funds so we can have more."

(f) "Because the interns and the team leader are not required to teach a full load of classes, they can offer individual help to some children. They are planning also to offer a new type of seminar in order to help some of our under-achieving students who might benefit from small group work. The preservice and inservice training stresses the use of innovative material and the Teacher Corps team is planning to experiment with the use of some new materials which might be valuable in this school and which might be valuable in similar schools."

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 22, 1967.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: As discussion of the future of the National Teacher Corps continues I should like to take this opportunity to express my views on its effectiveness.

In spite of the complications which we encountered here at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in the initiation of our program and its funding, we have been delighted to be associated with this important project. Of particular significance, in my judgment, has been the opportunity which our Teacher Corps program has provided for close University-Public School System cooperation. Our present program includes interns working in both the Milwaukee Public Schools and the Racine Public Schools. The program has provided a means by which a number of our faculty members could work closely with representatives of the public schools in a common effort to improve the education of boys and girls. In the case of the Milwaukee Public Schools such cooperation has developed to a point where the director of our program is on a joint appointment with the Public Schools. Further, a key member of the Public School staff, recently retired, has joined our staff and has greatly facilitated the relationships between School System and University.

Another important contribution of the Teacher Corps program can be found in its emphasis on the designing of teacher education programs to meet local school needs. Rather than detaching preparation programs from the reality of school and community as is too often the case at many institutions, this program has emphasized efforts to build in prospective teachers a sensitivity to community problems and school needs and to design their training programs to effectively meet those problems and needs.

Much more could be said in support of the Teacher Corps program but let me simply conclude with reaffirmation of our enthusiasm for the program and our sincere hope that it will be continued and expanded in the years ahead. If there are ways in which this office can be of assistance to you in support of the National Teacher Corps please feel free to call upon us.

Cordially,

GEORGE W. DENEMARK,
Dean.

[From the NEA Journal, April 1967]

THE FORD ROAD SCHOOL VOTES AYE FOR THE TEACHER CORPS

(By Ron Van Doren, U.S. Department of Labor)

If you ask Carolyn Nowlin of Memphis, Tennessee, why she joined the National Teacher Corps, she will tell you, "Because I want to become a professional teacher and I want to teach disadvantaged children." Mrs. Nowlin works with four other National Teachers Corpsmen at the Ford Road School in a low-income suburb of Memphis.

The National Teacher Corps aims to produce a cadre of teachers trained to deal with

the special problems of educating culturally deprived children. It was created by Congress in the Higher Education Act of 1965, and got under way in the spring of 1966.

The Corps recruits both veteran teachers and college graduates without teaching experience. It offers inexperienced graduates the opportunity to study for a master's degree in education, tuition free, while working with the culturally deprived and learning about their special problems. The Teacher Corps screens applicants, who must have a bachelor's degree and must meet the entrance requirements for the master's degree program at the university to which they will be assigned.

The Corps is built around teams consisting of a team leader (a teacher with a master's degree and five years' experience or three years' experience teaching the disadvantaged) and 3 to 10 interns (college graduates who want to become professional teachers).

The Corpsmen begin their service with an 8- to 13-week summer training session devoted to the sociology of poverty and ways of teaching the disadvantaged. The training is given at a local university involved in the program in cooperation with local school and community organizations. Memphis State, where the Ford Road team members are doing their advanced studies, is one of 50 colleges and universities in 29 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia that are participating in the program.

In September, the teams report to local poverty-area schools that request them and carry out a wide range of activities such as those (described below) that are being done by the Ford Road team. At the same time, they begin a 21-month graduate program that leads to the master's degree and state certification as a teacher. Although the Teacher Corps is a federally funded program, the Corpsmen are under the control of the local education agency once they begin their in-service work in the school.

The team leaders are paid at the local rate for teachers with comparable education and experience. Interns are paid $75 per week during the summer training session and at local beginning teachers rates during the school year. The federal government underwrites 90 percent of Corpsmen's salaries and all administrative costs.

The Teacher Corps team at Ford Road School has brought a new morale to the school, according to Isaiah Goodrich, the principal. And they are reaching those slow learners previously unaffected by classroom teaching:

A third grader who has been dawdling since the beginning of the class period suddenly perks up, jumps out of his seat, and joins Peggy Pickle, a Teacher Corps intern, out in the corridor. Like a mother hen collecting her chicks, Mrs. Pickle continues down the hall, taking the slow learners out of the regular classrooms. She works with a special kit that makes a game out of learning. Giving her students much individual attention, she is slowly bringing them up to the achievement level of the other third graders.

When Anne Archer, another intern, enters the classroom, her three pupils are already there—hiding behind a movable chalkboard. They jump out, she feigns fright, and they all laugh at the joke. A month earlier, one of the boys was so shy that he spoke to no one, and finally stoped coming to school. Now, he teases Mrs. Archer about his "not coming tomorrow," but he hasn't missed class for a month.

Mrs. Nowlin has her class in a semicircle around her, explaining a special lesson to eight children who were nonreaders three months ago. She gives each child many opportunities to participate but allows each to achieve at his own pace on his own level. Several of the group are ready to move up to the regular reader.

"The Teacher Corps is the best thing that ever happened to our school," says Mr. Goodrich, "Every day it is a delight to be with them. What's going on here inspires me to want to do more."

"They are a godsend," says one of the classroom teachers. "We have always wanted to devote more time to the individual problems of our children. We can do it now through the Teacher Corps team. I just wish we had more of them."

And more interns like Lee Visky Powell could make a great difference in the teaching of disadvantaged children, but they would probably be hard to find. He is a new father figure to the children he tutors in small groups in the classroom and on the athletic field. Using a combination of know-how, patience, and a sense of humor, he introduces slow learners to the baffling world of mathematics.

Although Bertha Johnson, the team leader, has had 25 years' experience teaching the disadvantaged, she says, "While learning and watching these young interns learn, we are all undergoing a creative process. We older teachers learn from the interns by seeing in a fresh light the relationship between teacher and child."

The interns unanimously agree that the importance of achievement to a slow learner is the most valuable lesson they have learned thus far. When a visitor to her special classroom expressed surprise at the enthusiasm of her slow learners, Mrs. Nowline said, "They're always like this. Working here with other children on their own level, they they develop the self-respect and confidence they need to learn."

Mr. Goodrich is especially interested in treating children individually and "eliminating a rigid set of expectations for all of them." Each of the 60 students in the special intern classes is carefully watched and his progress charted on a conference sheet. Each week, the interns, Mrs. Johnson, and the classroom teachers meet to discuss any problems and plan future programs for the special students.

But what is all this doing for the intern?

"In three months here, I've learned a lot about education that my education courses can't teach," says Mrs. Archer. And because I'm actually teaching and have real problems to solve, I get much more out of my courses, too."

After six months of teaching, do the interns feel they could handle regular classes?

"I don't think so—the way I have things planned, I wouldn't want to try," says Mr. Powell. "I want to really know what I'm doing here first."

Is the Teacher Corps what you expected it to be?

"I think so, but some of the others had different ideas," says Mrs. Pickle. "Those who couldn't understand what it means to teach—that you can't expect to do everything overnight—didn't last very long." (Sixty percent of the recruits washed out of the summer training program at Memphis State, the university training center for the Ford Road team.)

The interns credit Mrs. Johnson with teaching them the facts of life about teaching. "The hardest thing to put over to a young teacher is the need to be patient—with both the children and his profession," Mrs. Johnson says. "At the same time that we stress this, we try to be careful not to destroy the creative spirit or sense of urgency and need for accomplishment. I think these interns are well balanced in their perceptions about teaching."

The experience of the Ford Road School project is being shared with the whole educational community, because the school is one of the demonstration centers for the National TEPS Commission Year of the Non-Conference. The Non-Conference Year is devoted to the teacher and his staff—to finding better ways of organizing school staffs and improving the climate and opportunity for staff development. TEPS has enthusiastically endorsed the potential of the Teacher Corps program and has included eight Teacher Corps projects on the list of demonstration centers to be inspected by educators visiting experimental programs throughout the country.

What are the greatest difficulties being experienced in the Ford Road program?

"Our biggest problem is one of uncertainty, the insecurity of not knowing when future funds are coming, if they are coming at all," says Milton Phillips, director of the Teacher Corps project at Memphis State. At present, the Teacher Corps is funded only through June 1967, even though the program is designed for a two-year cycle, carrying through to June 1968. The interns joined the Corps expecting to spend two years in it and to have the opportunity of completing the master's degree program. No one can say at this point whether Congress will appropriate money for the second year.

The Teacher Corps has been plagued with financial difficulties from the start. Although it was created in November 1965 with an authorization of $36 million for the fiscal year 1966, no money was appropriated until the following April, too late to build up the 3,750-man Corps hoped for by the Administration for the 1966–67 school year. Out of some $64 million authorized for the Corps for the fiscal year 1967, a total of $7.5 million was appropriated in October 1966. The late funding and the drastic cut in expected funds hampered the program and forced it to begin with a reduced number of volunteers who were not even sure they would be able to teach in the schools when the summer training session ended.

"We started the training with volunteers and no money the first time," says Mrs. Phillips. "I don't know whether we can do the same thing all over again."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Mar. 12, 1967]

THE EMBATTLED TEACHERS CORPS

(By Mary McGrory)

The Teacher Corps, a modest proposal to combat ignorance in the slums, has engendered a hostility on Capitol Hill that baffles and discourages its friends.

The Teacher Corps trains volunteers who ask only to be allowed to teach in poor schools where many teachers fear to tread. Since assignments to "blackboard jungles" are not exactly fought over, it is incomprehensible to many observers, including President Johnson, that anybody would want to stand in the way of the volunteers.

But Republicans have made opposition to the Teacher Corps a party issue and conservative Democrats, while less vocal, have fought it every step of the way. The Corps squeaked through the Senate Appropriations Committee by one vote last year, and was initially rejected by the House. Its "Perils of Pauline" existence seems likely to continue in this session.

Some 1,200 volunteers are now actually at work. Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., one of the Corp's few friends on Capitol Hill, reports that he has not had a single complaint from any principal who has interns in his school.

The volunteers are trained under the Office of Education in summer courses where they learn about subcultures and the special problems of poor children. They visit the grim neighborhoods where they will live and teach.

The President has just told Congress he wants to expand the number of volunteers to 5,500 by September 1963. He wants an additional appropriation of $12.5 million in fiscal 1967.

His espousal of the scheme, which was

originally proposed by Nelson and Senator Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., is one of the factors that have made the Corps vulnerable. It is an easy way to buck the President.

While it seems to its admirers a simple and direct approach to the sea of troubles in poor schools in both country and town, the Corps is regarded by its enemies as a nefarious scheme for bringing Uncle Sam into the elementary and secondary classrooms of the land.

The administration has tried to meet this objection by dropping the word "National" from the designation of "Teacher Corps." It has given local jurisdictions the right to hire staff and volunteers at will. It has adjusted salary scales so that no volunteer will receive more money than a beginning teacher in the same school.

Nelson started with the idea of interns based on his observation of the work of Peace Corps returnees in the Cardozo area of Washington. Kennedy was inspired by the 1963 experiment in Prince Edward County, Va., where schools were closed to avoid integration. One hundred experienced teachers were imported from all over the country, including elegant suburbs like Grosse Pointe and Westchester. Their efforts were a huge success.

The two senators combined their idea in a bill, which was promptly attacked. Rep. Edith Green, D–Ore., objected to the "pirating" of experienced teachers from other areas. And she foresaw morale problems among permanent slum teachers "just as idealistic and dedicated" who have paid for their master's degrees out of their own funds, while Corps volunteers working for their masters' were financed out of federal funds.

The National Education Association proposed that Teacher Corps funds and volunteers be under the control of state departments of education.

Mrs. Johnson is going to do her bit for the beleaguered young Teacher Corps. On a journey which begins tomorrow, she will stop off at Canada Township, a little hollow in North Carolina, where there are 49 impoverished families who live in shacks papered with newspapers and furnished with old automobile seats.

There are eight Teacher Corpsmen and a master teacher who, according to the local school principal, have transformed the life of the town. They cut their pupils' hair, drive them to school in buses, collect clothes and shoes for them in nearby Asheville. They are teaching them remedial reading in a novel fashion. The children tell stories into a tape recorder and the tapes are transcribed into little booklets which the children then learn to read.

"For some people," said a friend of the Corps, "going into an area like that is like going to Nigeria. They have the Peace Corps spirit, and the Teacher Corps gives them a chance to play the national game of helping people."

The hope is that Congress will allow many more players.

[From Life magazine, Mar. 17, 1967]

AN EDUCATIONAL BARGAIN WORTH KEEPING

While the draft gets plenty of attention in Congress, a small, valuable, but little-known program may die of congressional inattention. It is the National Teacher Corps.

The Teacher Corps serves in the combat areas of American education—in the schools of the slums and the rural poor. In 29 states, its 1,200 corpsmen pay special attention to "culturally deprived" children, whose schooling must provide values and training that their homes do not. Teacher Corps teams—each consisting of a veteran of about five years' experience in slum schools, aided by from three to 10 young teacher interns—go into these schools by invitation only. They work under the close supervision of community school officials, who can fire or transfer them on a day's notice. There are plenty of safeguards, in short, against federal government meddling in local schools.

But because it lacks any effective lobby on Capitol Hill, the Teacher Corps's budget was shrunk to $7.5 million, which runs out this June. With that modest amount, the corps has been able to reach a quarter of a million children with a variety of unorthodox teaching techniques. Corpsmen make frequent home visits to encourage parents, whose previous dealings with school officials too often have been only to hear complaints. Rock 'n' roll songs may be played in class with the hope that these often uncommunicative youngsters will learn to express themselves by explaining what they think the lyrics mean. Their reading assignments can be on their special folk heroes, such as prizefighters, and they learn mathematics by computing gas mileage for the hotrods they so admire.

The Teacher Corps interns who conduct such classes are also studying parttime at universities nearby. In two years, with the federal government paying their tuition, they can earn master's degrees in education. Eighty percent of them have said they want to stay on in slum schools, whose greatest problem is a chronic shortage of qualified teachers.

Outside of Congress, the Teacher Corps has won impressive support from the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. Practically every school which has corpsmen this year wants more of them next year. The Teacher Corps needs a supplemental stopgap appropriation of $12.5 million by the middle of April to set up summer training programs for the 2,400 new interns the Administration has recommended, and an educational $36.5 million to carry the corps through the full fiscal year. At these prices, it remains the best bargain in the federal education program.

MORE COMMENTS ON THE TEACHER CORPS

Our Teacher Corpsmen have made tremendous progress in remedial work and speech therapy. They are providing services in the community that could not have been accomplished through regular school finances. (T. O. Adams, superintendent, Nemo Vista Public School, Center Ridge, Ark.)

Our district feels the National Teacher Corps is of great value to our students and to our community as a whole. This group is able to get to the heart of many problems—but better still—they are able to use preventive methods and prevent many things from even becoming problems. Our regular teaching staff have great praise for these people, as do our parents and community leaders.

These programs should always be set up on a two year basis—giving both the school districts and National Teacher Corps a chance for better planning and removing the uncertainty attached. (Arlene M. Bitely, member, Carvey Board of Education, Monterey Park, Calif.)

Should the Teacher Corps need affirmation of the continuing need for its existence for endorsement of its merit and valuable assistance to local education agencies provided in the first year of operation, please do not hesitate to call on me at any time. (Thomas J. Pollino, director, instructional development, Monterey County, Monterey, Calif.)

The ten corpsmen and the three team leaders currently assigned to our school system are rendering significant educational and community services to the high schools where they are assigned. The principals have expressed their interest in the continuation of the program and their appreciation of the services rendered.

It would be helpful if the administrative and fiscal arrangements could be settled prior to the beginning of the program each year. We realize that there were many exigencies beyond the control of the Teacher Corps staff and that you did the best you could under difficult circumstances. (George F. Ostheimer, general superintendent, Indianapolis Public Schools, Indianapolis, Ind.)

It is one of the greatest training programs I have ever witnessed because it gives the trainees experiences that they would never have gotten in a normal training program. The Teacher Corps has helped to interrelate the various communities. We have six distinct types who have only these things in common: one parent, distrust and aggressive behavior.

Corpsmen have organized many additional after-school clubs (Corpsmen carry from two to three clubs per week) and taken over the noon lunch program where they have introduced a variety of activities to break the routine of that program. (Robert Wagner, principal, Heinhold Junior High School, Cincinnati, Ohio.)

Lincoln Heights Local School District in Cincinnati should be saturated with Corpsmen. (Dr. William L. Carter, dean, School of Education, Teacher Corps program director, University of Cincinnati.)

I wish that I had about 10 more Corps members just like the ones I have. Then I would have the most swinging program in the state. (William Smith, Principal, Patrick Henry Junior High School, Cleveland, Ohio.)

The Corpsmen have exhibited "staying power" through very trying circumstances and we hope to keep them in our system.

Let us examine our school and community activities and see if we can broaden these. Let's make sure these interns get a chance to work in every area of a school day and become more involved in the community. (Principals, teachers, and Corps team leaders in the Cleveland Public Schools.)

We are pleased to be a part of the efforts being made through the Teacher Corps and hope that we shall be able to continue in this outstanding endeavor. We are thoroughly convinced that it is a practical and effective type of program. (F. H. Gorman, Dean, College of Education, Municipal University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebr.)

The five young people sent to me are exceptional. You have to realize that I had four classrooms from September to Christmas without qualified teachers. I placed Teacher Corpsmen in these schools to help with remedial work in Language Arts, to help with better relationship between the schools and the parents, and they have done a magnificent piece of work.

I am writing to all the congressmen from this region to help make the Teacher Corps a broader and bigger project because the professional personnel problem is predicted to get much worse. These young people are enthusiastic, prepared, and willing to work with underprivileged children and we are in dire need of their help. (R. A. dela Garza, superintendent of schools, Rio Grande City Consolidated Independent School District, Rio Grande City, Tex.)

Phyllis Strick, the team leader, is helping me to get ready for my high school equivalency test. I didn't even know I could take a test. (Lydia Gonzales, Ben Bolt, Tex.)

Our teachers see these Teacher Corps kids here till 5:30, 6 o'clock . . . They are beginning to get competitive, now nobody runs out when the bell rings, all doing a better job. (Principal, a Chicago public school.)

There is no question, in our minds, that the National Teacher Corps is doing a fine job and will serve a real need in providing qualified teachers of a caliber never before equaled. Keep up the good work—we need more forward-thinking people to get education to those who need it—to get education to them in a way that they will understand.

(Charles E. Skidmore, district superintendent, Santee School District, Santee, Calif.)

They (the Corpsmen) have an entirely different attitude—they are not always right—but they bring us something we need. (Miss Maude Carson, principal, Jensen School, Chicago, Ill.)

One Assistant Principal bluntly said, "I really don't know how we would have survived this year without the National Teacher Corps. They have really helped us out, especially in problem cases. When problems get tough I frequently go to them (the Teacher Corps) for help." (Assistant principal, Northern High School, Detroit, Mich.)

The National Teacher Corps at New York University has provided the School of Education with unusual opportunities to attempt innovations in its teacher education programs. It has also enabled us to develop viable ways of improving our working relationships with local education agencies to make the teaching experiences of our students more meaningful. (Daniel E. Griffith, dean of School of Education, New York University, New York, N.Y.)

The Corps members have been most useful in implementing school curricula designed especially for the culturally deprived pupils in Dade County. (Terence T. O'Connor, Ph. D., director of inservice education, Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Fla.)

In summary, I should like to re-emphasize the fact that I endorse the program on the ground that it is valuable to the interns, to the community, to the school system, and most particularly to those individual students who have profited not only academically, but socially in having their opinions of themselves altered. (Mabel E. Ray, supervisor of elementary education, Worcester, Mass.)

Basically, Teacher Corps is a good idea and can render a great service in areas similar to ours. We are in the lower part of the Appalachian Area and some might think of this area as not as applicable as West Virginia and other places farther North. This small mountain county has a high percentage of drop-outs. The folks are in what might be thought of as a cut-off area far from any cities, and many have not gone out of the county. We're trying to help the situation.

The 1960 Census shows that 39% of our pupils come from homes with less than $2,000 income. Our recent survey shows this same condition with income rate at $2,500. Inflation and higher costs put these folk in about the same condition.

In the Western part of Macon County, over a mountain about 3,400 feet, roads impassable in winter; at least not safe for bus travel, and 30 miles away; we have Nantahala School were the percentage of deprived is 55%. We'd like to get a Teacher Corps team next year that would work there and in the Cowee School which is closer but has the need. A team that could go live with these folk could, in our opinion do a lot of good.

Give me some idea of the prospects. We have not made any effort through Western Carolina College which directs our present team, but would like to begin some plans. What encouragement can Teacher Corps give us? (Berry Floyd, administrative assistant, Macon County Schools, Franklin, N.C.)

We feel this program has been very beneficial for our school and community. We hope that this program can continue in our community. (PTA president, Willard School.)

Be it resolved that Title V-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 created a National Teacher Corps and whereas the National Teacher Corps is helping to revitalize education in low income areas by providing financial incentives for local school districts to hire teaching personnel and whereas the authorization for the Teacher Corps expires June 30, 1967 and whereas the Teacher Corps has been hampered by a meager appropriation of only $7.5 million dollars during fiscal year 1967 and whereas President Johnson has requested legislation to strengthen and expand the National Teacher Corps, therefore be it resolved that the Young Democratic Clubs of America urge Congress to renew the authorization of the National Teacher Corps and to make substantial increases in its appropriation. (Adopted by the National Committee of the Young Democrats, Salt Lake City, Utah.)

In spite of the complications which we encountered here at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in the initiation of our program and its funding, we have been delighted to be associated with this important project. Of particular significance, in my judgment, has been the opportunity which our Teacher Corps program has provided for close University-Public School System cooperation. Our present program includes interns working in both the Milwaukee Public Schools and the Racine Public Schools. The program has provided a means by which a number of our faculty members could work closely with representatives of the public schools in a common effort to improve the education of boys and girls. In the case of the Milwaukee Public Schools such cooperation has developed to a point where the director of our program is on a joint appointment with the Public Schools. Further, a key member of the Public School staff, recently retired, has joined our staff and has greatly facilitated the relationships between School System and University.

Another important contribution of the Teacher Corps program can be found in its emphasis on the designing of teacher education programs to meet local school needs. Rather than detaching preparation programs from the realty of school and community as is too often the case at many institutions, this program has emphasized efforts to build in prospective teachers a sensitivity to community problems and school needs and to design their training programs to effectively meet those problems and needs.

Much more could be said in support of the Teacher Corps program but let me simply conclude with reaffirmation of our enthusiasm for the program and our sincere hope that it will be continued and expanded in the years ahead. If there are ways in which this office can be of assistance to you in support of the National Teacher Corps please feel free to call upon us. (George W. Denemark, dean, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.)

The Teacher Corps is the best thing that ever happened to our school. Every day it is a delight to be with them. What's going on here inspires me to want to do more. (Isaiah Goodrich, principal, Ford Road School, Memphis, Tenn.)

They (Corpsmen) are a godsend. We have always wanted to devote more time to the individual problems of our children. We can do it now through the Teacher Corps team. I just wish we had more of them. (A classroom teacher, Ford Road School, Memphis, Tenn.)

In the process of learning and of watching these young interns learn, we are all undergoing a creative process. We older teachers learn from the interns by seeing in a fresh light the relationship between teacher and child. . . . The hardest thing to put over to young teachers is the need to be patient—with both the children and his profession. At the same time that we stress this, we try to be careful not to destroy the creative spirit or sense of urgency and need for accomplishment. I think these interns are well balanced in their perceptions about teaching. (Mrs. Bertha Johnson, Teacher Corps team leader, Ford Road School, Memphis, Tenn.)

The Teacher Corps program which you direct has, I feel, tremendous growth potential, and I am, indeed, very much interested in doing whatever I can to help you achieve its goal of excellence. (John M. Hyams, division of compensatory education, ESEA, title I, Harrisburg, Pa.)

We feel that the National Teacher Corps is a highly successful program and that it will be a great help in alleviating the teacher shortage. (C. R. Dale, assistant superintendent, Haywood County Schools, Waynesville, N.C.)

Corps members are teaching habits of mind that will be useful—curiosity, openmindedness, objectivity, respect for evidence, and the capacity to think critically. (George W. Lawson, principal, Savage-Golver Elementary School, Sumpter, S.C.)

The Teacher Corps is creating better overall learning situations for pupils at Bates School. (Matthew O. Ramsey, principal, Bates Junior High School, Sumpter, S.C.)

Just tremendous! The methods and practices used by the interns in the areas of reading and music are innovative, interesting and workable. (E. J. Thompson, principal, Stonehill Elementary School, Sumpter, S.C.)

We are delighted with the progress of our National Teacher Corps people in this area and we hope that Congress will appropriate the necessary funds for continuation of the old program and an expansion of the new. (Franklin R. Zeran, dean, School of Education, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg.)

Because the National Teacher Corps members represent a cross-section of our society, and have a continued affiliation with an institution of higher learning, we in Lowell believe they will be the most effective agent for change in our schools. We therefore urge the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and/or the members of Congress to give serious consideration not only to the continuation of the N.T.C. program, but also, in light of the educational needs of our society, to the expansion of this program. (Daniel P. Leahy, National Teacher Corps Director for Lowell, Memorial Hall, Lowell, Mass.)

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT, SECRETARY OF LABOR, AND OTHERS, AT NLRB VOTER OBSERVANCE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on March 2 there was a luncheon observance in the Capitol of the 25 millionth vote cast in employee elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board under the National Labor Relations Act.

The event had been preceded by an impressive morning ceremony at the Department of the Interior auditorium, which was honored by the presence of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, and others who gathered to note that the 25 millionth vote had been symbolized in the person of Leonard P. Scheno, an employee of Reynolds Metals Co.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the addresses made at that event, including those by the Vice President and Secretary Wirtz.

Also participating in the ceremonies were R. S. Reynolds, Jr., chairman of the board, Reynolds Metals Co.; Joseph P. Molony, vice president of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO; J. Herbert Hollomon, Acting Under Sec-

retary of Commerce, and members of the NLRB.

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

Chairman Frank W. McCulloch, National Labor Relations Board: We are met today to celebrate the exercise and the practice of a basic freedom. This is the freedom to vote a secret-ballot election to determine whether employees choose to be represented by a Union for collective bargaining with their Employer.

Until Congress in 1935 and the Supreme Court spoke in 1937 it was not a freedom clearly protected by law. Today it is so commonplace but so fundamental that the members of the Board and the General Counsel decided to mark the occasion of the twenty-five millionth vote cast in the Board election with these special ceremonies.

We are deeply gratified for the responses to our invitation. This company itself is a mark of the distance we have come. There are representatives of the Congress which created the Agency and reviews its work and provides its funds, of the Executive which appoints its Members and its General Counsel, of the Agency itself which carries out the mandate of Congress, of the reviewing courts without whose orders our orders don't have the force of law, and most importantly the representatives of the unions and the employers who with their employees utilize this machinery to carry out the Congressional purpose.

It is worthy of notice that the National Association of Manufacturers and the Electronic Industries Association have joined the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations in supporting the different phases of today's celebration.

Our Congressional participation is strictly bipartisan. Everyone says the lions and the lambs are lying down together but no one says which is which. We have thus come a long way from Memorial Day 1937 in Chicago when I saw law enforcement officers' guns blaze at workers marching for recognition killing ten and wounding scores, or from Flint, Michigan where in 1937 I happened to be, when employees seeking recognition violated the law by their sitdown strike and now 200,000 elections later after 25 million votes with strikes over recognition cut to a minor fraction of their former level, with elections still running over 8,000 a year with over a half million voting each year, with the parties working out consent agreements in 75 to 80 percent of these situations and with 90 percent of the eligible employees voting, the orderly process of the secret-ballot election has become the norm.

Our Agency, both its Washington Staff and its indefatigable regional staffs which conduct these elections, and all of you who have helped to build this tremendous record can take great pride in our progress on the road to greater industrial democracy, and in the collective bargaining that now covers 18 million men and women and vitally affects the wages and the working conditions and job-security of millions of others. We are closer to the goal of freedom of choice and the goal of a broader exercise of participation by those who so choose in shaping their working lives and we are together vindicating the underlying faith in the worth and dignity of the individual and in the desirability of human relations established on a more fraternal, cooperative and mutually responsible basis. The Board may not be universally loved but its election processes seem to have won the support of all.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey: Today as has been so well noted in these ceremonies, we mark a milestone in the development of industrial democracy in this great democracy of ours, and with us who has already been introduced and presented to you is Leonard Scheno and his lovely family. He is a maintenance technician in the State of New Jersey and he is here because as has already been noted the ballot that he cast symbolized the 25 millionth vote in a National Labor Relations Board election.

Now the right of American workers to a secret-ballot election to decide which if any union will represent them in collective bargaining was affirmed by the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. The father of this landmark in labor legislation, the late Senator Robert F. Wagner of New York said these words, "Democracy cannot work unless it is honored in the factory as well as in the polling booth. And men cannot be truly free in body and in spirit unless their freedom extends into the places where they earn their daily bread."

I am sure we all recall that one of the most forceful, dedicated, devoted champions of freedom everywhere and particularly of the rights and the freedoms of the working man was the late Senator Robert Wagner. He has earned a place in the history of our country that will live forever as a champion of people's rights. The right that Mr. Scheno has exercised is now so commonplace in America that we seldom even talk of it. The 25 million votes cast in these elections is a figure close to ⅓ of the civilian labor force of today. The National Labor Relations Board in 1935 according to the research that was done for these remarks held 31 elections. This year it will hold about 8,000. In 1935 only 7,734 workers voted. This year more than ½ million will vote.

These elections have helped to make collective bargaining work, helped to make collective bargaining work for the benefit of labor, and of management and of every American, indeed of the nation. It's a much happier situation today where labor-management relations are a product of negotiation and collective bargaining, all made possible by elections and the establishment of trade unions as the legitimate bargaining agents. It is a much happier day than when we had violence in factories, and on the streets, over the working conditions of those who were employed in industrial life.

Yes these elections have helped to reduce work stoppages which cripple our national economy. They have not stopped them all but they have made a decided impact. For example, the percentage of workers made idle by stoppages in 1950 was about 6.9 percent, just under 7 percent last year. It was less than half of that, 3.4, in 1966, which is an amazing record of industrial or labor management peace.

These elections have helped millions of Americans achieve better pay, shorter hours, safer working conditions, and greater job security. They have helped America be more prosperous and a more just society. And they have helped industry to be more productive by assuring greater labor stability. In short these elections under the National Labor Relations Act have helped the American economy achieve three decades of unprecedented growth.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz: We are all here to recognize an ethic which is just as fundamental as any in the whole principle of the things which we live by, and the ethic which we are talking about, as distinguished from the mechanics of voting, is the ethic of representation . . .

What Section 7 did was to recognize one of the two elements of that truer freedom which permits every individual to find or to have an opportunity to find his meaning in a crowded, complex world. One of those two elements is equality of opportunity for education. The other element is equality of representation.

The more I see of it, all the others can be fitted into second place. If there were equality of education and representation in this country, if there were equality of education and representation among all the people of the world, I would not worry about any other freedoms because they would all follow from those two. And I think it is true usually that where one is lacking in the person of an individual the other is lacking similarly. And I think it is true that either of them without both isn't very much good to anybody for very long. These differences are the two characteristics today, which more notably than any others distinguish between the nations of the world. Those which have equality of opportunity are the more anxious to learn equality of representation than those in which people do not have such opportunity.

Within America it is these two characteristics more than any others which mark the distinction between the advantaged and the disadvantaged as far as we, ourselves, are concerned. So, I find emerging today, with the starting point being Section 7 of the Act of 1935, one of the two cornerstones of this pure democracy. I find emerging an understanding of ourselves and an understanding of freedom which insists that we recognize freedom as something which we must look behind to find its true meaning, and which when we do look behind it discloses equality of representation and education as the two things upon which we build what we really mean as opportunity.

So we mark today the fact that 25 million Americans have had an opportunity for the basic right of representation which they would not otherwise have had. And we say, those few of us from outside this tradition of yours, who have come here as guests, our gratitude to the members, to the staff, present and past, of the National Labor Relations Board who have in their administration of this law, sometimes under great difficulty, acted with the courage of the Nation's convictions . . .

Honorable Robert Taft, Jr., U.S. Representative, Ohio: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, distinguished platform guests and ladies and gentlemen, I shall make only a very few comments but I would like to say that while it is true Mr. Keyserling that you and my father and some others here, may not have agreed on all the points I am sure that the secret ballot is one point upon which my father would have fought, bled and died at any time the question was raised.

The progress that has been made I am sure is not solely due to this but certainly it is a keystone and a keystone which we should never forget which will I am sure remain in our law and should always remain in our law as a most important principle which was established under the Wagner Act and was carried forward under the Taft-Hartley Act. I do appreciate the honor of being here today. And I felt I certainly should be so for I know that if my father were alive he would be here and I hope saying about what I have said. Thank you.

Leon Keyserling, Economist: So much has been said about the contribution of the Wagner Act to our political freedoms and to the peaceful settlement of labor disputes but I would not want to overlook its most important function which was economic in nature. There were reforms and there were recovery measures during the New Deal, and the primary value of the reforms was the effect that they had upon our economic performance after, unfortunately, World War II provided the galvanizing force for complete recovery.

The Wagner Act in its history and the thoughts of its author and sponsor, Senator Wagner, and the events of the times were primarily an effort to redress imbalances in the economy which had occurred in the years prior to the great depression, and which were occurring again under the National Re-

covery Act in the early years of the New Deal, by bringing a more effective, more recognized and more confident force to bear as a third balance wheel, as against the balance wheel of government, with the balance wheel of responsible industry in assuring a just distribution of the national product which would not only be beneficial to workers but be beneficial to their employers and to their government and to what are now two hundred million Americans.

This was the signal contribution of the Wagner Act, and I honestly believe, I hope without any pridefulness, that the Wagner Act, more than any other single measure which has since been enacted was a cornerstone of the greater prosperity, the greater stability, as well as the greater economic justice, and the greater economic freedom which we have since enjoyed.

Acting Under Secretary of Commerce J. Herbert Hollomon: The 25 millionth vote we celebrate today testifies to the magnitude of the job you of the NLRB have done in making democracy work. But that figure alone does not fully describe the scope of your achievement. You have had effect on labor-management relations and on the peace of the labor movement and the business relations for decades.

In the very first year of NLRB, there was an average 80% vote of participation rate. Skeptics might have assumed that this was due mainly to the novelty of insuring employees' free choice, with employees, or perhaps to the rancor and bitterness that too often characterized labor-management relations in the mid-thirties. But during the last year when the Board held no less than 8,324 elections compared to 31 that first year, the average vote of participation rate was a remarkable 90% with a half million voters going to the polling places. Compare this with 62% of eligible voters who cared enough to cast a ballot in the last national election.

Moreover, as a direct result of democracy's leavening effects, the rancor and the bitterness that was commonplace in the thirties has largely disappeared from the industrial scene. The National Labor Relations Act identified a pressing need and provided an effective means for meeting it. Just how effective the Act has been can be seen through the fact that in 1935 almost half the labor disputes in the nation were over union recognition and the right of labor to organize. In 1965 union recognition was a factor in strikes involving less than 3/100 of 1% of the man days worked.

Obviously industrial democracy works, and to the lasting benefit of society at large. The ballot box has established a new basis for industrial relations and collective bargaining. It has helped create conditions in which each union in the labor movement can become a vital and responsible force because its survival depends upon its membership and not on the sponsorship of government or business or some other more powerful group of employers.

The ballot box has led to the establishment of a healthy climate for stable labor relations based on dignity and security. Out of this relationship mutual efforts to solve common problems with technological change and economic growth have become increasingly effective. It is certainly no coincidence that the nation's industrial growth and prosperity have as Mr. Keyserling said, advanced virtually hand in hand with the growing degree of labor management cooperation in the last thirty years. But I think that the prime catalyst of our economic progress has been and continues to be the enlightened cooperation of labor and management in the pursuit of their common goal of economic betterment in which all can share.

To put it another way, without labor management cooperation we most definitely would not have been able to reach the level of national prosperity we now enjoy.

Judge J. Warren Madden, Senior Judge, U.S. Court of Claims: The occasion for this reunion is the celebration of the casting of the 25 millionth ballot in the long series of Labor Board elections. The fact that this mantle fell upon the particular voter who is here today was, of course, completely accidental. It is not inappropriate for me to tell him that my appointment in 1935 as the first chairman of the Labor Board was similarly accidental. The occasion of today's celebration is evidence of the continuity and permanence of an institution which started thirty-two years ago without much prospect even of survival. But it embodied a truly magnificent combination of purposes, those of enabling working people to have more of the material advantages of a good life and also have the independence and self-respect which derives from knowledge that one does not stand alone and insignificant in his dealing with the vital problems of his wages and working conditions.

The Act was a long step forward in the extension of civil liberties to millions of our population.

In the 1937 Labor Board decisions establishing the power of Congress to regulate labor relations because of their effect upon interstate commerce were the germs of ideas which Congress made use of in drafting its history-making Civil Rights Act of 1964, which Act was promptly and unanimously held valid by the Supreme Court. Thus Senator Wagner's objectives of bringing material benefits and social justice to more and more of our population have again been advanced in a manner which would have had the enthusiastic approval of the great Senator, had he been alive in 1964.

As I have said on other occasions, no statute in American history has so completely fulfilled its intended objectives as has the Wagner Act. It is the principal architect of our incredibly affluent society, and has importantly extended civil liberties. Those of us who had the opportunity to keep the project alive when it was young and weak and its survival was in peril, and all of those who have followed and have administered the Act with dedicated fidelity and integrity are entitled to pride and satisfaction. The Act is a fitting monument to a great American.

Arnold Ordman, General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board: We of the NLRB have a bias, an admitted bias—and a strong bias—in favor of the resolution of representation disputes by the technique of free and democratic elections. Our history, our training, our tradition, our experience and the statute itself support that bias. Our resort to alternative methods of determining representation of employees is reluctant and we invoke it only where conduct of the parties has destroyed or impaired the validity of the favored election route.

We take pride, and you can, too, in the fact that resort to all these alternative methods is still a tiny fraction of our activity in this entire area. We take pride in the high degree of voter participation in our elections. Ninety percent of those eligible to cast votes in our elections do cast them. But it would be remiss of me not to give credit to the hundreds and over the years I guess thousands, of dedicated men and women in our Agency who, without regard to time, place, weather, physical inconvenience or hardship, brought the polling place to the voter. This does not detract in any measure from the tribute due the inspiring leadership which this Agency has enjoyed throughout the years starting with Judge Madden. And in this connection and in this frame of reference, I want to pay tribute to our newest member, Sam Zagoria, who is the driving force behind today's program.

And finally, let me pay tribute also to those representatives of management and labor—many of them are here today—those representatives of management and labor—and they are the overwhelming majority in both groups—who have embraced and supported this magnificent experiment in industrial democracy. Without their cooperation, the achievement we are celebrating today could not have happened.

Now others, I am sure, will more eloquently, and certainly with more detachment, narrate the progress we have made from the often bloody, sometimes fatal episodes, which marked labor relations in the latter decades of the last century and the early decades of this century. We aren't wholly without disorder or malfunctions in our industrial order today, but against the panorama even of recent history we have much for which to be grateful.

Let me bid you welcome again in our joint tribute to what I deem another chapter, a thrilling chapter in the history of our unfolding democracy.

John A. Penello, NLRB Regional Director, Baltimore, Md.: I am very proud of the fact that in implementing the representation procedure of the NLRB we brought to a segment of our democracy the secret ballot and a fulfillment of a democratic promise to a section of the country that for a hundred years had been denied a secret ballot. . . . Another satisfaction I have had . . . is in discerning in the faces of thousands and thousands of people who come to vote in (NLRB) elections . . . the sense of deep satisfaction . . . that is in their power with their little pencils and little pieces of paper to decide the issue, and I think that in that moment no matter how humble the voter's surroundings, no matter how humble a man he may be, he feels in that moment that he is indeed a very important man, and you know, I think he really is . . .

THE VALUE OF HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the March 1967 issue of the NEA Journal there appeared a very short statement by Richard D. Alderfer, chairman of the department of speech, at A. D. Eisenhower Senior High School, Norristown, Pa., on the value of high school debate.

I recall with great pleasure my own early participation in this valuable discipline and I commend to my colleagues Mr. Alderfer's comments outlining the values of the discipline.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE VALUE OF HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE

I believe that high school debate training contributes much to the school, the community, and the nation. It does so by preparing articulate citizens who are able to analyze the complicated issues of the day, organize their thoughts on those issues, and express themselves clearly when faced with the question, "What do you think about . . . ?"

Ralph L. Towne, debate director at Temple University, Philadelphia, expresses it this way, "In such a development of ideas, the values can go all the way from making good and lasting friendships for the students to making them much wiser members of society, and either is worthwhile!"

His thoughts reflect those of debate instructors throughout the nation who have promoted debate by organizing debate societies at local, state, and national levels. Students have more opportunities to debate today than at any other time in the fifteen years since I became a debate coach. In

addition to the established programs of larger schools, many senior high schools and some junior high schools, even those with a limited number of students, are beginning to offer and support school debate activities.

One reason that school officials are increasingly ready to support debate is that it commands general respect. Businessmen and professional men as well as teachers realize the importance of preparing students—the future leaders of their community and nation—to research both sides of an issue, evaluate the facts, and come to a sensible conclusion.

Why, then, is debate still missing in so many schools? One of the two most common excuses given is that there is no qualified teacher who can handle it. The other is that no qualified teacher wishes to add extra duties to his already demanding schedule without compensation.

The first reason appears invalid. Many of today's teachers have taken at least a required basic speech course in college. Such a course usually includes not only public speaking but also research procedures and methods of reasoning, both basic components of debate. This background is a starting point, and state and national speech organizations make available the necessary material to help an inexperienced teacher start a program.

Naturally, if the school has a certificated speech teacher, that teacher will have no difficulty organizing a debate course.

The second problem can be solved, in my opinion, by paying a teacher for his work as debate coach. Many high school debate coaches get a stipend ranging from $200 to $600 a year.

Debate has survived many centuries and will continue to do so as long as responsible people want to express themselves clearly on the issues which confront them.

RICHARD D. ALDERFER,
Chairman, Department of Speech, A. D. Eisenhower Senior High School, Norristown, Pa.

UNREST ON THE FARM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the agricultural areas of the United States are today in a turmoil reminiscent of the 1920's and the early 1930's when the Nonpartisan League and the Farmers Holiday Association mushroomed and became leaders of a discontented farm people.

The agricultural income situation has improved some in the past 6 years. Surpluses have been worked off. Total net farm income in 1966 was $16.1 billion compared to $12 billion in 1960. Income per farm at 1966 prices was up from $3,308 to $4,660. A considerable part of that increase was a consequence of a decline in the number of farms from 3,956,000 farms on January 1, 1960, to 3,176,000 farms on January 1, 1967, and the fact that the farm income pie was divided among about 20 percent fewer farmers.

Considering these farm income gains many people are puzzled and confused by the withholding of milk by the members of the National Farmers Organization, by the "Stop Buying" movement endorsed by the National Farmers Union convention in Oklahoma City recently, by the "Parity or Plow" banner raised by some Kansas and Colorado wheatgrowers, by the new surge of protest against meat and dairy imports, low egg prices, weak lamb and mutton markets, and a dozen other specific commodity complaints.

Some observers wonder why farmers are not rejoicing over the elimination of the surpluses. Why are they not celebrating the improvement in total net farm income? Why the unrest? Why the demonstrations in the agricultural areas?

The answer is not difficult to find if one looks below the surface.

It is because tens of thousands of farmers are still going broke, or closing out before going completely broke.

It is because the country newspapers right now are filled with closing-out sale advertisements and the voices of auctioneers are husky from conducting farm auctions.

It is because farmers are being asked to accept a per capita income that is one-third less than the per capita income of the rest of the population.

It is because farming is so economically unattractive that young people are refusing to get into it. The average age of farmers is steadily increasing, and now stands in the middle fifties. Farmers are increasingly only those who are trapped in agriculture by advancing years, training, and investment.

It is because the price of everything the farmer buys keeps going up year after year whereas his prices are below the level of 20 years ago.

It is because after years of hardship and low income attributed to surpluses, with the surpluses now gone, the farmers are being asked to increase their production without any increase in income.

Farm prices have declined from 82 percent of parity in February 1966, to 74 percent of parity in February 1967. They declined 1 percent, but less than a full point on the parity index in March. The Department of Agriculture is predicting that if the producers work harder, produce more wheat and rice and feed grains, risk more capital—provided they can raise it—if they stay in their fields and their dairy barns longer hours, if the weather stays favorable and there are no early freezes, if the drought and winds do not kill their crop in the Great Plains, and if a score of other factors work out favorably—they may be able to keep their incomes in 1967 standing still, and not declining. An Iowa State University economist thinks the Department of Agriculture's view is overly optimistic; that farm income will fall 5 to 8 percent this year regardless of increased output.

There is no hope offered anywhere that if total production goes up as requested, the farmers' net income will take another step up from the inadequate level at which it still remained in 1966.

Back in the 1930's, in the New Deal era when we adopted the parity price concept in agriculture, there were a few of the so-called sons of the wild jackass who opposed the parity formula under consideration because 100 percent of parity price would only produce a per capita farm income of about 60 to 65 percent of the national average per capita income. They were radicals; the more conservative elements felt that the parity price formula proposed would be adequate to keep farmers contented and was enough. The 60 to 65 percent of per capita parity of income concept was adopted. We have revised the old parity price formula some. It has been reduced on some key commodities. Parity price for corn today, for instance, would be $2 per bushel based on the original 1910–14 parity base, but the revisions have brought parity for corn down to $1.60 per bushel, and the farmers are not getting even that for corn.

Overall, farmers were getting 74 percent of revised parity in the market in February of this year—74 percent of a price formula that would give them 60 or 65 percent of per capita income parity. They were getting a little more—5 or 6 percent—in payments. They are not content with it, and in my judgment they are doing this Nation a service in sounding off about it.

Those hotheads who resort to violence are doing a disservice to agriculture. I deplore it and every responsible farm leader deplores it. But here in Washington, we cannot shrug off all responsibility for the deep frustration and discontent that produce these outbreaks.

We clearly recognized our responsibility to the farmers last year when we passed unanimously a concurrent resolution I proposed with the support of more than 40 other Senators instructing all agencies of the Government to forgo any actions which would keep farm prices from rising to parity. The Senate reindorsed the parity price objective which is written into the laws of our country.

But this year, when I introduced S. 7, to lift the level of wheat and feed grain income of farmers a little—to provide 65 cents per bushel export certificates on 35 percent of the wheat crop and to raise the support for corn just 9 cents a bushel to 90 percent of revised parity—I was accused in some quarters of proposing the unattainable.

Senator MILTON YOUNG's proposal to lift wheat price assurances to $2 per bushel average—less than 80 percent of parity—has been characterized in some quarters in the same way. So has the bill by Senators BURDICK, METCALF, and others to add a 25-cent export certificate to the return for all wheat not given domestic marketing certificates.

Let me say that I am in earnest about the objectives of S. 7, as I know the Senators from North Dakota, Montana, and the other States are in earnest. Every one of us believes that the producers who have made this Nation both the best and most economically fed Nation in world history are entitled to just compensation and they are not getting it. Farmers overall were doing better in 1966 than in the middle and late fifties, when 140,000 to 150,000 a year were closing out. But they are still going broke by thousands—101,000 in 1963, 97,000 in 1964, 122,000 in 1965, and 82,000 last year—or hanging on to the land by living on depreciation and other forms of capital. Farm debt is rising. The head of the Farm Credit Administration told the National Farmers Union convention last week that the farm credit agencies have loaned $87 billion to farmers during their

entire existence and that $8.2 billion of it was loaned last year—1966.

This farm credit is not all going into farm enlargement and new machinery to keep up with technological advances. Some of it is going into current living expense. There is some basis in fact for the story told at a recent farm meeting about the farmer who, when asked what he would do if he should inherit a million dollars, replied: "I reckon I would just go on farming as long as it lasted."

What we are witnessing today in agriculture is an expression of protest against what farmers believe is public and Federal acceptance of current low price and income levels as the best we can do; a protest against the philosophy that there is room in agriculture for only a million farmers, so capitalized and equipped that they can get along at price levels below the prices being paid for farm products in 1947—20 years ago.

It cannot be done.

There have been technological advances in industry. Industrial production has been automated. But the prices farmers have to pay for the products of modern, automated, industrial plants are not, and have not, remained constant.

The tractor which cost a farmer $1,910 in 1947 cost him $3,900 on December 15, 1966. The gasoline which cost 20.3 cents per gallon in 1947 now costs 27.7 cents per gallon.

The milking machine which cost $97 20 years ago now costs $155, and in addition to that, most dairy farmers have been required to invest $4,000 or more in bulk milk refrigerating and handling systems in the past two decades to keep their milk eligible for class I markets.

The price of iron pipe which was 25 cents a foot in 1947 is now 47 cents per foot. The price of a three-tine pitchfork in 1947 was $1.73 and they cost $4.76 now.

The only segment of our economy which has been expected to live on lower prices and pay higher costs has been agriculture. It has been asked to pay more and more for the inputs but to pass on as savings any gain it may have achieved in productivity and technology.

There are 780,000 farm houses in rural America today, emptied since January 1, 1960—over 110,000 a year of them—which attest the impossibility of making a living in agriculture at 1947 farm prices and 1967 farm costs.

As the gentleman from Texas, Congressman POAGE, has said, we are asking farmers to equip their farms with expensive 20th-century equipment, but to accept 19th-century prices.

Farmers are entitled to 1967 prices for the commodities they produce, and I expect to press both for administrative actions and for legislation—including the enactment of S. 7 to raise their income on wheat and feed grains—just as effectively as I am able, knowing as I do it that my colleagues in this body are in agreement that 100 percent of parity is the proper farm price goal.

A great deal can be done under existing authorities in present farm laws to raise farm income.

The National Farmers Union recently published a study indicating that, with maximum price supports authorized under existing law, farm income could be increased as much as $4.5 billion.

Not all of those increases are immediately feasible, but there are substantial improvements in farm income possible now without the enactment of further legislation.

Departments other than the Department of Agriculture could be very helpful, if they would. The Department of Defense could confine its purchases of beef, pork, lamb, and mutton to U.S. production. It could start using butterfat instead of substitutes in Vietnam, strengthening the market and reducing the quantities which the Department of Agriculture has had to buy in price support operations.

The Council of Economic Advisers, which unfortunately has had no farm-oriented member in recent years, might well review the propriety of its policy of demanding a freeze on subparity farm prices.

Discontent in agriculture is not going to subside until we end exploitation of our agricultural producers and make them full, 100 percent of parity partners in our affluent society; until we quit making them the scapegoats of every attempt to control inflation, and until we recognize that they are entitled to the same sort of returns as the rest of our citizens on capital, and for labor and management.

There is far more than discontented farmers involved in low farm prices.

Rural communities are immediately involved; their economies deteriorate with the inadequate purchasing power of the farmers. Over a period of years, the Lemmon, S. Dak., Chamber of Commerce has found that for every nine farm closeout sales there is one business closure in town. This does not include the doctors, the dentists, the lawyers—the professional people and service establishment workers—who are forced to move on but can seldom stop at the medium sized towns and cities because they, too, are undergoing a decline in all agribusiness activities.

Ultimately, inadequate farm income is reaching back to the largest urban areas in America, which feel both an influx of migrants and a decline in demand for their industrial products.

The sooner this Nation starts thinking again of achieving full parity prices for farmers, the better off we all will be.

Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Des Moines, Iowa, Register of March 19, 1967, discussing "Farm Discontent" and an article from the March 20, U.S. News & World Report on the same subject, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 19, 1967]

FARM DISCONTENT

The National Farmers Organization is conducting a "milk withholding operation," trying to persuade dairymen to dump their milk in order to bargain for higher prices. The National Farmers Union is conducting a "nationwide voluntary moratorium" on purchases of farm machinery and automobiles to protest the rise in farm costs in relation to prices of farm products. The Iowa Farm Bureau recently sent a delegation to Washington to complain about the decline in prices of farm products and the rise in farm costs.

What's going on here?

Farm income rose to a new high in 1966. The net income of farm operators advanced to a national total of $16 billion, compared with $15 billion the year before. Net income averaged nearly $5,000 per farm, as against $4,500 in 1965. Income per person of the farm population was $1,731 in 1966, a rise from $1,563 in 1965, and amounted to 66 per cent of the income per person of the nonfarm population, compared with 63 per cent in 1965.

The fact that average income of farm people is still only two-thirds that of nonfarm people is the result of the large number of families living on small, inadequate farms. Agriculture still harbors a disproportionate share of the national poverty problem.

But for the full-scale commercial farmers grossing $20,000 a year or more, they never had it so good as in 1966. And it is these folks who belong to farm organizations that are protesting. City dwellers may write this off as chronic farmer complaining, but it is more than that.

Farmers have been watching their prices sag sharply since the middle of last year, while the prices of the things they buy have been staying up. The parity index of the Department of Agriculture (ratio between prices received and prices paid) declined from 82 in February, 1966 to 74 in February, 1967. Livestock prices and most crop prices are down.

The euphoria of last summer, when propaganda about the world food shortage and the rising demand for America's farm output was at a peak, has dampened considerably. The good feeling about the end of the surpluses of grains has turned to a feeling of concern about the future. Farmers have become more conscious of the fact that their surplus capacity problem has not been washed away just by the disappearance of the grain surpluses above ground.

A year ago there was much talk about doing away with the federal farm commodity programs for adjusting supplies and supporting prices. The American Farm Bureau again is proposing to do this through a bill in Congress introduced by Representative Thomas Curtis (Rep. Mo.). However, that idea may not be so popular now, judging by the concern expressed by Iowa Farm Bureau leaders recently.

Department of Agriculture economists recently made a study of the surplus prospects for the years ahead. They consulted economists at leading universities. The conclusion was that net farm income would decline by about $5 billion, or one-third, from now to 1970 if federal farm programs were abandoned. Prices of corn would fall to 70 cents a bushel, and livestock prices would drop 10 per cent.

Farmers are not just being perverse. They have long memories, and the recent price declines have brought back some of the more unpleasant ones.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 20, 1967]

WHERE LOW PRICES ARE CAUSING TROUBLE FOR JOHNSON

(Talk of revolt is rumbling through the farm States. It comes on the heels of farmers' best year in a long time.

(Now prices have dropped and farmers are beginning to wonder if they have become the victims of a cheap-food policy.)

CHICAGO.—A cloud of discontent, portend-

ing trouble for President Johnson and the Democrats in 1968, is spreading across the prairies of mid-America.

The approach of spring and a new planting season finds farmers increasingly bitter about sagging farm prices, soaring farm costs, and a rising tide of farm products imported from abroad.

Prices for farm products have been falling virtually across the board.

The chart on this page tells a part of the story. [Not in RECORD.]

But it is when you talk to farmers themselves that you sense the depth of their resentment.

Discontent has reached the rebellion stage in the Great Plains. There, wheat farmers have organized a Parity Wheat Producers Association and are threatening to plow under the 30 per cent increase in wheat acreage that they were encouraged to plant by the Johnson Administration.

May ultimatum. Under the slogan, "Parity or plow," 500 Kansas and Colorado wheat farmers have given the Government until May 1 to guarantee them higher prices for this year's wheat crop.

"We think that gives them plenty of time in Washington to make up their minds," says R. M. Hough of Fort Morgan, Colo., president of the new organization. Requested is Government action to boost the national-average price for wheat to $2.56 a bushel, which would be the parity price for wheat.

Parity, a goal of farmers since Depression days, is a level of farm prices determined by a federal formula to be fair to farmers in relation to prices they have to pay for nonfarm products.

In the corn belt, cattle feeders say that the cost-price squeeze has drained the profit right out of their business.

"At the best we're breaking even, and at the worst we're losing around $50 a head," says Kenneth Thatcher, a Cumming, Ia., cattle feeder who is also secretary of the Iowa Farm Bureau.

Ronald Bartlett, who fattens around 3,000 head of catle a year in his lots at Rockwell City, Ia., gives this description of the cost-price squeeze:

"Last year, I sold a load of fat heifers for $27 a hundredweight. Last week, I got $23.75 for the same kind of cattle. Corn is costing me more than it did a year ago. My labor costs are up by 15 to 20 per cent. I'm paying a full 1 per cent higher interest rate on borrowed money."

Corn maintains price. Corn is one commodity that promises to hold up in price. At present, as shown in the chart, it is below the peak reached in 1966. That peak, however, came just before harvest when supplies are lowest. The average price in February this year was 6 cents higher than in February, 1966.

Revolt is brewing, too, among dairy farmers. Prices paid to them for milk have dropped sharply.

The National Farmers Organization is reported to be adding many dairy farmers to its membership in a campaign leading up to an organized withholding of milk from markets.

The NFO has organized similar withholding actions among Midwestern hog raisers and cattle feeders in recent years. There is dispute over the success of these campaigns, but there is no question that enough farmers have been involved to disrupt marketing to some extent.

Costs keep climbing. Don Quale, a dairy farmer near Madison, Wis., tells how feed costs have kept climbing and says:

"You can make a profit only if you have good luck. Hard luck, such as loss of a cow, can throw you."

Trouble in the dairy business is reported everywhere. Dwight Morris, a dairy farmer near Siloam Springs, Ark., tells this story:

"My feed costs have gone up 12 per cent in the past year. My tax bill goes up $100 to $200 every year. I've had to raise my hired man's pay by $10 a week. Detergents used to clean equipment are up a dollar per 25 pounds. Price of disinfectant has gone from $3.25 to $3.85 a gallon."

Mr. Morris farms on a large scale, milking an average of 120 cows. He says his capital investment is $200,000.

While costs are rising, prices are dropping, reports Mr. Morris. Like most dairy farmers, he belongs to a co-operative that markets members' milk under a federal milk-marketing order. Under the order in effect for his co-operative, says Mr. Morris, the price he gets for his milk is scheduled to drop by around 75 cents a hundredweight between January and August of this year.

Fear of drought. Falling prices are being compounded by a threat of drought in many parts of the farm belt. The dry weather is reported most severe in wheat country.

"From the Rio Grande to Canada, it is terrifically dry," says John Coolidge, farm-management specialist at Kansas State University in Manhattan. "Kansas had only half its normal moisture last year, and there's been practically nothing since then."

Elmer A. Bryant, farmer near Dighton, Kans., says that there has been no moisture in his area, except for a little snow in December, since the winter wheat crop was seeded in September.

"The pinch is really on now," says Mr. Bryant, "Last September we were getting $1.80 a bushel here for wheat. Then it dropped to $1.40. Now it's climbed back up to about $1.50."

Meanwhile, Mr. Bryant's costs have kept going up. He says:

"A thousand bushels of wheat used to buy a tractor or new car. Now it only makes the down payment. It's hard to understand what is happening. I feel Government meddling is responsible for our price situation."

A changed outlook. A few months ago, the outlook for wheat farmers was the best in years. The surpluses that had hung over their market were gone, largely because of exports to India to relieve hunger there. Prices were rising at harvest time when they normally drop. The President had ordered an increase of more than 30 per cent in the acreage farmers could plant to wheat and still be eligible for price guarantees.

Now, unless drought cuts the crop, a record-breaking wheat harvest of 1.5 billion bushels or more is in prospect. At the same time, wheat production in Canada and Australia is up considerably, and the world-market price for wheat is under pressure.

Farm-State Congressmen are pressing the White House to give farmers a higher price for their wheat. Senator George McGovern, South Dakota Democrat, says that asking farmers to fight the war on hunger at prevailing prices is "like sending marines to fight the war in Vietnam after cutting their pay and limiting their equipment to avoid an increase in consumer prices."

Much of the farm resentment is found to trace to rising imports of beef and dairy products. The volume of beef imports is nearing the point where quotas will be invoked under a law passed by Congress in 1964.

Farm leaders say that the White House is standing by while a flood of imported dairy products drives U.S. milk prices down. If it were not for this, they maintain, the price of milk would be rising because U.S. output has been cut sharply by the exodus of so many dairy farmers from the business.

The dairy crisis. The situation, according to W. D. Knox, editor of "Hoard's Dairyman" at Fort Atkinson, Wis., is this: U.S. milk production has dropped by around 4 billion pounds a year. But imports of dairy products tripled from the equivalent of 900 million pounds of milk in 1965 to 2.7 billion pounds in 1966, and could go as high as 4 billion pounds this year. Much of the imported material is coming from the Common Market countries of Europe and is made possible by heavy subsidy from governments of those countries.

Dairy-State Congressmen say that the White House is reluctant to clamp down on the dairy imports for fear of jeopardizing tariff negotiations now under way with European nations at Geneva. Nearly 100 Senators and Representatives are backing a bill to place import quotas on dairy products into the U.S.

Complaints are coming, too, from Florida, where a bumper crop of oranges has dropped prices so low that citrus growers are reported giving fruit to people willing to pick it.

The outlook for corn-belt farmers is not without some bright spots, according to William B. Sayre, manager of rural real estate for the Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company in Chicago. His size-up:

"Corn and soybean producers had one of their most profitable years in 1966. Hog producers have come through two years of record profits. Cattle feeders have not been as fortunate. They should see some improvement during the next half of the year. Hog farmers should not expect the return of highly profitable hog-corn ratios until mid-July."

Income drop predicted. Gene ———, Iowa State University economist, predicts that 1967 farm income in Iowa and in the U.S. as a whole will be from 5 to 8 per cent below that of 1966.

It is this outlook that is spreading discontent across the prairies. Last year, the farm income reached the highest level since 1948. Farmers had reason to believe that they might be headed up the economic ladder after long years on the bottom rungs.

Even in the glow of last year's relatively good times, farmers became unhappy with the Administration when President Johnson and Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman appeared to blame them for rising food costs.

Now, with farm prices and income sagging, many farmers are convinced that the White House is following a deliberate cheap-food policy. It is a situation that Democratic farm-State leaders in Congress are warning could lead to more trouble for their party in 1968.

Why farmers are grumbling

Prices received by farmers for—	1966 peak	Latest
Wheat (per bushel)	$1.74 (July)	$1.49, down 14.4 percent.
Corn (per bushel)	$1.35 (September)	$1.26, down 6.7 percent.
Cattle (per hundredweight)	$24.00 (March)	$21.60, down 10 percent.
Hogs (per hundredweight)	$27.30 (January)	$18.80, down 31.1 percent.
Milk (per hundredweight)	$5.40 (October)	$5.07, down 6.1 percent.
Eggs (per dozen)	42.5 cents (September)	32.4 cents, down 23.8 percent.
Chickens (per pound)	17.4 cents (March)	15.4 cents, down 11.5 percent.
Oranges (per box)	$2.87 (October)	76 cents, down 73.5 percent.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Over all, the drop in farm prices has amounted to 7.4 per cent from the 1966 peak reached in August, to mid-February, 1967, when latest figures of U.S. Department of Agriculture were compiled.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ESTHER PETERSON

Mr. HART. Mr. President, no one who watched her at work as Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, would be surprised that Mrs. Esther Peterson earned the admiration of many.

The special qualities—and the tremendous amount of energy—she dedicated to that role were portrayed well by Marion Meade in the April 1967 issue of Coronet.

"The Consumers' Friend on Capitol Hill" begins with the statement:

It is possible that 1966 will be remembered in the annals of U.S. business history as the Year of the Consumer.

Indeed it well might. And if so, Mrs. Peterson will have had much to do with that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Coronet article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

ESTHER PETERSON: THE CONSUMERS' FRIEND ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Marion Meade)

It is possible that 1966 will be remembered in the annals of U.S. business history as the Year of the Consumer.

Housewife boycotts of supermarkets, debate, and legislation on dozens of issues including auto safety, packaging, and retail credit, and a movement to create a cabinet-level Department of Consumers may not have added up to rebellion on the part of 198-million American consumers but certainly indicated a new and unprecedented national concern.

This growing awareness pleases no one more than a sixty-year-old former schoolteacher and labor lobbyist who bears the title of Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs.

Esther Eggertsen Peterson calls herself a housewife and mother, which indeed she is. But that is only part of her story. Not only is she the highest-ranking woman official in the federal government but possibly the most influential woman in Washington and, by virtue of the vigorous manner in which she handles her job, the most controversial as well. President Kennedy, who first appointed her to office back in 1961, wished there were two of her. Her opponents in business and advertising think that even a single Esther Peterson is one too many.

At an age when most people begin to slow down, the energetic Mrs. Peterson just seems to be swinging into high gear. "When my mother was sixty, I thought she was completely finished," she laughs. "I'm finding that I don't feel a bit old."

As the holder of two government posts she is fond of saying that she wears two hats, one of them as an Assistant Secretary of Labor responsible for administering the Fair Labor Standards Act. Yet she is better known by her second hat, acting as the consumer's representative in Washington or, as she once baldly phrased it, "guardian of the gullible."

Into her office each week stream hundreds of complaining letters as well as concrete examples of buyers' displeasure, such as jars with false bottoms, misleading labels, and empty food cartons. Some correspondents don't even know her name but that does not seem to deter them. Framed and hung in the foyer to her office is an envelope addressed to "That Woman President Johnson Appointed to Look Out for the Consumers, Washington, D.C." It arrived without delay.

"That Woman" has been known to enter a supermarket with a slide rule to dramatically demonstrate some of the difficulties facing housewives (and house-husbands). In her opinion, today's consumer has to be "a mathematician, chemist, mechanic, nutritionist, accountant, electrician and—sometimes I think—a Houdini."

And in a speech which undoubtedly won her few friends in the packaging industry, she charged that "it is time for consumers to be given the full truth about the comparative costs and contents of all these brightly colored, oddly shaped, fractionally priced, hermetically sealed things in today's market."

Mrs. Peterson and her Committee on Consumer Interests have little actual power. She makes recommendations to the President, testifies at Congressional hearings, and organizes consumer conferences. Perhaps her most important task, though, is to make consumers aware of their rights by encouragement, education, and advice.

She did not, as some people mistakenly imagine, organize the supermarket boycotts last fall. Nor did she even believe that the boycotts would result in a permanent lowering of food prices. Yet she did defend the housewives' right to picket, contributed moral support, advice, sympathy, and in some cases her physical presence. When she began her job four years ago she found consumers to be silent, timid, unorganized, and complacently fatalistic. "We women have been raised to be polite, to feel that aggressiveness isn't feminine or right," she points out. "But now I think there's been a great awakening. Over and again women say to me, 'Oh Esther, I've become so conscious of my shopping. For the first time I'm reading labels and asking questions.' "

One of Mrs. Peterson's favorite tips to shoppers is, if a purchase is faulty, take it back to the merchant. In one case her advice unexpectedly came home to roost. A housewife approached her in a District of Columbia supermarket and asked, "You're Mrs. Peterson, aren't you? I want to return this spoiled bag of potatoes and I wonder if you mind standing next to me while I speak to the manager?" Mrs. Peterson obligingly stood by while the potatoes were exchanged. "Of course the manager would have been courteous to her anyway—I told her he wouldn't bite her. They don't deliberately put rotten potatoes or oranges in bags but these things happen in mass production." And she adds, "I think the consumer has a tremendous responsibility to be reasonable."

Much of Esther Peterson's success has been due to her personality. She has an abundance of enthusiasm, a tendency to be idealistic, and a fervent belief that the consumer should be "heard and heeded," instead of being "had." As a veteran Washington lobbyist, she is well aware that practically every special-interest group is organized to exert strong influence upon legislation. "In contrast, the consumer's interest is so widely diversified and disorganized that its voice is barely heard above a whisper in many, many cases," she says.

Her fans are legion. Former Senator Paul Douglas calls her "remarkable and inspiring," a woman who "knows her stuff and is not afraid of anybody." A housewife from Ohio summed her up thus: "I felt I could talk to her just as I would to my next-door neighbor."

A newspaper report once described her as "toothy and plain as a glass of water." If she is not Marlene Dietrich, one hardly notices because her face is animated and her manner bubbling. Tall and simply dressed, she has white hair which is wispy around her face and pulled back tightly into a coronet. Her blue eyes sparkle and her complexion looks fresh and healthy. She radiates good humor, good sense, and unaffected charm.

Housewives probably take to her so quickly because it's readily apparent she is no phony and she talks their language. Disdaining bureaucratic jargon, she gets right down to business and says what she thinks. Senator Philip Hart feels that one factor which allowed enactment of his Truth in Packaging Bill last year was Mrs. Peterson's help in communicating with the nation's housewives. "One of her greatest strengths is her ability to express complex issues in accurate language that everyone can understand," explained the Senator.

Mrs. Peterson believes that firsthand experience is her best teacher. For example, she does her own marketing. "I've been doing it all my life," she states emphatically. "It's not a new thing I do because of this job." Previously she shopped at one or two markets near her home in the northwest section of Washington. Now she patronizes additional ones in order "to shop around." She confesses that she's been asking questions in supermarkets for years, except that now the clerks and managers know who she is.

And does the President's special assistant save trading stamps? "Well, of course I do," she grinned. "Because, after all, we pay for them. What's so annoying is that I have a drawer full of stamps and no time to paste them into the books."

In the nation's capital Mrs. Peterson is regarded with affection and admiration by her friends, an element of amazement by her staff, and respect by her adversaries. Even those who fiercely disagree with her opinions admit that "she's no ogre." Her capacity to hold down two jobs at once and her unusual energy and poise prompted one congressman to call her "a female Sargent Shriver."

Congressman Joseph Resnick recalls that he arranged for her to address a group of women in his New York district during the last election campaign. Over two hundred women were expected to attend the breakfast meeting. "Well, as sometimes happens, about twenty-five women actually showed up," said Representative Resnick. "Quite frankly, if this had happened to me I don't know how I would have reacted. But she came through like a real pro and delivered an excellent forty-five-minute talk with the same verve and enthusiasm that she would have used for an audience ten times the size. If she was annoyed or disappointed, she did not show it."

Her speaking schedules for both her jobs involve a considerable amount of traveling. Although she is forced to turn down dozens of invitations, she still seems to be constantly on the move, making cross-country jaunts, changing planes in the middle of the night, and returning to her office full of pep. "I don't know how she does it," comments an aide at least twenty-five years her junior, shaking his head. "She seems to thrive on it."

Born Esther Eggertsen in Provo, Utah, she was raised on a small farm of ten acres where her family produced most of their own food. She had six brothers and sisters but the household seemed larger because her mother took in boarders.

"I don't ever recall sitting down to a table with less than twelve people," she reminisced. Since she was not overly fond of housework, she was assigned farm chores. Later in high

school and college she worked as a fruit picker.

The fact that her father was superintendent of county schools played an important role in Mrs. Peterson's decision to be a teacher. Upon graduating from Brigham Young University, she came east to New York City to get a master's degree from Columbia Teachers College. After teaching in New Jersey and Massachusetts schools, she married Oliver Peterson in 1932 and, through him, became interested in labor and politics.

In the 1930's she took a job as assistant director of education with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and subsequently served as the union's lobbyist in Washington. During much of the time she was meeting the twin demands of a full-time job and raising four children. In 1948 the family went overseas when Mr. Peterson was appointed labor attaché to the U.S. Embassy in Sweden. Later they lived in Belgium. Upon returning home in 1957 she became a lobbyist for the AFL–CIO's industrial union department.

Prior to her years abroad, however, she had become acquainted with a young congressman named Jack Kennedy and had worked with him on increasing the minimum wage law. Back in Washington after the ten-year absence, she was hurrying down a hall in the Senate one day when she heard a voice yell: "Esther, Esther, where have you been?" Once again she found herself working with Kennedy, who was by then a senator. Therefore it was not surprising that when he became President, he thought of her to head the Labor Department's Women's Bureau and soon afterwards appointed her an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Three years later, President Johnson gave her the additional duty of running his newly created Consumer Interests Committee.

When in Washington, her day ordinarily begins at 6:00 a.m. After a good husky breakfast, she reads three newspapers, including the comics, before driving downtown in either the family Volkswagen or Chevy station wagon. Her first stop at 8:15 is usually her office at the Labor Department. Later in the day she switches hats and departs for the Executive Office Building next door to the White House where the Consumer Interests office is located. (Incidentally, she receives an annual salary of $27,000 as Assistant Secretary of Labor but nothing additional for her duties as a Presidential assistant.)

Most of her mail from consumers is deadly serious, toned with irritation. Since the supermarket boycotts, mail has increased, particularly from people asking for advice. Every letter receives a reply, and Mrs. Peterson and her assistant, Jean Wittman, often suggest that a complaint be sent directly to the manufacturer of a product, a procedure which brings rectification in many cases.

Most of the gripes sent in by consumers echo Mrs. Peterson's own personal pet peeves. For example, she gets mad at the confusing superlatives used to designate package sizes. "Nonsense terms," she dubs them and tells of a husband who wrote that he had been instructed to buy a large box of soap powder. He came home with the Large Size, which actually was Medium, and found out his wife really had meant Giant Size.

A woman sent in a label from a can of peaches bearing the words, "Average Servings . . . Six-Seven," Her accompanying note demanded, "This can contained only five peach halves which were literally swimming in juice. Can you visualize the seventh average serving?"

Other practices which arouse Mrs. Peterson's ire are meaningless bargains, such as "cents off" deals (cents off what? she wants to know) and the habit of pricing food by fractions and requiring shoppers to do some fancy mental arithmetic to figure out the best buy. Another gripe: supermarkets which display gum and candy at children's eye level near the checkout counters. She sympathizes with the mother of five who wages a continual battle and wrote in comic despair: "If I lose my mind, I know it will be found at the supermarket checkout counter."

The fact that Mrs. Peterson takes serious note of what she considers to be abuses—and publicizes her objections in a loud and clear voice—has won her the wrath of certain groups. There is no doubt that she has stepped on a few toes. Last year she told an annual meeting of the Better Business Bureau International, many of whose members take exception to her views, that a businessman friend proposed she be made ambassadress to Upper Volta—because at that moment he couldn't think of a country farther away.

Whether or not this story is true, Mrs. Peterson *has* been characterized as "the most pernicious threat to advertising today" by the Advertising Federation of America. She also has crossed swords with officials at Campbell's Soup, Procter and Gamble, and General Foods, and provoked an emotional attack from Herbert Mayes, director of the McCall Corporation. He patronizingly described her as "a kindly lady", and added, "I don't believe that because her heart is in the right place she necessarily knows how to reform the marketplace." And Mr. Mayes went on to say: "If I were one of the recently boycotted supermarkets, I would consider taking to the courts my case against anybody who endorsed the boycott and thereby caused me loss of business and reputation for no rhyme or reason."

Mrs. Peterson's reaction to criticism is this: "It would bother me if I had done anything dishonest. But having been appointed to this job, I have to carry it out to the best of my judgment; if I'm doing it wrong, then the President will say so."

Personal attacks, in particular, don't worry her. "I like my criticism straight," she remarks. "My real trouble is with people who prejudge, who feel that if they silence me the problem will go away. The problem will *not* go away. It will only be solved by bringing complaints out into the open."

A GREAT STEP FORWARD: POPE PAUL'S ENCYCLICAL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the English translation released by the Vatican of the encyclical of Pope Paul VI, "Populorum Progressio," "On Development of Peoples," released on March 28, 1967, is an historic commentary on economic and social conditions in our world today. His Holiness has pointed up the urgent need for the rich—countries and people—to help the poor—countries and people—by specifically stating:

> In brief, to seek to do more, know more and have more in order to be more; that is what men aspire to now when a greater number of them are condemned to live in conditions that make this lawful desire illusory.

And so we find ourselves today as we search for ways to make meaningful the quality of man's life on earth and as we seek to aline the world's food supply and the world's population.

"Populorum Progressio" in part I entitled "For Man's Complete Development" in the portion devoted to "programs and planning" contains paragraph 37 on "Demography." In this paragraph His Holiness has taken a most important step forward in meeting the population problems of the world.

Pope Paul says that it is proper for government to take an interest in the population crisis.

Let me quote the complete text of the encyclical paragraph on demography:

> 37. DEMOGRAPHY
>
> It is true that too frequently an accelerated demographic increase adds its own difficulties to the problems of development: The size of the population increases more rapidly than available resources, and things are found to have reached apparently an impasse. From that moment the temptation is great to check the demographic increase by means of radical measures. It is certain that public authorities can intervene, within the limit of their competence, by favoring the availability of appropriate information and by adopting suitable measures, provided that these be in conformity with the moral law and that they respect the rightful freedom of married couples. Where the inalienable right to marriage and procreation is lacking, human dignity has ceased to exist. Finally, it is for the parents to decide, with full knowledge of the matter, on the number of their children, taking into account their responsibilities toward God, themselves, the children they have already brought into the world, and the community to which they belong. In all this they must follow the demands of their own conscience enlightened by God's law authentically interpreted, and sustained by confidence in Him.

This is the first time that the head of the Roman Catholic Church has said in a papal encyclical that government has the right to concern itself about birth control. Thus, it is clear from this papal statement that it has now become the Catholic Church's official position that government has a legitimate interest in the field.

Men of good will welcome this statement.

It removes the doubt expressed by Mr. William B. Ball of Harrisburg, Pa., who as general counsel for the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference presented testimony at the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures hearings on the population crisis on August 24, 1965. At that time Mr. Ball testified with the approval of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. He said further research upon population growth was welcome, but he expressed concern about dangers to civil liberties were the Government to enter the field. Mr. Ball expressed his fear that coercion would result.

That fear was shared by the American bishops of the church, and in November of last year their fear was expressed in a written, public comment.

Repeatedly in committee hearings, I have stressed its opposition to coercion in any form.

The full text of such a statement I made on November 15, 1966, was:

> STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, DEMOCRAT OF ALASKA, CHAIRMAN, GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES, NOVEMBER 15, 1966
>
> In response to your question for comment on the Bishops' birth control statement, I would say that throughout the hearings of

the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Government Operations Committee the emphasis of the subcommittee has been wholly on coordination and dissemination of information. Certainly coercion should never be used and this was repeatedly affirmed by the chairman. What is sought is that all people should have access to this information and thereafter freedom of choice both as to whether they wish to receive information on the subject of birth control or not and, having received it, whether they wish to utilize it by any of the various methods available. This should be entirely within the realm of the individual's freedom of choice, and all efforts to impose either one method of birth control or another or not to use any such method should be left wholly to the individual and should be in keeping with his or her own individual beliefs and conscience.

So let us move forward as Pope Paul VI suggests. Let us discuss the problem areas and solve them while there is time.

His Holiness has not authorized any change in what are the acceptable contraceptive methods for Catholics, but as one outstanding lay member of the church stated when the encyclical was made public, and I quote from a New York Times news story, Dr. John Rock, the noted Catholic gynecologist, the inventor of "the pill," is reported as saying:

Oh, perfect! That's just what I've been hoping they would say. Parental responsibility and the supremacy of conscience—that's an excellent way to satisfy the Old Guard as well as the young. Now I'm free to go and fight other battles.

The dialog on population problems, of course, continues. It must, and we may hope that the Washington Post is correct editorially in its April 4 issue, when it states:

A later papal pronouncement is expected to deal with the birth control question in greater detail.

That decision or commentary remains for the future. The important fact at this point in history is the confirmation by the highest authority of the Catholic Church that government has the legitimate right to concern itself about birth control.

POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I read with a great deal of interest an article written by Prof. Jed Arthur Cooper, assistant professor of education at North Texas State University, Denton, Tex., which appeared in the March 1967 NEA Journal under the caption, "Mugwump or Full Participant?"

Professor Cooper, a former Utah State legislator, in short compass, has set forth his recommendation to his educational colleagues regarding political responsibility. Dr. Cooper's views parallel those I have frequently given to groups of educators in which I stressed the importance of citizen-statesmanship on the part of the teaching profession. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of teachers everywhere.

It is my hope that those who read the article in the educational professions will consider carefully the points raised by Dr. Cooper in order that they can become knowledgeable and full participants in the political process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have alluded printed in the RECORD.

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

MUGWAMP OR FULL PARTICIPANT?

(By Jed Arthur Cooper, assistant professor of education, North Texas State University, Denton; former high school teacher and former Utah State legislator)

Many of us teachers dutifully appear at the polls every election, compliment ourselves on our good citizenship, and criticize those who failed to vote. But how many of us are *full* participants in the electoral process?

Do you, for example, attend the precinct-level organizational meetings of your political party? If not, you have no say in the selection of persons to direct your party at the grass-roots level. Nor do you use your only opportunity to help select delegates to your party's county convention, which chooses delegates to the state convention, which—in a presidential election year—selects delegates to the national convention.

In the states which do not hold primaries, convention delegates have sole responsibility for choosing their party's nominees. In states with combination convention-primary systems, convention delegates narrow their party's field of candidates to two for each office. The two then oppose each other in the primary, with the winner being certified as the party's nominee in the general election.

Even in states with primary-runoff systems, convention delegates must certify the nominees selected by the voters in the primaries. Obviously, failure to participate in party functions at the grass-roots level is tantamount to surrendering one's opportunity to influence the decision about candidates whose names will appear on the general election ballot.

As an election approaches, we often hear, "I don't like either candidate," or "It's just a matter of choosing the lesser of two evils." Seldom have people who say these things attended the precinct meetings or participated in any of the party nominating processes. Why, then, should they complain about the alternatives offered them?

A common excuse for not participating in partisan activities is that "politics is dirty." If this is so, it is because upstanding citizens have refused to become involved. A large number of people prefer to remain independent, to "vote for the man." Such an attitude, I believe, denotes a lack of understanding of our electoral system. Political parties are essential. The chances are extremely remote that a person could be elected a governor, a congressman, or, in most cases, even a county official without first receiving a party nomination. The independent finds himself voting for a party nominee he has not helped select.

Some contend that party affiliation doesn't matter because the two parties don't really differ—"They are like Tweedledee and Tweedledum." Actually, the two parties have significant ideological differences, though it requires honest effort to become knowledgeable about them. Only by carefully studying the parties' histories and recent platforms and the statements of their present leaders can one recognize the real differences.

Even more difficult than discovering party differences is developing one's own political philosophy. What should be the role and scope of the different levels of government? What functions should remain exclusively within the private sector of our economy? Is deficit spending desirable or undesirable? After answering many questions like these to one's personal satisfaction, one can and should join the party most nearly representative of his own beliefs.

The full participant devotes some time and money, however limited, to his party and its candidates. He attends the precinct-level meetings, is willing to serve occasionally as a convention delegate, and may even become a candidate for public office.

The above is not a plea for straight-ticket voting. If the other party's candidate for a particular office seems superior, one has to vote for him in order to be true to one's conscience. This is especially true in local elections where ideological differences are less important than professional competencies.

Traditionally, teachers have shunned partisan political activity.* Some say it is because such activity is discouraged by their principal, superintendent, or local board. Surely all public school administrators accept the premise that teachers are supposed to teach good citizenship and that example is the most effective method. Probably some teachers have misinterpreted their administrators' sound directives to avoid political partisanship in the classroom as being a prohibition of political activity as a private citizen.

Between now and November 1968, won't you do your homework on our political system? Won't you quit the ranks of the mugwumps and become a knowledgeable, full participant?

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the people of South Dakota are working hard to develop their resources of land and water; 96 percent of the State is covered by soil and water conservation districts, and some 40,000 farmers and ranchers are SWCD cooperators. More than 1,800 of these cooperators joined in the last year alone.

These men and women are actively applying such conservation measures as terracing—580 miles in 1966 alone—grassed waterways, irrigation water management, improved grasslands, windbreak tree plantings, and so on. Approximately 40 percent of the agricultural land is under a basic conservation plan, and during the past year more than 132,000 acres of cropland were converted to pasture and hayland.

The Great Plains conservation program is of special interest in the western half of South Dakota. This is a long-term accelerated conservation plan, administered by the Soil Conservation Service, and tailored to the special climatic hazards of high winds and low rainfall found in the area.

Over 1,000 farmers and ranchers have signed Great Plains contracts covering about 4 million acres of land. This is land that, when rightly used, can be pro-

* NEA Teacher-Opinion Polls indicate rapid change in teachers' belief about their place in politics. In 1956, only 33 percent thought teachers should be active in political elections. In 1960, 50 percent said *yes*, they should, and in 1964, 67 percent.

ductive. The havoc caused by its unwise use is a vivid memory to all South Dakotans who lived through the "dirty thirties" and who saw part of their land and their future blow away with the wind.

When drought comes to the Great Plains again, we will be better prepared through the work of these men.

Irrigation is assuming more importance in South Dakota each year. As the Oahe irrigation development project of 190,000 acres becomes a reality, there will be a need for technical assistance to irrigators developing land in the area.

The challenge of improving the economic and social environment is also taking shape in larger forms in my State. Thirty-three small watershed Public Law 566 projects, wholly or partly in South Dakota, are in some stage between application and completion. Eleven of these are either completed or in the construction stage. All of them were organized by local people. In every case, soil conservation districts were among the sponsors.

These small watershed projects reduce flood hazards and, in some cases, provide for water supply, water-based recreation, and wildlife development. Land improvement in the watershed to reduce erosion and sedimentation is also a part of the program.

River basin studies were completed on the James River Basin last year and are now underway on the Big Sioux River Basin. These will be the basis for realistic development plans of the area's resources.

Soil surveys are also a basic tool for good land planning. About 35.2 million acres in the State have been surveyed, but only about half of this total are the new, multipurpose soil surveys. About 1.7 million acres were surveyed last year. An increase in funds and personnel to speed up the soil mapping would be desirable.

A Black Hills area resource study is being made jointly by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. The final report has now been released. The Black Hills area has great potential for development, and it seems wise to make coordinated plans for this development now, rather than wait until unplanned expansion threatens the scenic beauties and outdoor attractions upon which its appeal is based.

A special project is the Bon Homme-Charles Mix resource conservation and development project. This is a locally initiated and sponsored long-term project covering more than a million acres in the southeast part of the State. Its aim is to improve economic and social opportunities for the people by improving their land base.

The area has rough, broken terrain and severe erosion. Over two-thirds of the cropland is periodically damaged by wind and water, and almost 2 million tons of sediment yearly enter the lakes and rivers.

Projects in the Bon Homme-Charles Mix project include the conversion of unsuitable cropland to other uses, flood protection, irrigation, and income-producing recreational projects. Recreation is particularly promising because of the number of lakes and water areas, the location, and the expected development of a scenic highway.

An estimated increase in net income of $600,000 in the first 3 years should be one result of the project's better use of land and water. Perhaps more than most people, South Dakotans know that to improve our land is to improve the life of our men and women, too.

The Bon Homme-Charles Mix resource conservation and development project is not piecemeal, not easy, and essentially not "government." I commend the vision and foresight of its local leaders.

Outdoor recreation is a growing business all over South Dakota. We have the Black Hills, pheasant hunting, water-based sports, room to breathe, and the unpolluted air which makes breathing a pleasure. Recreation, too, is a land "crop" which depends upon conservation.

Outdoor beauty is also a byproduct of such conservation measures as stripcropping, windbreaks, farm ponds, and contour fields. One of the happier facts of life is that beauty and good land use are do-it-yourself projects that come with the same set of instructions.

No area of South Dakota lacks the potential for growth and improvement through resource development. But it takes local leadership, a recognition of each community's special assets, an analysis of its needs, and the development of plans to fit the needs and resources together. It also takes enthusiasm, imagination, cooperation and hard work.

The members of South Dakota's 69 soil and water conservation districts have these personal qualities in abundance. I have met many district leaders, and I am always impressed by their dedication to the unpaid but essential task of wise land use. I salute them, and through them, all of South Dakota's men and women who are making our State a better place in which to live.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following documents showing detailed accomplishment data be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Some conservation accomplishments in districts with SCS assistance in South Dakota

BASIC DATA

	Unit	Amount
Districts organized to Feb. 1, 1967	Number	69
Do	Acre	47,020,808
Farms in districts organized	Number	55,243
Farmland in districts organized.	Acre	43,421,950

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS FUNDS, CUMULATIVE TO JUNE 30, 1966

	Unit	Amount
Soil surveys completed	Acre	31,707,656
Basic plans	Number	26,828
Do	Acre	18,332,561
Total district cooperators	Number	39,828
Do	Acre	29,877,271

Some practices applied	Unit	Applied fiscal year 1966	On the land June 30, 1966 [1]
Conservation cropping system.	Acre	804,592	8,678,578
Contour farming	do	32,672	533,702
Cover and green manure crop.	do	36,326	1,333,820
Crop residue use	do	680,050	8,700,926
Stripcropping	do	51,915	1,142,321
Range seeding	do	1,983	115,422
Pasture and hayland planting.	do	156,679	1,664,281
Wildlife development.	do	1,547	54,327
Wildlife preservation.	do	19,142	216,471
Field windbreak	Mile	407	5,409
Tree planting	Acre	4,547	139,707
Farm ponds	Number	2,825	72,471
Terraces	Mile	377	6,225
Diversions	do	21	829
Open drains	do	42	5,877
Tile drains	Linear foot.	3,751	10,977,516
Irrigation water management.	Acre	3,913	76,301
Irrigation storage reservoir.	Number	1	247
Irrigation system, sprinkler.	do	15	292
Land clearing	Acre	24	12,025

[1] All programs.

GREAT PLAINS PROGRAM

Item	Unit	Fiscal year 1966	To date June 30, 1966
Great Plains applications received.	Number	216	1,343
Do	Acre	572,964	4,363,024
Great Plains contracts signed.	Number	185	1,055
Do	Acre	525,045	3,502,940
Great Plains contract modifications.	Number	864	4,449
Cropland before Great Plains contract.	Acre	73,441	445,893
Planned cropland conversions on Great Plains contracts.	do	26,891	144,322

Resource conservation and development program—Bon Homme-Charles Mix R.C. & D. project

	Unit	Amount		Unit	Amount
1. Accelerated programs:			(d) Great Plains contracts	Number	5
(a) Technical services	Man-years	10		Dollar	78,000
(b) Soil surveys	Acre	51,000	(e) Cropland conversion program contracts.	Number	70
(c) Conservation planning:					
New cooperators	Number	71	(f) Cropland adjustment program contracts.	do	25
Plans and revisions	do	240			

	Man-years employment provided
2. Project and supporting measures completed:	
Lawrence Township erosion control	0.5
Jackson Township erosion control	.5
Randall recreation, golf course	3.0
Tabor access road	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, boat ramp	1.0
Fort Randall Black Hills Tourist Association; promotion	3.0
East Side Park, Lake Andes	6.0
Total man-years employment	14.0

Watershed Protection (Public Law 566)

Status of program in the State of South Dakota as of Mar. 23, 1967

[Abbreviations: SCD, soil conservation district; SWCD, soil and water conservation district; Stab., stabilization structure; FWR, floodwater retarding structure; MP, multiple purpose structure; chan. impr., channel improvement]

Projects having construction completed	Area (acres)	County	Local sponsors	Estimated total cost	Total Federal cumulative obligations through June 30, 1966
Green Creek	11,104	Union	Union County SWCD Green Creek Watershed District	$180,918	$87,807

Projects approved and underway	Area (acres)	County	Local sponsors	Estimated total cost	Total Federal cumulative obligations through June 30, 1966
Brule Creek	142,720	Union Lincoln	Union County SCD Lincoln SCD	$3,205,709	$524,386
Marne Creek	20,825	Yankton	Yankton County SCD City of Yankton	398,191	48,317
Pattee Creek	25,462	Lincoln	Lincoln SCD Pattee Creek Watershed District South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks.	1,080,447	358,656
Richland Creek	6,515	Union	Union County SCD	124,077	13,147
Silver Creek	20,661	Minnehaha	Minnehaha SWCD Silver Creek Watershed District	643,897	324,174
Tewaukon (North Dakota and South Dakota) South Dakota portion.	30,587	Marshall	Marshall County SCD	292,261	17,855
Turkey Ridge Creek	115,000	Turner Hutchinson Yankton	Turkey Ridge Creek Watershed District Turner County SWCD South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks.	2,189,900	12,375
Upper Deer Creek-Lake Hendricks (South Dakota and Minnesota).	36,610	Brookings, S. Dak. Deuel, S. Dak. Lincoln, Minn.	Brookings SWCD Deuel County SWCD Lincoln SWCD Upper Deer Creek-Hendricks Watershed District.	372,350	
Upper Little Minnesota River	37,000	Marshall Roberts	Marshall County SWCD Roberts County SWCD Upper Little Minnesota River Watershed District.	578,750	53,943
Wild Rice Creek (North Dakota and South Dakota) South Dakota portion.	75,340	Marshall	Marshall County SCD	1,166,211	737,311
Total				10,051,793	2,090,164
Estimated allotments for fiscal year 1967					205,000

Projects being planned	Area (acres)	County	Local sponsors	Date planning authorized	Percent complete
Hurley Creek	22,200	Turner	Turner County SWCD Hurley Creek Watershed District board of managers.	Feb. 21, 1966	84
North Fork of Whetstone	123,700	Roberts Grant	Roberts SWCD Grant SWCD	Apr. 15, 1963	79
Spring-Bull Creek	27,000	Charles Mix	Charles Mix County SWCD Emanuel-Choteau Creek SWCD Spring-Bull Creek Watershed District	Feb. 15, 1965	100
Upper East Fork Vermillion River	112,600	McCook Lake Miner	McCook County SCD Lake County SCD Miner County SCD	May 18, 1964	44
Veblen (South Dakota and North Dakota.)	115,000	Marshall, S. Dak. Roberts, S. Dak. Richland, N. Dak. Sargent, N. Dak.	Marshall County SCD Roberts SCD South Richland SCD Wild Rice SCD	Apr. 14, 1961	90

Unserviced watershed applications	Area (acres)	County	Local sponsors
Baptist Creek	20,600	Clay	Clay County SCD.
Bear Butte Creek	144,000	Lawrence Meade	Black Hills subconservancy District. Meade County commissioners. City of Sturgis. Sturgis Independent School District. Elk Creek SWCD. Laurence SWCD.
Lower North Branch Spring Creek (S.D. and N.D.)	132,000	Campbell, S. Dak. McIntosh, N. Dak. Emmons, N. Dak.	Campbell County SWCD. Oahe Conservancy subdistrict. Pollock-Herreid Irrigation District. McIntosh County SCD. Emmons County SCD.

WATERSHED PROTECTION (PUBLIC LAW 566)—Continued

Status of program in the State of South Dakota as of Mar. 23, 1967—Continued

Unserviced watershed applications	Area (acres)	County	Local sponsors
Lower Skunk Creek	207,000	Minnehaha	Minnehaha SWCD.
Mud Creek	16,580	Grant	Grant County commissioners.
		Deuel	Deuel County SWCD.
			Grant County SWCD.
			Adams Township.
			City of Revillo.
			Mud Creek Watershed District.
North Deer Creek	73,620	Brookings	Brookings SCD.
		Deuel	Deuel County SCD.
Rapid Creek	153,462	Pennington	Pennington County Commission.
			Pennington SWCD.
			Rapid Valley Conservancy District.
			Rapid City Common Council.
South Branch Spring	130,000	Campbell	Campbell County SWCD.
		Walworth	Walworth County SCD.
			Pollock-Herreid Irrigation District.
			Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict.
Onion Creek	29,215	Union	Union County SWCD.
Upper Skunk Creek	200,000	Lake	Minnehaha SWCD.
		Moody	Lake County SWCD.
		Minnehaha	Moody County SWCD.
		McCook	
Upper Spring Creek (S. Dak. and N. Dak.)	242,000	Campbell	Campbell County SWCD.
		McPherson, S. Dak	McPherson County SWCD. Pollock-Herreid Irrigation District.
		McIntosh, N. Dak	Oahe Conservancy District. McIntosh County SCD.

DEPLETION ALLOWANCES SHOULD BE MAINTAINED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on every occasion on which the Senate finds it necessary to consider legislation dealing with the Internal Revenue Code we can depend upon the offering of an amendment intended to limit or reduce the depletion allowances now allowed for certain mineral properties, most notably those containing deposits of oil, gas, sulfur, uranium, and other similar deposits. I shall, as I have on occasions in the past, vote against the amendment.

Coming, as I do, from the State of Alaska, where mineral deposits represent a source of great treasure, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I recognize only too well the virtue of encouraging development of this heritage of nature. Alaska is the great underdeveloped region of the United States where maximum effort to bring our resources of fruitful use must be made. The mineral resources of Alaska, especially our resources of oil and gas, can make an enormously valuable contribution to the Nation, to the free world, and to the people of Alaska. Our State is only in the early stages of exploration and utilization of these riches buried in the earth. Those pioneers now seeking to bring our mineral resources to the surface and use them for the development of the economy deserve encouragement such as that provided by the special incentive of the mineral depletion allowance.

In Alaska the cost of mining and the cost of oil and gas exploration and processing is enormously high. We have been overburdened for all our history by abnormally high costs of doing business, largely as a result of unduly high costs of transportation which balloons the cost of every other aspect of life in the State. Alaska's rugged climate and geography, her lack of surface transportation also contribute their complications to business progress in Alaska and necessitate inordinate expenditures for equipment and facilities essential to operation. Many times extraordinarily expensive exploration ventures result in failure to find the deposits for which a company searches.

In the cases where oil or other minerals are found and development is undertaken the inexorable fact is that with every unit of the resource that is removed, the value of investment is reduced. Thus, a special allowance for the reduction in quantity of the resource is, I think, justified for those intrepid companies that are willing to undertake the hard work and great expense of exploration and development, especially where, as in Alaska, economic and physical conditions impose additional handicaps.

The great oil development in Alaska is just 10 years old. It arose in 1957 when the Alaskan economy had reached a critically disastrous stage. Our fisheries, Alaska's main economic prop, had been sorely depleted through the mismanagement of the Federal agency entrusted under territorialism with its conservation. Our salmon fishery had gone down steadily under the direction of the Fish and Wildlife Service since the establishment of that agency in 1940, and was destined to reach its lowest point in 60 years in the last days of our territorial status in 1959.

Gold mining, our second largest economic prop, was passing out, owing to the economically unwise policies in respect to this precious mineral imposed both by Republican and Democratic administrations which insisted and still continues to insist, on maintaining a price for gold established in 1934, and compelling its sale only at that price, a price no longer profitable to the gold miners. The Federal Government has concomitantly refused to countenance other measures designed for the gold miners' relief.

In desperation with Alaska's two major economic mainstays facing extinction, a group of Anchorage citizens invited the oil companies to prospect and drill for oil in the Kenai Peninsula, where substantial petroleum deposits were suspected. This move was fought savagely by several professional conservationist groups as well as by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Since the greater part of the Kenai Peninsula has been withdrawn as a national moose range, they alleged that oil prospecting and drilling would be destructive of the moose, a mistaken assumption which those of us no less concerned for our wildlife knew to be completely unfounded. Those of us concerned both for wildlife and for economic development prevailed. A little less than half of the Kenai moose reservation was opened for oil exploration. Oil and gas resources that have been developed in consequence both in the Kenai Peninsula and elsewhere really saved Alaska from bankruptcy and subsequently have been a great source of economic development and of revenue for the State treasury. Meanwhile, the moose have multiplied and have spread all over Alaska to such an extent that in the opinion of the State's department of fish and game officials, they are too numerous.

But it is important that for this great industry, oil and gas, a favorable economic and social climate be maintained. That has been the case in Alaska to date and it is desirable that it continue to be so.

Only recently Alaskans have rejoiced at the news of yet another exciting development of resources in our State. Marathon Oil Co. and Phillips Petroleum Co. announced early in March the completion of negotiations for the export to Japan of an enormous quantity of liquified natural gas to be drawn from the immense reserves of the Kenai Peninsula discovered since exploration there began 10 years ago. The result will be the establishment of a major industrial complex in Alaska, employment opportunities for many Alaskans needing jobs, and the accompanying "multiplier effect" realized in the development of service and other industries needed to accommodate the new industrial growth.

Investment and development in Alaska such as this is what we need and must have. We must do nothing to discourage it. On the contrary, every effort must be made to give impetus and aid to adventurous companies seeking treasure in Alaska and thereby stimulating

its long-deficient economy. Wise application of tax policy, such as continuation of the depletion allowance arrangements now in effect can help accomplish this.

GOVERNMENT STUDY GRANTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Monday morning's Washington Post contained an editorial which commented upon an admirable speech by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, in defense of Government study grants without strings attached, as it were. Mr. THOMPSON and the Washington Post have done a service in pointing out the need for Congress to put a stop now, before it goes any further, to the kind of thinking which can only shackle the intellectual resources of our country by requiring a stamp of political orthodoxy upon every researcher and every project assisted by Government funds.

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:

SCHOLAR POWER

Congressman Frank Thompson Jr. let go with a haymaker of a speech on Thursday—in as good and decent and humane a cause as any Congressman could choose. He aimed his blow at a 1967 revival of know-nothingism by Congressman Durward Hall, who seems bent upon making an ugly name for himself by attacking the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Congressman Hall appears to feel that scholarship in the Arts and Humanities should have governmental encouragement and support only if the project falls squarely within the boundaries of orthodoxy and only if the researcher holds political opinions approved by Congress or at least in full conformity with some national norm. Accordingly, he has taken out against the Foundation because it gave a grant to an assistant professor of art at the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California to undertake a study of the influence of cartoons and comic strips on political thought.

Anyone who thinks that cartoons are not a political force need do no more to change his mind than look at the upper right-hand portion of this page. But Congressman Hall's true objections run, apparently, not so much to the research as to the researcher. He denounced the California art teacher before the House Appropriations Committee by asserting—as though this were, somehow, conclusive—that he "is not an American citizen. He has been among those in the forefront of opposing our presence in Vietnam."

Congress ought to nip this kind of thinking in the bud—before it can bloom again. The country had more than enough of it during the hysteria of the 1950s. Study grants, whether in the humanities or in science, should not be contingent in any way on the political opinions of the grantee. Neither should they be contingent on the inexpert and often uninformed judgment of Congressmen as to the desirability of a project. The danger in this kind of interference was pointed out very plainly by Congressman Thompson who observed that "I am afraid the Foundation has not yet felt politically able to tackle anything too controversial for fear of bringing congressional wrath down upon its head when it asks for its annual appropriation."

This is a danger that could be ruinous to the Foundation's potentialities. For the key to the Foundation's effectiveness, as it has been the key to all American progress, is freedom. Congressman Thompson put it very well in his remarks on Friday to the Modern Language Association: "Eventually you must have the courage to ask fundamental questions which may shake the foundations of our society. And eventually you must dirty your hands. You must make Scholar Power felt in Washington." It will be felt only in the degree to which the American public recalls its value—and recognizes the importance of keeping its intellectual resources unshackled.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last evening, the Washington Star added its voice to those defending the Foundation for the Humanities, pointing out the absolute truth that to choose wisely among the riches of science requires a discipline different from science. Yet we have, by infusing our funds willingly in science, permitted a vast chasm between our scientific knowledge and our understanding of what science has given us and how to use it. The Foundation has made an admirable start at rectifying this gap, as the Star points out. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Having Fun With the Foundation" be printed in the RECORD.

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

HAVING FUN WITH THE FOUNDATION

Following the announcement of its first batch of grants to American scholars, the Foundation for the Humanities has been getting a certain amount of critical static. This is all good fun, and as inevitable as the tide. Lists of such awards will always provide ideal grist to the satiric mills of congressmen and columnists. Most of the criticism is, at root, the fundamental, Yahoo, anti-learning bias that has been with us ever since some men learned to write and others did not.

The critics have focused mostly on one announced project to study the history and significance of the comic strip. As an American newspaper, we are, of course, prepared to defend this study. Of all the departments of a newspaper, the comics are the most exquisitely sensitive to changing popular taste. Hence, they can be invaluable as a key to the evolution of popular thought, to the relations between popular thought and political attitudes, and to the modulation of original thinking that occurs when it reaches the man in the street.

The mission of the Foundation for the Humanities is an important one. Massive government funds invested in science have completely upset the earlier balance between that discipline and the other main branch of higher learning in America, the literary and liberal arts culture. Our accelerated science is almost able to put a man on the moon, harvest the sea and replace man's infirm vital organs. But to choose wisely among the riches of science requires a discipline different from science.

In strengthening America's resources in a most important field, the Foundation for the Humanities, under Dr. Barnaby Keeney, has made an impressive and a hopeful beginning. It should not be discouraged that the voice of the semi-professional Know-Nothing is in opposition. Where else would it be?

OPERATIONS OF THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention was recently directed by Mr Warren S. Seyfert, director of editorial services of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, to an article which was published in the March 1967, issue of the Bulletin of that organization.

This article, which appears under the byline of Mr. Ed Powell, in my judgment, is an excellent review of the operations of the Teacher Corps.

Because I feel that this description of the program can be helpful to my colleagues when later this session we move to the consideration of the funding of this important program, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

THEY CAME TO HELP

(By Ed Powell)

(The National Teacher Corps is, to be sure, national in organization. But in actual operation it is local, immediate, face-to-face. All of the names used in these notes on the work of the Teacher Corps in one junior high school are real. So, it seems, is the value of the program.)

The National Teacher Corps is little more than an undernourished infant when set against the mammoth needs of schools that are trying to educate the millions of disadvantaged children in this nation.

A pioneering 1,200 corpsmen have taken on the commitment to help provide better schooling for poverty kids. Three hundred are veteran teachers, serving as team leaders for the other 900. These 900 are intern teachers who, this time last year, were still college seniors or first-year teachers, or perhaps Air Force colonels or housewives or social workers.

But despite its Lilliputian size and its halting first good steps, there is now a growing number of schoolmen who are deeply committed to the program—schoolmen who believe it points the way to producing teachers of superior ability, and who view the corpsmen as fresh reinforcements for faculties that are struggling against the by-products of poverty, apathy, and truancy: dropouts and failures.

In the beginning, these men also had to be convinced. And this included Robert Wagner, principal of Heinold Junior High School in Cincinnati, Ohio. His first reaction when hearing of the Corps: "Thanks, but no thanks. We've already scheduled 17 practice teachers and that is a pretty full load for our faculty."

He recently elaborated on his earlier statement: "There was another reason in the back of my mind. The truth was that I wasn't interested in running five more people through the same tired process of practice teaching."

It could have ended there, but Professor Charles Weilbaker, who directs the Teacher Corps project at the University of Cincinnati, was a persuasive salesman and had a unique offer to make.

ADVANTAGES CITED

First, the corpsmen need not add an extra burden to the faculty. They have their own team leader, Mrs. Margaret Smith, who is a really outstanding teacher with years of classroom experience in ghetto schools of Detroit. In addition, she has taught at Delaware State College, Tuskegee Institute, and at Florida A. & M. in Tallahassee. Mrs. Smith has also been a social worker with Aid to Dependent Children families in Detroit, Hartford, and Suffolk County, Long Island. One of Mrs. Smith's jobs—and she would have many—would be to serve as an active supervising teacher. Hers was not to be the relatively passive role of assigning interns to other faculty members.

Secondly, the principal would be a primary authority in setting the training routine for corpsmen in his school. The exact 2-year program would be planned cooperatively: Robert Wagner, Charles Weilbaker, and Mrs. Smith would work out the detailed activities, applying the Teachers Corps guidelines—internship training with heavy accent on one-to-one teaching and community activity—to the specific needs of Heinold High.

Perhaps this last was the winning point, for the school has plenty of problems. It is located squarely between two great public housing projects, one of which is all Negro, the other Appalachian poor white. In school, there had been a dangerous tension between the two groups. There is a certain irony in their antagonism, because all these children share a lot of common circumstances at home. Most of them live in extreme poverty, and a high percentage have only a single parent to raise the usually large family. Many have only welfare or unemployment assistance as their sole means of support.

They also share some personal traits. School, to these children, is a resented requirement; a place where they are forced to play a stupid game in which their best efforts are clumsy and ludicrous. Their pride has been eroded and the result is an attitude of belligerence and resentment toward adult supervision and organized activities.

PLANNING A PROGRAM

"I began to see in the Teacher Corps an opportunity to make some real gains in the school," said Wagner, "so we began planning and came up with a program that looked very hopeful. First, I wanted the corpsmen to work with the young people outside the classroom where they could get to know them informally, through afternoon clubs and in extracurricular activities. I feel that through these clubs they have a chance to help the kids develop a feeling of belonging; of having a stake in the school and making an appreciated contribution to it.

"As for teaching itself, I wanted to keep the corpsmen out of the classroom for the entire first semester. Instead, I wanted them to learn what a school is all about from working in some central location. They have all spent at least 16 years in classrooms, so I want them to start off with something different."

When school began in September, Margaret Smith and her four intern teachers began their work at Heinold. During the day, their service was to the total school—interviewing tardy students, calling the home of absentees, supervising the lunchroom and playgrounds. In the afternoon they worked with regular faculty members to set up a broad range of extracurricular activities for the students.

Their work removed many burdens from the regular staff, but that effect was only tangent to their central purpose: to learn to work with the deep-seated problems of poverty's children. And from their attendance-checking and assistance to counselors they became increasingly familiar with these problems.

"I've made nearly 50 visits to the homes of kids who are chronic truants," intern Ron Priore explains, "and I've heard every excuse for absences that you can imagine. But in nearly every case you find the same things operating: the parent is kind of 'out of it,' pretty much unaware of what the school is all about. And the kids are staying out because they hate the place and they are sure they are going to fail anyway. They put in their time when they're forced to; it's just like a jail sentence. They think of school as another place where adults order them around, and they can't find any way to belong, to protect their pride."

EFFECTIVE TEACHER TRAINING

The visits have a specific purpose in the intern's training, and it is not to warm his heart to a maudlin sympathy, but to make him a more effective teacher in the classroom. The aim is to keep him from repeating the common error of equating silence and passivity with stupidity, to keep him from interpreting bizarre values and behavior as simple antisocial rebellion. Interns are learning that sometimes they have to search deeply for basic, decent values on which they can build.

Searching for these values, corpsmen find a lot of contradictions, because in a twisted, distorted way the finest kind of middle-class values so often seem to work to turn some of these youngsters into hard core disciplinary cases. Wanting desperately to play a role with dignity and meaning—boys want to work and earn a salary, girls want to marry and begin a family—these young people do not have enough inner security to be patient, to wait.

There are a few who know they can escape the grasp of the compulsory education laws by getting themselves expelled from school, and they are determined enough to wage a grim and conscious campaign to "earn their freedom."

In their families and in their circles of friends, there is no one who got a job or won a husband because of having a high school diploma. And they don't want to wait and bet on the promises they hear about how important it is to finish school.

Good intentions and easy answers weren't much help for the students at Heinold! But there was hope and there were many ways to help. By way of constructive achievements, both Robert Wagner and Margaret Smith are proudest of the newly created after-school activities.

AFTER ONE SEMESTER

"Of the 1,000 students enrolled in Heinold, a full 800 were participating in one of the clubs by the end of the first semester this year. It has become a kind of status thing," Mrs. Smith goes on to say. "Hundreds of kids are now participating who never before had any way really to belong." (Mr. Wagner remarked that the number of boys and girls in the club program had doubled this year over last, and there are twice as many clubs.)

"Some of the clubs are academic-based like current events, dramatics and debate. And Raymonde Basone, a corpsman who was born and raised in Haiti, is running a Spanish Club where kids are learning conversational Spanish and studying Latin culture. Most of the clubs have had weekend tours. Ron Priore took the current-events club to visit the newspaper and is now planning a trip to visit the legislature in Columbus.

"Dick Murphy holds a basketball clinic after school where white and Negro boys are planning together without any regard for racial differences, and some of the regular standbys are boys that the juvenile authorities have marked down as hard core delinquents. But my favorite," and Mrs. Smith frowns an admonition, "is the girls' drill team. And let me warn you, if you think that must be an empty frill, then you are dead wrong. It includes 300 girls who are really excited about the club. Most of them have never cared about anything that related to school, but now they are searching for some way to earn money for uniforms.

"We are convinced that these clubs are making a difference, and I believe the faculty thinks so, too. They have given a lot of kids their first chance to succeed at something and really be appreciated."

Something has made a difference. Many people in the school think they can sense a new school spirit beginning to emerge. Whatever the reason for the change, it is there and that is a fact that can be measured by attendance records—absences are now averaging a full 15 percent below last year.

A FUTURE PROJECT

Robert Wagner and his corpsmen are planning one more project that aims at better school—community relations. They are sure that many school problems stem from the fact that parents don't know what goes on at Heinold. They plan to remedy that. They are now working to line up the support of six local community councils in Heinold's district to help sponsor a "Community Jamboree" in each of the nearby neighborhoods. Besides refreshments, parents will get classroom demonstrations, musical programs and a session of questions and answers about the school.

Along with the jamborees, corpsmen are now working to prepare a "mobile school" in a trailer that will be on display in each shopping center and housing project. Containing textbooks and displays of student work in various subjects, it will be staffed by students and corpsmen who will answer questions and, you can be sure, issue standing invitations to visit the school itself.

But where does teaching fit into this busy schedule of school clubs, community activities and home visits plus eight to twelve hours weekly of graduate study at the University of Cincinnati?

At the beginning of the second semester, Margaret Smith and her interns began their first classroom teaching at Heinold. Taking nearly 50 children with records of multiple failures, Mrs. Smith worked out a schedule which assigned each intern small groups of three to five students which they are teaching an hour a day, three days a week. And they have already completed plans to do team teaching before full-size classes in English and geography, which they will begin as soon as scheduling will allow.

THE PAYOFF

The sessions they are teaching now are the payoff for all the lessons they learned from their work in the fall. They learned to respect the students for their ability to get along in spite of impossible home conditions. They learned that authoritarianism is a sorry substitute for good teaching. They now know that kids who live in slums have their own style of learning which *requires* action and motion and personal involvement on the part of the student. And finally, they have learned that children of poverty are the final test of a good teacher, that these kids lack the inner security and patience to subsidize poor teaching with quiet compliance.

These same lessons are being learned by interns in every project, whether they are teaching the Negroes and Puerto Ricans in Harlem, the mountain whites of Appalachia, the Mexican-Americans of Texas and the Southwest, or the reservation Indians of the Great Plains.

Intern Dick Murphy won the hearts of Heinold teachers at a party they gave to welcome the incoming corpsmen, when he told them, "I don't know exactly what our duties are going to be in the months ahead, but as far as I'm concerned, I'm supposed to learn by helping you. So whatever you want done, just let me know." This seems to be the philosophy that runs throughout the program and it has led the corpsmen into a wild variety of jobs; some are picturesque, some humanitarian, but most are solid educational achievements.

WIDE-RANGING ACTIVITIES

In North Carolina they are cooking and serving oatmeal to children before school to make sure that they have had breakfast. And before the children leave in the afternoon, they are given haircuts because no barbers work in the mountain hamlets where the children live. In Tennessee, interns found themselves at a school with no playground although there was equipment—stored for years in a back room. So they organized the kids and cleared a plot of ground, then begged cement and mixed it with rocks that the children carried from a nearby creek. Result: one playground.

In Arkansas, interns found in one small community that children had deep-seated

problems in speech and reading that needed advanced professional therapy. They found recognized specialists in the region and persuaded them to volunteer their assistance in diagnosing problems and outlining therapy. In Florida they have pioneered a whole system of field trips to museums, universities and sites of government, history and culture. The tours have worked out so successfully for children who had scarcely been outside their own neighborhoods that they have been incorporated into the regular curriculum of the school with several tours scheduled each week.

In Michigan, one team was asked to construct a one-semester unit in Negro History and teach it on a pilot basis in junior high school. The team traveled to Washington, D.C., to attend a national conference on Race in Education, and built the course after consulting with outstanding national authorities in Negro history. In Galveston, Texas, corpsmen are giving intensive tutoring to high school seniors in English, composition and speech, in an effort to reduce the dropout rate among the students that enroll in college.

But immediate service to children of poverty and the schools that teach them is a secondary benefit. The Teacher Corps' central purpose is teacher training—to implement new techniques of teacher preparation and to produce teachers who have a maximum chance of reaching and teaching kids who live in slums. Perhaps of greater importance than the first 900 teachers it will train is the chance that the Teacher Corps is giving to local schools and to colleges of teacher education to offer new services and to carry out their own programs of innovation in education.

If a composite were made of statements by university project directors about the significance of their work in training corpsmen, it would be something like this:

"Since we began training corpsmen at our university, our regular program of teacher education has been under continuous revision, for we have learned more in the past few months than we would have learned in years of normal operations. And what we learn today, we will teach tomorrow."

But the Teacher Corps interns are less aware and a lot less concerned about fundamental changes in teacher education. They are pretty busy, like Dick Murphy at Heinold Junior High School, trying to learn by doing the things that need doing.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The National Teacher Corps was launched last year by the U.S. Office of Education to reach and teach economically and educationally handicapped children, to train promising college graduates in the special methods of teaching such children, and to increase the number of accredited teachers qualified for such teaching. The program operates through teams composed of an experienced teacher as leader and college graduates who serve as teacher interns and divide their time among teaching in the schools, community activities, and graduate study.

All corpsmen are enrolled for graduate study in a university within reach of their school district, and university staff members are associated with all Teacher Corps teams. Teacher Corps teams of one master teacher and three to six interns may be requested by schools with a predominance of students from homes with an annual income of less than $3,000 yearly. This year, 111 local school districts and 50 universities are participating in this program.

THE CONTROL OF CRIME

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on March 14, 1967, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] gave a comprehensive, thoughtful speech on the control of crime to the legislative conference of the National League of Cities.

This speech I believe will be informative to all who are concerned with crime in our cities and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY TO THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 14, 1967

You are hearing from many important people on many important issues for these two days, but I am sure that no problem is of more concern to you, both as community leaders and as individual citizens, than the problem of crime.

We can never eradicate all crime, we cannot even come close. For in any society there will be a certain number of citizens, whether motivated by greed, or anger, or perversity, or illness, or frustration, or ignorance, who cannot live in peace within the society. Our goal must be to reduce this number to a minimum, or at least to prevent it from growing. We must seek crime reduction on many fronts. We must focus on our youth, providing them with the education and training and hope which they need, if they are not to be drawn into lives of crime. We must focus on our poor, relieving them of the despair of slum living, of unemployment, of discrimination, so that they can develop a will and an ability to have a stake in society. And we must focus on our physically and mentally ill, identifying their diseases, and offering them the treatment they need to participate in society without threatening it. Yet as we undertake all these efforts to attack the roots of crime, we must also deal more effectively with those who have already become offenders—those whom family, school, and society have failed to inculcate with the values of conscience and responsibility which free citizens must possess. We must drastically improve our capacity to detect crimes and discover offenders, to assure speedy and fair court action, separating the guilty from the innocent, and to rehabilitate as many offenders as we can once we have identified them.

I know you have heard from James Vorenberg and that he has told you about many of the substantive programs which can meet these needs. What I want to cover are the roles you in local government and we in the Federal Government will play in bringing about these changes.

Traditionally and necessarily in our federal system, the primary responsibility for law enforcement and criminal justice must be local. Your police departments are the front lines in the war on crime, and in your own jurisdictions, you are the commanders in chief. Through your courts and your correctional systems go the vast bulk of the nation's criminal offenders.

Of course the Federal Government has an important role to play, and for the past six years it has been playing its role actively and fruitfully.

Early in President Kennedy's Administration it became obvious to him that local governments, with their constant difficulties in meeting current needs, could never supply the risk capital for long-term efforts to combat juvenile delinquency. He formed the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and proposed the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. With the passage of that Act there became available flexible resources with which the nation's communities could find new ways to prevent young people from becoming criminals. His remarks upon signing that Act are particularly relevant here today, for they mark the beginning of a relationship which has grown and prospered, and holds great promise for the future:

"With this legislation," he said, "the Federal Government becomes an active partner with states and local communities to prevent and control the spread of juvenile delinquency. Though initiative and primary responsibility for coping with delinquency resides with families and local communities, the Federal Government can provide leadership, guidance, and assistance."

Many of your cities were sites for projects under the 1961 Act, and you know that these projects became the prototypes for the entire poverty program, and for other special programs in education and manpower development, all of which have flowered and developed under President Johnson's leadership.

But at the same time the Federal Government recognized its responsibility to perform its own functions in the law enforcement and criminal justice fields in such a way that it would be a model for the nation. Thus also in 1961 began a concerted effort to combat organized crime, the interstate conspiracy which eats at the very fabric of society. This required legislation, and the Congress passed seven new bills; and it required manpower, and Congress gave the Internal Revenue Service and the FBI more men. The success of this effort was rapid and widespread, and our commitment to it continues today, as reaffirmed by President Johnson last spring and again last month in his message on crime.

Yet, as we have learned, enforcement is only one part of the continuum of a criminal justice system. There was work to be done in the Federal courts and the Federal prisons. Thus in 1963 the Administration proposed the Criminal Justice Act to provide indigent defendants in Federal courts with the assistance of paid counsel and expert witnesses, and this legislation was passed by the 88th Congress. The National Bail Conference was convened to discuss newly developed programs for pre-trial release of accused offenders, resulting in a Federal Bail Reform Act, as well as many state programs. The number of judges in the Federal courts was increased significantly. The vocational and educational programs in the Federal prisons were expanded and improved, and the Federal Prisoner Rehabilitation Act and the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act giving new flexibility to Federal rehabilitation programs, were proposed and passed. These are just a few of the most notable achievements, but I mention them because they are worth learning more about. You will find that most of them could have counterparts in your own states and cities, and *if* they don't, you may want to find out *why* they don't.

These, then, were the first three prongs of the Federal Government's participation in this decade's war on crime—first, the stimulation of new programs for long-term prevention of crime and delinquency; second, the acceleration of Federal criminal enforcement efforts; and, third, the improvement of Federal criminal justice and rehabilitation functions. With these efforts well under way, we came to the most difficult dimension of the Federal role in the war on crime: How could the Federal Government help improve local law enforcement and criminal justice systems without upsetting the traditional division between Federal and local responsibilities in these fields? There was some precedent: The FBI had for years been providing direct and excellent training and assistance to local law enforcement agencies. But what was now needed was a thorough analysis and rehabilitation of the entire criminal justice system in our states and cities.

In 1965 President Johnson moved with speed and determination. First he proposed the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, a means to see what kinds of imagination and innovation would be forthcoming from local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, to test their commitment to progress, to determine whether a partnership between Federal Government and community leaders

could bring change. At the same time he established the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. It had a mandate to study the nation's criminal justice systems critically but constructively with an eye toward the future, rather than toward immediate budgetary possibilities.

The Crime Commission's report pictures a past which is discouraging, yet it promises a future of hope. It points out to all of us where we have failed and to a large extent, why. We can see what the most promising avenues of progress are and how to reach them. And our experience under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act shows clearly that our local communities and universities and citizens can be a force for change. Many of you here today have demonstrated that your cities, and especially your police departments, are not bound to the past, that seed money planted in your soil can grow, and grow fast. And President Johnson himself has provided us with an example of how a community can prepare for progress and begin to achieve it. The work of his District of Columbia Crime Commission shows what an aroused and enlightened community—even a community with a 535-member city council can do if it is willing to face up to the problem of crime. This is not all the District did. It began implementing the D.C. Commission's recommendations almost before they were published. It took full advantage of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act to provide new equipment and training for its police, an alcoholic detoxification facility and a citizens information service in its municipal court. It supported bail reform, and court reform, and corrections reforms. Just last week I attended a conference where one hundred of the community's most active citizens, professionals in criminal justice fields, as well as civic leaders, government officials, and legislators, spent two entire days discussing the D.C. Crime Commission report, and how the momentum it stimulated can be maintained.

And so the groundwork for Federal-local cooperation has been laid, in the National Crime Commission, in the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, and in the District of Columbia's example. On this foundation the President has proposed to build the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967.

In this Act lies hope and promise for meeting our national goals in the war on crime. But the Safe Streets Act is not a panacea; it is not magical; it is not a bottomless pit of funds; it will not do your job for you. It will in fact require you to work harder, think more, and spend more. Its initial implementation may make your crime rates appear to rise and your clearance rates appear to fall. It will be a challenge requiring every bit of ability, imagination, and resourcefulness you can muster.

I believe that the local official can be the key to whether the Safe Streets Act succeeds where we have never succeeded before. I want to concentrate on what these top officials personally can do, as elected representatives, as appointed officials, as political activists, as community opinion leaders, and as individuals who have both the ear and respect of their fellow citizens.

First, we in Congress must hear what *you* believe the priorities should be.

In my opinion the Safe Streets Act merits the highest priority in the Federal Government's efforts to combat crime in the United States. Yet despite the fact that it was described in President Johnson's State of the Union Message two months ago and presented to Congress over a month ago, despite the fact that I am a member of the Subcommittee holding hearings on the bill, and despite the fact that I have publicly expressed my particular interest in the subject of crime, I have not received one letter from any municipal official urging me to support this bill. Whenever I mention firearms, or the National Guard, and even when I do not mention obscenity, I receive thousands of letters from the appropriate lobbies. But not a word about the Safe Streets Act—not even complaining that there is not enough money in it—from mayors or city managers or councilmen. I know this does not indicate indifference, but I am afraid it is symptomatic of the fact that many public officials have not yet found time to focus on their role in this effort. I hope you will all have a chance to communicate your thoughts to us before you leave or when you return home. This will certainly be useful to us, and, I think, helpful to you.

Second, when the bill is passed it can only be effective if it is used, and used fully, but in good faith, not just to supplement existing budgets, but as a source of innovation and change. The top local officials will have to be able to say "no" to police chiefs who suggest proposals which are not well enough thought out or not innovative enough, or not capable of bringing about change and progress. But the "no's" will have to be tempered with encouragement to try again until a "yes" is honestly deserved.

Third, municipal officials must be strong and courageous enough to open their cities to study by outsiders—by consultants and planning groups and analysts—outsiders of their choice, but outsiders nevertheless. These outsiders will discover what you already know, that many criminal justice systems are obsolete and inefficient and ineffective, but the outsiders will also come prepared to make realistic suggestions for improvement. If the city officials are too defensive, if they are oversensitive, if they try to negate all criticism of the past, then the future can only be bleak. Cities will have to recognize the flaws in their criminal justice systems if they are to deal wtih them constructively. And they cannot do the job alone; they will have to welcome outsiders to their midst and let them see the dirty linen and perhaps even wash it in public. Many of you already know that frequently it is *only* an outsider who can have the independence to do what needs to be done in a sensitive situation. Those of you who have used the services of the International Association of Chiefs of Police of the Community Relations Service know what I mean.

Fourth is a related responsibility and a difficult one. In many areas of law enforcement and criminal justice, city officials will find, as our forefathers found at our nation's birth, that there is strength in unity. They may find that pooling of police communications and laboratories and computers and training facilities among neighboring towns and cities and counties not only saves money, but vastly improves police effectiveness. And they may find that multi-city or state-wide or regional arrangements for offender rehabilitation hold far greater promise than local jails and workhouses. But it may take political and personal courage to accept these findings and to act on them. Some officials will be accused of surrendering sovereignty or of undercutting the powers of others, but it is the men at the top who must have the objectivity and perspective to overcome such parochial viewpoints. They must do what is right for their communities as a whole because it is they who represent no special bureaucratic interest, but only the people's interest.

Fifth, they must also be able to stand up to law enforcement and judicial and correctional agencies if those agencies resist internal changes which the public interest requires. A stagnant police department will resist the measures which can alleviate its stagnancy—higher educational standards, new types of in-service training, lateral entry of officers, civilian legal advisors, and others. It will fall to the municipal leaders to educate and persuade and act. It will fall to them to get the public and the local legislatures behind a program for change and to resist obstructionist tactics.

Sixth, municipal leaders must, on the other hand, support the police, and the courts, and correctional agencies, when these agencies need backing within the structure of government in their own efforts at change. "Support your police" should not be a demagogic rallying cry for the city official, but a call for his political support for bigger police budgets, authorizations for more equipment, higher pay, time off for in-service training, funds to go to conferences and seminars, matching funds for Federal grant programs. And this support will mean going to city councils and to state legislatures for more judges, more probation and parole officers, training facilities for correctional personnel and all the other resources which an effective criminal justice system requires.

Seventh, and perhaps most vital local leadership will be crucial in the most important dimension of a successful effort in the war on crime—an aroused and active citizenry. For it is ultimately the public that must provide the local financial resources for criminal justice systems. And it is individual citizens who must participate in the detection and solution of crime by coming forward as witnesses before the police and before the courts. And it is individual citizens who must provide the jobs and guidance for parolees and probationers if they are to be rehabilitated. And it is individual citizens who can cut the tentacles of organized crime by drying up its sources of funds—gambling, vice, loan sharking, and other rackets. But our citizens cannot fulfill these responsibilities without leadership, and it is the local officials who must provide that leadership. What is said in local speeches and proposed in local programs will go further toward stimulating public action and support than anything we here in Washington can possibly do, for the local official is closest to the people and his government touches most directly on their lives. Yet if he spends his time blaming the Supreme Court for crime, then it will be difficult to convince his taxpayers that more police resources, efficient local courts, better correctional system, and long term programs to attack the causes of crime, are what is called for. If the leaders do not focus on priorities and on constructive programs, then it will be hard to keep the citizens from wasting their efforts on useless bickering over peripheral issues.

I think that President Johnson has shown us the way in this regard. He has recognized that it is action programs which promise progress. He realizes that time spent on arguing about reversing Supreme Court decisions is wasted time, and he has wisely stayed out of the argument. I hope you here and your colleagues throughout the nation will have the wisdom to follow the President's lead. For with his leadership in Washington, your support in the communities and with a responsive Congress we can together provide the programs and resources the nation needs to bring crime under control.

ASSUMPTION OF REGULATORY AUTHORITY BY FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have read an article to which I invite the attention of the entire Senate. It is an analysis of some of the problems posed by the assumption of regulatory authority by the Federal Food and Drug Administration in fields where that authority has not been directly granted by law. The article was written by Mr. Lewis E. Harris, a Nebraskan, and was published in the February 1967, issue of Animal Nutrition and Health.

Mr. Harris speaks from many years of personal experience with the Food and Drug Administration and close association with the research and development

programs conducted by pharmaceutical industries. I feel certain that all of us realize that it took great courage for him to stand up and criticize a Government agency with which he does business. Yet he considered the situation so dangerous that some knowledgeable person needed to speak out on the subject in the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

FDA: BUREAUCRATIC STUMBLING BLOCK IN NEW DRUG DEVELOPMENT—EFFECT OF FDA LAWS AND ACTIVITIES ON THE LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY INDUSTRY

(By Lewis E. Harris)

(NOTE.—The author is president and founder of Harris Laboratories, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska. He is also president of Norden Laboratories, Inc., chairman of the board of Scientific Development Corporation and a special lecturer at University of Nebraska. He is a member of 16 national and seven state or local professional and scientific organizations, including six of which he is a past president. He is also a member of numerous honorary, civic, fraternal and religious organizations. He has patents and publications in the fields of analytical chemistry, food products, pharmaceutical research and production, toxicology, waste disposal, water and sewage treatment and scientific crime detection. He is a graduate of University of Nebraska, 1932, with a M.Sc. awarded in 1933, and additional PhD. level studies from 1941 to 1945.)

It is difficult to evaluate the full effect of the 1962 Amendments to the Federal Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act on the livestock and poultry industry, for only during the past year have we begun to realize the extent to which new regulations and interpretations of the Amendments were planned by government bureaucracies. Now we find the intent of Congress repeatedly circumvented or ignored by such devices. It appears that some officials in the Department of Health, Education & Welfare and Food & Drug Administration sponsored and supported various specific parts of the 1962 Drug Amendments, for they saw this as the mechanism whereby they could accomplish goals long sought in establishing unrealistic controls and in building departmental empires. If this was done deliberately, these individuals have been eminently successful.

During the past four years we have seen a continuous decline in the number of important new drugs introduced into the animal health market. This situation has not resulted from lack of industry research. Indeed, industry has continually increased the number of dollars spent in this field. Pharmaceutical manufacturers have developed a number of new products which are safe and clinically effective and have submitted detailed and realistically complete New Drug Applications (NDA's) covering these items. But FDA has cleared only a small percentage of such applications.

The livestock and poultry industry, those who need these improved and more effective pharmaceutical products, have started asking "Why," and "What causes the delay?" Some of the blame must be absorbed by industry where grossly incomplete NDA's have been submitted, but these constitute only a small percentage, and rarely represent the really important products. What, then, is the trouble? In answer, most manufacturers could write volumes.

Basically, there is something radically wrong with FDA organization, its flow systems, the delegating of authority, and clear-cut policies. To the best of my knowledge, FDA has never accepted and approved an NDA on the basis of data supplied in the first draft. There is always something found to be "incomplete," regardless of how insignificant the point might be. Now surely, FDA doesn't have a corner on all the brains. Surely scientists and specialists in industry must have intelligence equal to that found in FDA. Why, then, does FDA strive so consistently to pick out insignificant points on which further data are requested? If industry submits 300 clinical cases, FDA believes it should have 325. If 325 are submitted, FDA asks for 350, and so on.

But if we agree for the moment that FDA requests for more data are realistic, then the first response should enumerate *all* the points wherein there is question. I don't believe there has ever been a first response from FDA which listed *all* areas in which they considered the application incomplete. For years, the practice has been to list a few in first response, then when these data are supplied, the second response includes one or more entirely new matters. This may continue through three to ten responses, each resulting in delays ranging from 60 days to one year. If all requests for additional information were included in first response, all items could be handled simultaneously, and the time for NDA clearance could be reduced from years to months.

Currently, a somewhat new and different delaying tactic is being encountered. After all the medical, scientific and technical aspects of an NDA have been reviewed and cleared by persons trained in these specialized fields, it seems necessary for the NDA to be "reviewed" by someone in the Commissioner's office. These "reviewers" appear to be persons with limited technical knowledge. They seem to be primarily concerned with "nit-picking" and so we have NDA's being returned for clarification, or with requests for additional data which have little, if any, useful purpose. This system of reviewing in the Commissioner's office has caused the worst bottleneck in the history of FDA. Unfortunately, the Commissioner and his assistants seem to be so busy making speeches with wholesale condemnation of industry, that very little attention is given to matters of organization, policies, clearance of NDA's or necessary correspondence. This speech-making smoke screen to hide inefficiency and poor management is costing the livestock industry and the public both as food consumers and taxpayers, millions or even billions of dollars.

In reviewing the period since enactment of 1962 Drug Amendments, it is my opinion their principal effect on the livestock industry has been to delay unnecessarily the availability of important new drugs for use in control and treatment of animal diseases.

In viewing the current situation, the negative effect of the 1962 Amendments not only continues, but appears to be increasingly serious. For a while, it seemed the total FDA organization and handling of NDA's was improving. This was particularly true in the Bureau of Veterinary Medicine. But as of today, FDA gives the impression of jumping on a horse and riding off in all directions. There is little or no delegation of authority, it is difficult and sometimes impossible to obtain status information on an NDA, and in many areas it takes weeks or months to get a written opinion.

Further, we have reached a point where FDA is actually dictating and trying to direct the practice of human and veterinary medicine. And the medical opinions are frequently being given by individuals who have little, if any, actual experience in practice.

But, even more serious is the current FDA program related to advertising. In this connection, one wonders whether FDA hasn't actually become vindictive. Again we have a controversy concerning intent of Congress. FDA has apparently concluded that drug manufacturers are basically dishonest, and physicians and veterinarians lack intelligence and professional judgment to use products properly. Some FDA officials have suddenly become advertising geniuses. They see deliberately planned innuendo in professional advertising, and believe the physician and veterinarian are being misled. Some of their reasoning is so absurd it is frightening.

The current problem, however, also extends to the now popular program of "consumer protection." FDA and other federal agencies have decided the average consumer is also deficient in intelligence, is readily misled by advertising and labeling, and really needs extreme protection from what is pictured as a dishonest industry. Indeed, it would appear that some federal agency zealots would be satisfied only when a staff of federal guides could be stationed at each shopping center to lead the poor uninformed, gullible consumer through the shops, pointing out the many hazards lurking on shelves, and aid in comparing labels to assure getting the best bargain.

Even more amazing is the recent effort of FDA officials to be concerned with the cost of drugs. In careful reading of the original law and amendments, I fail to find anything which remotely suggests a role for FDA in price matters.

At this time, the FDA attempts to expand control of every aspect of food and drug manufacturing and marketing, together with the lack of FDA organization, have brought us to the most chaotic situation which has existed since the enactment of the 1962 Drug Amendments. The effect of this on the livestock and poultry industry is incalculable, but enormous. At the very time we need to do everything possible to expand production of food producing animals and poultry, we are experiencing the greatest problem in obtaining NDA clearance of important new drugs which are essential for the prevention, control and treatment of animal diseases.

FDA public relations departments point with pride to the number of NDA applications cleared each month. This may look good to the public, but those of us in the industry recognize that the great majority of these clearances are for products which are simply new dosage forms or combinations of drugs previously in wide use. One could speculate that the kind of press releases used by FDA might actually be subject to strong action if used in similar manner by industry.

What about the future? I wish I could be optimistic, but in view of the past and present situation, I can predict only complications in the years ahead. Some of the unrealistic FDA requirements can do nothing but suppress research in many areas. The extreme cost now involved makes it impractical to carry development of some new compounds far enough to evaluate them properly. Many useful compounds will fall by the wayside simply because it is economically impractical to carry them far enough in development. Every time this happens, the livestock industry suffers, and the public is directly affected.

What can be done? First, we need to develop a sense of balance. We must insist that the advantages of a new compound or product be more carefully weighed against any real or assumed disadvantages instead of continuing the present policy of rejection if any real or assumed side effect is apparent. Unfortunately, many FDA officials recognize the need for this approach, but are reluctant to speak out for what is right because of fear of embarrassment or unjustified ridicule by some senator, congressman, or feature story writer. Using present FDA policies and standards, it is doubtful that penicillin could now be cleared as a new drug. And this should cause one to wonder about how many equally valuable new drugs are being withheld because of FDA activities and policies.

Second, we must direct our attention to electing senators or congressmen who will stand on principle, rather than what may be politically expedient. We now have several elected representatives who have learned to make effective use of any negative concerned with drugs or related compounds. They do this by exaggerating the negative aspect and ignoring the positive. This makes newspaper headlines, and creates the impression such representatives are protecting the public from poisonous or dangerous drugs. To date, efforts to refute these attacks by presenting a true picture usually receive little or no attention, for these aren't sufficiently sensational, and do little to get more votes for an elected official.

Third, we must challenge FDA in any and all cases where there is adequate evidence that it has not properly interpreted the data presented to it. This will have to be done by insisting on hearings when applicable, and going to the courts when necessary.

Fourth, the livestock industry must become more vocal in demanding a realistic approach by FDA in relation to new drugs needed to improve livestock health, and to provide necessary food for an increasing population. It must become more effective in telling its side of the story.

During the past several years, the drug industry, veterinarians, food processors, poultry and livestock men and others related directly and indirectly to the food and drug industry have been so stunned by the vicious and unjustified attacks made on them by a few congressmen, certain FDA officials, and some feature writers who specialize in sensationalism, that they have not moved effectively to neutralize these attacks. All of these individuals and firms have been put in a position of having to defend themselves, and this kind of action doesn't get much attention in the press. Now, a strong program must be initiated to get a positive story to the public in an emphatic manner. Staff writers for some congressmen, for certain government agencies, and for some "do-gooder" independent groups, have become very proficient in the art of half-truths, incomplete stories, sensationalism and innuendo in relation to the food and drug industry. This must be neutralized, and the public made aware of how it has been misled.

This is a tremendous task. But either we fight back and insist on fair play, or we move slowly into oblivion with eventual government take-over of all drug research and production. Then it may be only a simple further step to complete federal control of food-producing animals.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a little over 20 years ago President Harry Truman outlined to an anxious Congress and an anxious world the American aid programs for Greece and Turkey which later came to be known as the Truman doctrine.

It was a time of civil war and of attempted foreign intervention similar to what we are witnessing in Vietnam today. President Truman summed up the program by stating:

It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

That policy was questioned and severely attacked by many Americans and others throughout the world. President Truman was called a warmonger and an interventionist. But he persisted in what he thought was right. Greece and Turkey are free nations because President Truman did not weaken.

Today, President Johnson faces the same situation in Vietnam. Under cover of a civil conflict, armed minorities are attempting to subjugate a free people—and the United States has rightfully opposed that subjugation, even though there are those who continue to protest our policies in Vietnam.

Each time in the last 20 years, when communism has tried to use civil conflict as a mask for international subversion, the United States has stood against it—in Korea, in Berlin, in Cuba, and in Vietnam.

Harry Truman taught us the lesson of our times, that the security of the United States is intimately bound to the security of every free nation in the world; this remains our basic commitment today.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD letters from the President of the United States to President Truman; King Constantine, of Greece; and President Cevdet Sunay, of Turkey.

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

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Independence, Mo.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On this day—as on so many others—those who love freedom will once again honor your name.

Twenty years ago you went before the Congress and summoned the American people to a great endeavor: that of helping free peoples to "maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes."

With that message you served two great functions of the Presidency—those of the teacher and the leader. You related the struggle of the Greek people against armed terrorism to the national security of the United States. You recognized that totalitarian regimes, imposed upon free peoples by direct or indirect aggression, "undermine the foundations of international peace." And you called upon the Congress and the American people to help resist that aggression.

Today America is again engaged in helping to turn back armed terrorism. As in your day, there are those who believe that effort is too costly. As on other occasions during the past twenty years, there are those who counsel us that the stakes are not high enough, nor the danger near enough, to warrant our involvement.

But our people have learned that freedom is not divisible; that order in the world is vital to our national interest; and that the highest costs are paid not by those who meet their responsibilities, but by those who ignore them.

You helped to teach those lessons, Mr. President. Just as importantly, you had the courage and the determination to put them into practice: in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, in Korea, and in other parts of the world where today men are free and prospering because of what you did.

March 12th is thus a proud anniversary. Years from now men will still mark this date, and the man whose Doctrine gave it meaning.

With best wishes for your health and happiness.

Devotedly,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT TO KING CONSTANTINE OF GREECE

Twenty years ago today, President Harry S. Truman asked the American people to help the Greek nation preserve its freedom. Before a joint session of the Congress, he declared:

"I believe it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

The message and the program he conveyed on that historic occasion became known as the Truman Doctrine.

In commemoration of that decisive hour, in thanksgiving for his courage and vision, and in celebration of the friendship that endures between our peoples, I extend to you and the citizens of Greece my warm greetings and best wishes. In this I am joined by every American who rejoices that Greece is today free and prospering.

President Truman recognized that the security of the United States was intimately related to that of Greece. He warned our people—who, like yours, had just emerged from a savage conflict with another terrorist aggression—that

"We shall not realize our objectives unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed upon free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States."

The American people responded to his call for assistance to a people struggling to be free—and their decision has affected, not only the security of your great nation, but the security of the world for two decades.

I am aware of the sacrifices made by the Greek people in the past 20 years. I am proud of the fact that throughout that period, the United States and Greece have worked together in close partnership toward common goals. I revere the Greek spirit, that for thousands of years has inspired the world, and that has taught men to cherish freedom above all else in life.

Today we mark a moment in man's long quest for freedom. I salute you and your people on this proud anniversary, and I look forward to a future of continued friendship and cooperation between our nations.

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON TO PRESIDENT CEVDET SUNAY, OF TURKEY

On the twentieth anniversary of the Truman Doctrine, I extend to you and to the Turkish people my good wishes. Then as now, the American people admire the vitality and the passion for freedom of the Turkish people. Then as now, the United States is proud of its association with the forward-looking Turkish nation.

Turkey has been a sturdy ally in NATO and CENTO. Its men played an unforgetable part with the United Nations forces which assured that aggression would not succeed in Korea.

With its security assured by its own courage and efforts, united with those of its allies, Turkey has moved forward remarkably in economic and social development. The vision of a modern Turkey, not only loyal to its own traditions and ambitions, but also a creative part of the world of contemporary science, technology, and industry, has been brought measurably closer to reality.

The visit you will soon be making to the United States affords an opportunity to give added meaning to that association. It will also serve as a symbol of the importance of the partnership of our two great republics. Mrs. Johnson and I are looking forward to welcoming you and Mrs. Sunay.

SENATOR SPARKMAN'S SPEECH AT NEW ORLEANS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 4 Senator SPARKMAN made a

speech to the members of the Independent Bankers Association at their annual convention held in New Orleans, La. Senator SPARKMAN's speech is an interesting and informative analysis of many banking matters and it challenges the Nation's banks to enter a number of fields where they could serve the Nation and the Nation's communities even more effectively.

I believe the speech would be of interest to the Senate and to the public and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have his introduction printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THIRD GENERAL SESSION, MARCH 4

Mr. DUBOIS. The third general session of our convention is now called to order:

We are privileged this afternoon to have with us the distinguished United States Senator from Alabama who is Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee. I think it would be appropriate if we called upon our Alabama director, Roland L. Adams, Chairman of the Board of the Bank of York, York, Alabama, to introduce our speaker.

Mr. ADAMS. Our speaker this morning knows the meaning of independence. His parents had limited means but much self reliance. They looked for nothing beyond what they could earn by their own efforts. All worked hard on the farm in Morgan County, Alabama, and young John did his share. In his teens, he planted, worked and harvested his own field to earn money for his education, and at school, he kept furnaces stoked for dollars to meet the cost of board and room. Elected to Congress 30 years ago, our guest served five House terms and was recognized as a vigorous spokesman for his state and the South. Twenty years ago, he won a special election to the Senate seat vacated by the death of Senator Bankhead, and in 1952, he was the Democratic candidate for vice president of the United States. He recently moved up to chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and men who know the Senate say that, measured in terms of committee position, John Sparkman is the Senate's most senior member. Every person in Alabama has benefited in some way from Sparkman-sponsored programs such as health care, rural telephones, veterans' legislation, educational measures, programs for the elderly and dependent, and social security. On the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Sparkman's strong, realistic voice makes him the committee leader supporting our stand in Viet-Nam. But in spite of his strenuous work load due to his membership on six committees, our guest is unfailingly, today as always, a plain-spoken, farm-bred, southern gentleman without guile. I am proud to present a distinguished American, Senator John J. Sparkman of Alabama.

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, thank you Roland Adams for that very generous introduction. Mr. President, I'm glad to see you again. We met together about a week or ten days ago in a blizzard. That's a funny place to meet, but that's just what you run into when you go to Minnesota in the wintertime. We had a great meeting, though.

* * * * *

I do appreciate the introduction by my long-time friend, Roland Adams. I have known Roland and his series of brothers that came to the University of Alabama for a great many years. I have told this story often and I'm sure some of you have had it, but talking about introductions, I think this is the first time I was ever introduced as a man without guile. You know I'm going to remember that!

* * * * *

I am glad to have the opportunity to meet with you people here today at the Convention of the Independent Bankers Association in this great city of New Orleans and to share with you some of my thoughts on our American banking system. Louisiana, with its background of French and Spanish history and tradition, recalls to our minds the depth and breadth of the background of our banking system. Louisiana was an essential factor in the Mississippi scheme of the Scotch financial genius, John Law, whose Louisiana Company was part of his French banking system in the early seventeen hundreds. Louisiana was also the scene of an engineering triumph by James B. Eads, builder of the Mississippi River Bridge at St. Louis. Using funds from his National Bank of the State of Missouri, which failed in the process, Eads built jetties in the South Pass below New Orleans which permitted the largest ships in the world at that time to come up to New Orleans, and raised the city from the eleventh to the second place as an exporting port. Today, we trust banking can do as much to develop the country as did Law's and Eads' banks, but without their failures and losses.

Louisiana can also claim much of the credit for the continued existence of the dual banking system. It was Senator Huey Long who in 1933 filibustered against a bill proposed by Senator Carter Glass which would have permitted national banks to branch state-wide, regardless of State laws. As a Southerner, believing in the filibuster, I'm glad to throw in that little note and remind you of the debt which you owe to the system of filibustering in the United States Senate. The compromise which resulted, requiring national bank branching to follow State branch banking laws, has lasted to this day and only a couple of months ago was upheld in a decision by the United States Supreme Court in the Utah branch bank cases. The principle of substantial competitive equality enunciated by the Court is indeed vital to the dual banking system.

One of the characteristics of the American banking system is its diversity and variety. It includes small independent banks as well as large branch banks and holding companies. As the Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business for many years, and as the sponsor of many laws designed to help small competitive businesses, I am especially glad to have the opportunity of addressing this Association which is made up in great part of many small independent community banks, which do much of their business with small business firms in all parts of the nation. Small banks and small businesses have a vital role to play in our economy and we must see that they have the opportunity to compete on equal terms with their larger counterparts.

Competition in banking is one of the most conspicuous aspects of our banking system. Our commercial banks, almost 14,000 of them, compete with each other and with savings and loan associations, and savings banks, and finance companies, and insurance companies, and with other financial institutions. As long as the dual banking system continues, with 50 different State banking systems and 50 corresponding national bank systems, and as long as these competing financial institutions continue, we can never reach the degree of concentration of some foreign countries which have only a handful of nation-wide banks, or the degree of concentration of our major manufacturing industries, with a dozen or less nation-wide firms doing 90% or more of the nation's business in their field. Even in the case of our largest banks, we must note that there are now 46 commercial banks with a billion dollars or more of assets, and 8 savings bank and 3 savings and loan associations in this same giant category. These huge institutions and their many slightly smaller fellows provide a substantial measure of nation-wide competition, along with the intense regional and local competition of both the large and the small institutions.

Competition in banking is different from competition in most industries because banking is so closely regulated in many of its aspects in view of its importance to the stability of our economy. Entry into banking is restricted. Obtaining a bank charter from the Comptroller or a State Supervisor is not an easy matter. Real and convincing proof of convenience and necessity must be shown, in the light of other available banks and other financial institutions and the service that they can provide. The investments and loans that banks may make are severely limited and their interest rates and charges are reviewed and frequently restricted by law. And the reserve requirements imposed on banks in order to insure their solvency and to carry out the nation's monetary policy constitute a real and substantial burden on the operation of banks.

Competition in banking is also different from competition in most industries because of the nature of banking. Banks do not sell a product. They are a "service" industry. Their raw materials, deposits, come from their customers because they, the banks, render a needed service by holding their depositors' funds safely and making them available in a convenient fashion—with interest in the case of savings deposits, or a small service charge in the case of demand deposits. Banks lend or invest the funds entrusted to them so as to make a return for their depositors and stockholders, and, of greater social importance, so as to enable the borrowers to undertake enterprises profitable to them and beneficial to the community and the country and to buy consumers' goods and houses which benefit the borrowers and the community and the manufacturers and builders. Making sound and constructive loans, incidentally, is not an automatic or easy process. The amounts and terms of the loans must be weighed in the light of the available funds, of competing demands, and of the needs of the borrower, and of his ability to make profitable use of the funds and to repay them with the interest on which the bank and its depositors and stockholders depend. And of course, banks provide many other services: investment advice, trust work, and so on.

All of these functions, all of these services, depend on the confidence which the bank's customers have in the bank. If a bank's depositors lose their confidence, all demand deposits can be withdrawn in a day, and all savings deposits in not much longer a time. This is not true of any other industry. Steel companies, chemical companies, and oil companies have products and assets that the public must have and must buy. Confidence, beyond confidence that the products are genuine and as represented, is immaterial. But in a bank, confidence in its soundness and in its ability to provide the various services we need from banks is vital to the continued existence of the bank.

Competition in banking resembles much more closely competition between lawyers or doctors, where confidence in the services provided from day to day to the clients or patients is absolutely vital to the continuance of the lawyer's or doctor's practice. I do not think it is farfetched to compare the services rendered by a doctor or a lawyer with the services rendered by a banker. Accepting deposits and cashing checks may be easy, though handling thousands of checks at a cost of five or ten cents each is a difficult mechanical job. But appraising homes or apartment houses or office buildings or factories is not so easy and handling a volume of consumer loans or making sound agricultural loans or working out a com-

plicated industrial financing operation involves years of experience, a great deal of information, and a deep knowledge of human character.

It should be clear that from what I've said about the work of banks and bankers that I am convinced that they are essential to the growth and development of their respective communities. As Alexander Hamilton said in 1790, banks become nurseries of national wealth. They are the principal institutions through which the savings of a community can be collected and channeled into productive purposes. They are the principal means of carrying on all the trade and industry of the country. And they are indispensable to the carrying on of the government's taxing and borrowing and spending activities.

I have mentioned the part which the National Bank of the State of Missouri played in financing the Mississippi River Bridge and the South Pass jetties, which were credited with increasing the value of the Mississippi valley farms and industries by a billion dollars, at the cost unfortunately of the bank's solvency, though the depositors eventually were paid in full. And each of you can think of many local projects which you have financed to the benefit of your communities.

But, each of you know too that the banking community has not always lived up to all of its possibilities and that every time banks have failed to supply all of the legitimate needs of their communities, someone else has moved into the vacuum. Nature abhors a vacuum and this is just as true in the financial world as it is in physics. Because banks failed to supply needs for small savers and small depositors, savings and loan associations, savings banks, credit unions, and the postal savings system were set up and have effectively supplied the needed services. Because banks did not supply the needs for small loans and mortgages, the savings institutions and credit unions, and finance companies, and the Small Business Administration and the specialized farm loan institutions were established.

These other specialized institutions are now doing a fine job—to the distress of many banks which regret their earlier inattention to these other financial opportunities.

I should like to add that as time has passed, the banks and the financial institutions I have mentioned as coming in to fill the vacuum have moved closer and closer together in rendering community service.

Can banks and bankers take advantage of these lessons? Are you alert to all the coming developments and the coming opportunities to render service to your communities and country? I should like to suggest a few possibilities along these lines that you might do well to consider.

* * * * *

Having been Chairman of the Small Business Committee for some 15 or 17 years, I feel very keenly the need of small businesses in every community in this nation of ours. Between 90 and 95% of the businesses in this country are small businesses. They work 50% of the total labor force in the country. They produce in excess of 40% of the total manufactured production in this country. And yet, many of them—I am almost tempted to say most of them—have a very hard time finding adequate support to give them the kind of operation and the privilege of expanding, and of adopting new methods, new technology, new equipment that they need. Small businesses need constructive and imaginative banking to enable them to grow and prosper. Some of these small businesses are uncertain and speculative. So were Ford, and Standard Oil, and General Electric at one time. We have established the Small Business Administration and the Small Business Investment Company program to provide government backing for the small firms and for the bankers and other investors in small businesses. I should like to urge all of you to look carefully into the whole field of small businesses and the aids which SBA can give you in this area. The last couple of days we've been holding hearings in the Senate on the small business outlook throughout the country generally. We discussed the banking aids, bank participations, bank loans guaranteed by the SBA, a plan whereby a bank makes the loan and the SBA guarantees 90% of it. In other words, only a 10% risk taken by the bank in making those loans. I'm told that the banks are coming in to the program quite well throughout the whole country. If you are not, I urge you to check into it and see if it's not a real opportunity there for you to aid the backbone of the economy of our country—the small businesses in your respective communities.

Another area in which I often wonder if banks have taken full advantage of is the Export-Import Bank program, and I believe all of you might well look into this field. The Export-Import Bank has many programs of insurance, and guaranties, and participations which can be of great help to small firms and small banks which may want to share in the program. And incidentally, helping to promote exports can benefit friendly nations around the world and help to solve a very embarrassing problem of ours—that is, our balance of payments problem.

Another field where banks, large and small, can do much to help their customers and their communities is in urban renewal. And this is just as much needed in small towns as it is in large cities. I am sure that each of you knows of some parts of your cities, towns or villages, or even of your countryside, where worn-out or obsolete buildings and facilities are a burden on your tax rolls and a fire and a health hazard and a detriment and handicap to those of your fellow citizens who must use them or live in them. If these were replaced by modern and efficient buildings, everyone would benefit, including the construction industry—the occupants of the new houses, the students at the new schools, the patients of the new hospitals, the workers in the new factories, and let me mention one of the most important—the tax rolls of your respective local governments.

Now I'll pause just a minute to give you an example of what I'm talking about. You know, the City of Washington is often described as the most beautiful city in the world. Up until a few years ago, it had some of the worst slums to be found in the whole United States—right within the shadow of the Capitol Dome. It's not rid of these slums altogether, yet, but thank goodness it is rid of these that were right under the shadows of the Dome. I'll tell you they're just inconceivable; I've been down in them and they were unbelievable, but they were there. Finally, they put in an urban renewal project and they cleared 555 acres—that's a pretty good sized area—of buildings. It took years to get them all taken down and cleared out, and to start construction on new buildings, but I remember when the first building was completed. It was an apartment building and when it went on the tax rolls, the Washington Post had a news story which I've always remembered and it was this: That this one building when it was evaluated for the tax roll brought in twelve times as much taxes as the whole area had before it had been cleared out. Now today that area is pretty well built up. They're still building, but I wonder how many times the tax rolls have been multiplied as a result of this urban renewal project. And on a lesser degree, it can be done in every community in the United States; and we can gradually over the years—it'll take a long, long time—but we can gradually clean out these blighted areas that exist in practically every town and city in the United States. Urban renewal and urban development, and I include in this the renewal and development of small towns and villages, and even the rural areas, will be one of the leading features of the coming decades. We're just getting started in it.

Senator Ribicoff has conducted hearings back during the recess of Congress as to the needs of our cities in rebuilding the downtown area and providing the rapid transit, adequate parking areas, urban renewal and urban redevelopment, and he came up with a program that he was suggesting that would involve both private and public, and local governmental participation, which he said would cost one trillion dollars. I was listening to him on a TV program when he said that; you know I nearly fell out of my seat. Speaking of a trillion dollars! You know, when I went to Congress, I didn't know what a million dollars was. I have learned, during the time I've been there, to talk in terms of billions, but Senator Pastore gave me an illustration the other day of what a billion dollars would be like. If stacked in thousand dollar bills, he told me how high it would be. And then he told me of what the amount of the budget of the United States would amount to and he said it would be 140 inches higher than the Washington Monument. Well I still don't have much of a conception of what that much money would be but trillions just get clear out from beyond me. I did get a warning of this—Sylvia Porter wrote an article in one of her columns of several months ago in which she said that this was fast becoming a trillion dollar country and it startled me but I read her column and I saw that we were moving very fast in that direction. We've got a gross national product today of 770 billion dollars; I believe the Joint Economic Committee of which I am a member predicted that our gross national product would hit a trillion dollars by 1975 and that's what she was saying—we were approaching a trillion dollars. When I went to Congress a little over 30 years ago, the gross national product was—I'll bet you couldn't guess—it was less than 50 billion dollars and today it is 770 billion dollars. The total intake of the Federal Government when I went to Congress was seven billion dollars a year. Why that's just a little over half of what the interest on the national debt is now. I saw a cartoon the other day which I thought was rather good. It was talking about this trillion dollar economy and these fellows were scratching their heads and said, for mercy's sake, don't let the budget planners know what comes after trillion! Well, going back to urban renewal and urban development, banks have done much in this field over the past years. I urge you to make every effort to take the leading role in your communities in this effort over the coming years. It will benefit you in every way.

A related project is the area redevelopment program which the Banking and Currency Committee sponsored in 1961, as an outgrowth of hearings that I had held earlier on the subject of rural poverty. This Federal program has had many difficulties of administration, but it still offers much promise. And the State and local development corporations which preceded the Federal program are still carrying out many valuable projects and providing needed jobs and profits for many communities. I may say, Roland, that our State of Alabama has profited greatly from that program. If I'm not mistaken we've got them right there in your County, two or three.

I should like to mention one more program which every bank and every other financial institution should back with every available dollar. That's the student aid program. I do not mean just the government-sponsored program, but every form of financial aid to students—in grade school, high school, college and graduate school. And I do not mean just the student loans, but also part-

time and summer jobs, and loans to schools and colleges to build classrooms and dormitories. I know the need for education and I know the benefits of education. As Roland said, I worked my own way through college and I have never regretted it. But I had to find a job, and with the increased cost of education today, it may not be possible for students to earn all of their way through school or college. We all know the benefits of education today, high school, college and graduate school. We know the benefits to the student, his family, his employer, his community and the country. And we all know the increasing cost of providing the education to more and more of our young people who are clamoring at the doors of our colleges and institutions of higher learning. We also know that the leaders of the country, ten, twenty, thirty years from now, will be the men and women who are now in schools and colleges. I cannot think of a better piece of institutional advertising that banks could undertake than to participate in educating the next generation of our country's leaders.

I have mentioned a number of fields in which I am convinced that you bankers could help your communities and your customers and yourselves by active and imaginative participation. In each of these fields the government has undertaken programs and I urge each of you to look into these governmental programs to see if they could be of value to you. But I urge you to look into each of these fields from your own point of view as bankers and as citizens to see what you can do yourself, and through your banks regardless of the government programs. I am convinced that individual citizens and communities can do much along these lines on their own initiative and at their own cost and in their own way without any government assistance and without any government control. The government programs have been undertaken primarily because you and I and our friends and our neighbors have been too busy with other things to do as much as we should have done in these fields. As leaders in your communities and with the benefit of the financial resources at your command, you can stimulate and assist your communities to improve and develop themselves along these lines, with little or no governmental assistance. In doing this, you will carry out your highest function as bankers. You will become nurseries of national wealth, and at the same time you can earn the rewards for your stockholders and yourselves to which they and you are justly entitled. I envy you this task and I wish you well in it. Certainly, our Committee, and I personally, will always be glad to do what we can to be helpful in forwarding your interests and the interests of all of the financial institutions that are helping to build our communities. Thank you!

VISTA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I speak today about the continuing accomplishments of an extremely valuable and constructive program within the Office of Economic Opportunity. This program is VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America.

When Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, it delivered to the President a decisive tool with which to wage total war against poverty and despair. The VISTA program is the volunteer force within the OEO that provides a natural channel for the skills, energies, and concerns of all Americans who want to do something about the plight of our least-privileged citizens.

Mr. President, the message I have today is one of hope and optimism—qualities which illuminate the growth, success, and future of VISTA in combating the darkness of poverty. VISTA has been one of the splendid achievements of the President's war on poverty—because with VISTA's growth and performance has come measurable successes and rewards in our common struggle.

Less than 1 year ago, I spoke to the Senate about the work that VISTA was doing in my own State of Rhode Island and throughout the Nation. At that time, in May of 1966, there were 1,900 VISTA volunteers working with the Nation's poor. Today, only 10 months later, nearly 6,000 men and women have served with VISTA. Another 15,000 concerned citizens are working part time on a regular basis with VISTA volunteers in their local communities. And Mr. William Crook, Director of VISTA, has stated that by next year over 100,000 people will be volunteering their skills and dedication part time in VISTA's citizens volunteer corps. And they will be doing this at no expense to the taxpayer. This is in addition to the 5,000 full-time volunteers VISTA expects to have in the field.

VISTA volunteers are performing the skills and services that have bypassed the poor of our Nation. They tutor children in need of special attention; they organize community development projects designed to improve the quality of life in our urban and rural slums; they establish recreation programs and neighborhood social centers; they teach adult literacy and home economics classes; they instruct informal classes in consumer education, vocational skills, and child care.

VISTA volunteers give the priceless ingredient of hope to those confined to homes for the aged, in mental health clinics and hospitals, and Job Corps centers. On American Indian reservations, in mountain hollows, in urban ghettoes, in the depths and on the frontiers of our society, from Florida to Alaska, from California to Maine, VISTA volunteers of all ages are living and working among the poor to restore their hopes and broaden their opportunities.

Mr. President, these VISTA volunteers do not receive a salary for their labors. Fifty dollars is set aside for each month of service and the volunteer gets a minimal food and shelter allowance, based upon living costs within each poverty location.

VISTA recruits, selects, trains, and supports those concerned citizens—from every State in the Union from all walks of life—who willingly devote a year of their lives helping our less fortunate fellow Americans. Local project sponsors file a formal request for VISTA volunteers to work under their supervision in their communities. Like Peace Corps volunteers abroad, VISTA volunteers have no Government funds to spend in their work. In most instances, VISTA volunteers mobilize local resources and manpower to accomplish their goal of stamping out poverty on the grassroots level.

At present, almost three-fourths of the VISTA volunteers are young men and women between the ages of 20 and 25, while others are senior citizens, in many cases retired from an active life, but who desire to pass on their experience and skills to the poor they serve. This combination of enthusiasm and experience makes the VISTA program a wide-ranging, resourceful attack on the tragedies and despair of poverty.

At a time when we hear much about crime in our Nation's streets—spreading juvenile delinquency—subtle and dangerous trends among our youth resulting in social alienation, drug experimentation, and discouragement, it is indeed refreshing to find so many of our young people committed to building a truly just and great society.

VISTA volunteers are helping to build this great society. In Atlanta, Ga., a young VISTA volunteer, Eric Metzner, helped a low-income neighborhood develop a community action program resulting in the creation of a recreation center and library. Through his counseling and tutorial programs many young boys and girls have returned to school who would otherwise never have finished their educations.

From my own State of Rhode Island, 24 dedicated men and women have served across the Nation in the VISTA program as volunteers. Currently working in VISTA are: Camille Barbato, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Cooper, and Margaret Missunas, all from Providence, R.I.; Judy Carnevale from East Providence, R.I.; Richard Byrd, Greenwich, R.I.; Catherine Swan and Timothy Troy from Barrington, R.I.; Judy Presbrey, Warwick, R.I.; Richard Lacey, Newport, R.I.; Linda Wareham, Ashton, R.I.; and Jacqueline Fournier, Cranston, R.I.

Mr. President, I would like to call attention to three of these Rhode Islanders who are serving as VISTA volunteers. I have chosen them at random as examples of VISTA's work in combating the suffering of our poor.

Richard Byrd of 6 Hyland Avenue, East Greenwich, R.I., is currently assigned to a low-income neighborhood in Baltimore. Richard is organizing cooperative day care centers and adult education classes. He works closely with local and municipal officials in determining the special needs of the low-income neighborhoods and devises other programs in cooperation with as many of the residents as possible.

Timothy Troy of 39 Waterway Street, Barrington, R.I., is working as a VISTA volunteer among some of our most forgotten citizens—the American Indians. At the request of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council in Fort Yates, N. Dak., Tim Troy is teaching, tutoring, and counseling American Indian youths who live on the reservation. He has assisted in the development and operation of the Headstart project and has guided and assisted local schoolteachers and officials in setting up educational programs, including adult literacy and vocational skill classes, for all the inhabitants of the reservation. The Sioux are a proud people, as we know, with a rich heritage and strong cultural values. The fact that Tim Troy has been accepted into their trust and confidence as a VISTA volunteer is a credit, not only to him, but also to the entire VISTA pro-

gram and its unique approach to the problems of poverty and neglect.

Margaret Missunas of 201 Thurbers Avenue, Providence, R.I., is volunteering her efforts as a VISTA volunteer in coping with another segment of America's forgotten poor: Migratory farmworkers. In many parts of our Nation, these migrant farmers need to know the opportunities that exist in our society so they may better raise their children, obtain decent housing, sanitation, and improve the quality of their lives. Miss Missunas works in southern Florida, in the migrant "stream." She assists migrant workers and their families in the improvement of their living conditions, education of their children, and helping the migrant women to budget their meager incomes and practice the skills of effective homemaking.

As another example of how VISTA volunteers are serving our country, I would like to tell the Senate about Joseph Salisbury, a young man from Pawtucket, R.I., who joined VISTA in 1965.

Joe Salisbury worked among migrant farm laborers in Gilroy, Calif. He set up a study hall for the youngsters in the camps, conducting English classes for preschool children. He came to know the people and the hopeless conditions in which they lived.

When he completed his year of VISTA service, he did not return to an easy life. He stayed on in California to share his experience and the knowledge he had gained. He is serving as the VISTA project director in Santa Clara County and is working with the 37 volunteers assigned to this sponsor.

Many more cases could be cited, Mr. President, of the sincere efforts and dedicated energy VISTA volunteers are providing to help the poor in their quest for self-fulfillment. Nearly 3,000 VISTA volunteers are laboring in all parts of the land, providing the hope and initiative tragically lacking in many of our low-income communities.

I mentioned earlier that Mr. William Crook, Director of VISTA, announced VISTA's plans to recruit more than 100,000 part-time volunteers into the new Citizens Volunteer Corps by the end of the year. Mr. Crook's expectations are well founded. A recent Gallup poll reported that three out of every four college graduates in our country would be willing to give several hours per week, on a voluntary basis, working with the poor in their own community.

If we just for a moment think about the amazing potential and promise of the VISTA program, if we could imagine the VISTA concept reaching into every town and city in America, tapping that abundant source of volunteer spirit and concern for our neighbor that is so typical of Americans, then, Mr. President, we can envision the day when the evils and pains of poverty will be eliminated in our country.

The VISTA program has the imagination and inspiration to make us think in such terms. The VISTA program has within itself the seeds of greatness—born and nourished in our own land. Compassion and humanitarian concern are tremendous forces. VISTA has harnessed those forces and has made them part of our national character and purpose.

Mr. President, I strongly support the work VISTA volunteers are doing in my own State and throughout the Nation.

The service of so many of our people, young and old alike, in the VISTA program is a tribute to the ideals of dedication, hard work, and self-improvement that have guided Americans throughout our history in building a strong and just America. That so many people are willing to be a part of the VISTA program indicates to me that we can meet the challenges posed by our growing and complex society here at home. The courageous and individual efforts of citizens who take part in dynamic and effective programs like VISTA are in the best spirit of our democratic tradition.

VISTA and the volunters who serve in it deserve our thanks and continued support.

THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AND THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am indebted, as are most of my colleagues, to the League of Women Voters, whose membership in our respective States applies itself diligently to the study of community problems and whose recommendations for legislative relief of those problems I always welcome. These comments are particularly relevant, because I have recently received from a number of organizations in Oregon letters indicating strong support for continued and expanded operations under the Economic Opportunity Act authorities.

Because of my belief that the comments made in these communications would be of interest to my colleagues and helpful to them in our consideration at a later date of legislation in this area, I ask unanimous consent that correspondence I have received from the League of Women Voters of Roseburg, Oreg., over the signature of Mrs. William T. Duvall, chairman of the Human Resources Committee; from the League of Women Voters of Springfield, Oreg., over the signature of Mrs. Bessie L. Koth, local league president; from the League of Women Voters of Portland, Oreg., over the signatures of Mrs. Morton Rosenblum, chairman of the Human Resources Committee and Mrs. Thomas E. Robinson, president; together with the descriptive memorandum by the League of Women Voters of East Multnomah County, entitled "The Vicious Circle"; and finally a letter from the League of Women Voters of McMinnville, Oreg., over the signature of Mrs. Glen C. Macy, president, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF ROSEBURG,
Roseburg, Oreg., March 1, 1967.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you to ask your support for the federal programs, especially those of the Economic Opportunity Act, which will provide equal opportunity in education and employment.

After a two year study, the League of Women Voters concluded that the federal government shared with other levels of government the responsibility of educating and training disadvantaged people, and removing racial discrimination in education and employment. We strongly believe that the Equal Opportunity Act will help to accomplish these goals, and are very concerned about the possibility of a further reduction of appropriations for the entire program, and in particular the possibility of deeply cutting the appropriations or entirely abandoning the Community Action Program. This local program is a welcome addition to the American scene with its emphasis upon local initiative and innovation; it has stimulated those people directly affected to assume some responsibility for their own welfare.

We are aware that there is some public dissatisfaction with the current programs. There have been some failures and administrative difficulties because the programs are innovations accompanied by much experimentation. That immediate results are not apparent, despite the large outlay of money, is understandable: the programs are designed in most part to break the cycle of poverty and we will not know the results for many years.

Here in Roseburg, our local League is examining the federal programs which exist in the community: Head Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, Adult Education, training under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Vocational Act, remedial reading classes under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We hope to determine what the programs are doing, how many people are being reached by them, how they are administered and financed, and how effective they are. We also hope to learn more about the needs of the disadvantaged people in our community, and to stimulate local interest in these federal programs.

We strongly urge your support in retaining and adequately financing the Economic Opportunity Act, in particular the Community Action Program.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. WILLIAM T. DUVALL,
Chairman, Human Resources Committee.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SPRINGFIELD,
Springfield, Oreg., March 11, 1967.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On behalf of the Springfield Board and Committee on Equality of Opportunity, I would like to state that the local League is especially appreciative of the support legislators have given to: Job Corps (Tongue Point), Lane Human Resources (formerly Lane Co. Youth Project), and to the various federally funded programs of School District 19. In this respect, we should like to see continued funding for the Diagnostic Remedial Services Clinic which was obtained under Title I, P.L. 89–10. This clinic we feel has contributed to the community's aid to disturbed and slow learning children. We are becoming more aware that health needs of disadvantaged children must be met along with psychological guidance and we are hopeful that the clinic could conceivably offer more than just diagnostic services in medical and dental problems of children from low income families.

We would like to see Springfield included in Headstart programs and in Day Care Center programs derived from the Economic Opportunity Act. The local School Board decided against the Program last year as they felt it was needed equally by all children. We are writing the Board expressing our hope for the program.

We are also much interested in the Scheuer Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1966 to provide educational opportunities by means of apprentice-type training job opportunities for those impoverished who

might by such a program be enabled to enter the professional and semi-professional fields of employment.

Sincerely,

BESSIE L. KOTH,
(Mrs. D. J.)
Local League President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF PORTLAND,
Portland, Oreg., March 10, 1967.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We would like to take this opportunity to remind you of our national position in support of programs which are designed to provide equality of opportunity in education and employment. The League of Women Voters of the United States strongly supports greatly increased educational opportunities through compensatory programs for disadvantaged groups beginning at the pre-school level.

We also support programs in occupational education and retraining, apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs; day-care centers for disadvantaged children to give parents the opportunity for employment; and federal aid to help needy students remain in school. Of particular concern to us is adequate funding and opportunity for local participation in Community Action Programs.

The League of Women Voters reached this position in March 1966 after two years of study and consensus of member opinion. You will find the entire text of our position on pages 24–25 of the enclosed publication. This booklet, focusing on programs in the Portland Metropolitan area was prepared as background information for local League discussion groups, meeting in March 1967. It is a sequel to our last year's study of EOA grants in Multnomah County which was sent to you in August 1966. We hope you will find it helpful.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MORTON ROSENBLUM,
Chairman, Human Resources Committee.
Mrs. THOMAS E. ROBINSON,
President.

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE—LACK OF EDUCATION, UNSKILLED, UNEMPLOYED, DISCRIMINATION, POOR HEALTH, INADEQUATE HOUSING

(Compiled by Human Resources Committee, Leagues of Women Voters of East Multnomah County, Lake Oswego, Milwaukie-East Clackamas County, Portland, Oreg., March 1967)

INTRODUCTION

NOTE.—Discussion questions for Unit use are included within the body of the text.

As a result of a national study in 1964–66 the League of Women Voters of the United States reached a position which, briefly states, "supports policies and programs in the United States to provide equality of opportunity for education and employment." A full text of this position is on page 24 of this publication.

In 1966 the Human Resources Committee (Portland and EMCO jointly) published a survey of Economic Opportunity Act programs in Multnomah County as funded for that calendar year.

In 1966–67 under our national position, local Leagues may evaluate programs on the local level and take action in support of opposition where it is appropriate. In Portland this position enabled us to support a War on Poverty Rally held in February. Action at the state level included support of the Day Care Certification Bill. (SB #32)

This year's study is a description of some selected programs in the metropolitan area. Some are federally funded, such as the Neighborhood Service Center and the Valley Migrant League. Some are non-federally funded, such as the Church Community Action Program (C–CAP). The study was compiled by a Joint Human Resources Committee with members from MECCA, East Multnomah County, Lake Oswego and Portland Leagues participating.

Programs included in the study fall into three categories: 1. Omissions from last year's study such as the Manpower Development Training Act (MDTA); 2. Areas in which we felt League members would have particular interest and; 3. Random selection by members of the committee.

The programs described in this publication are just a few of those currently operating in the metropolitan area. No attempt was made by the League committee to tabulate how many programs are available to the disadvantaged. No evaluations were made except those of the administrators interviewed by the committee.

Interviews with administrators, attendance at meetings and current publications provided background information.

We ask readers to remember these basic facts about poverty: That education, employment, housing and health are interrelated. To improve the conditions of the disadvantaged, the chain of poverty must be broken. Middle class values are not necessarily those of a disadvantaged family. Different experiences make communication difficult among groups of people. In Oregon, due to the absence of large slum areas, poverty tends to be hidden, but nevertheless, is still present.

Any program whose purpose is to help improve conditions in fields of education, employment, housing or health may not be entirely successful because of the lack of communication, transportation and day care. These three factors have sometimes been overlooked in planning and carrying out programs.

We ask League members to refer to our national position in discussing the programs we have reviewed in this publication.

II—EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Day care

The national League of Women Voters supports day care center for disadvantaged pre-school children "to give parents the opportunity for employment".

The problem of finding adequate day care seems to limit the ability of some disadvantaged parents to participate in equal opportunity programs. Presently, a committee has been formed with funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity to study this day-care problem in the Portland metropolitan area. The Governor's Committee on Children and Youth, State Welfare Commission, Community Council, Urban Affairs department of Portland State College, as well as professional personnel, are represented on the committee.

To gain some insight into day-care problems, Human Resource Committee members interviewed the directors of the three day-care centers in Portland which receive UGN support. These include Fruit and Flower Day Nursery, St. Martin Day Nursery and the Volunteers of America Day Nursery. Committee members also interviewed Mrs. Alice Collins, Director of Community Council Day-care exchange project.

Child Care Committee

The Metropolitan Steering Committee, EOA, Inc. announced early in January the formation of a Child Care Committee chaired by Mrs. Helen L. Gordon, Director of the Jewish Community Center Pre-School. Mrs. Gordon is taking leave from her position to join the staff of the Metropolitan Steering Committee on February 1st as Consultant for all Head Start programs in the area.

The Child Care Committee has been charged with the task of comprehensive planning of day-care services for children from infancy to age 16. This planning has already been started by three sub-committees representing labor, business and industry, professional and service agencies, mothers from low income families, and colleges and universities. Representatives from various other civic organizations will also be added to the committee.

Volunteers for this major effort are welcome. Calls may be directed to Mrs. Helen L. Gordon, Head Start Consultant, Metropolitan Steering Committee, EOA., Inc., 718 West Burnside, Portland, Oregon 227–3236.

Day care centers

Fruit and Flower Day Nursery: Fruit and Flower Day Nursery is a UGN agency. It has been housed in the same building since 1928. Children ages three through six are served. The center is licensed for 80 children. In September 1967, there were 87 calls for service. Cost of care is $5.00 per day with a sliding scale for fees according to the family's ability to pay. This fee is determined in an interview with the social worker. The UGN pays just less than half of the budget; parents' fees are about one-third of the budget. Income from gifts, memberships and interest from endowment account for the rest of the operating funds. Parents must supply their own transportation.

The nursery is open from 7 A.M. until 5:45 P.M. Children are usually present nine to nine and one half hours, or hours which coincide with the mothers' schedules. The majority of the children have mothers who are working, attending training programs or parents attending Portland State College. A few social cases are accepted where a child needs companionship or isn't ready for kindergarten and needs a group experience. Due to a smaller enrollment in the summer time, twenty children up to grade three are accepted.

Miss Mildred Kane, Executive Director, feels there are still unmet community needs: 1. Caring for the school-age child during Christmas, spring and summer vacations and before and after school hours. 2. Caring for the special child who may be physically or mentally or emotionally handicapped. 3. Caring for the child whose mother works other than 7:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. shifts. In addition there is need for many more day-care centers. There is a growing trend toward neighborhood centers so that children will not be spending so much time in transit.

Miss Kane feels that there is need for revised legislation for day-care centers. She is in favor of certifying day-care facilities. Miss Kane also stated that some of the private agencies find themselves put in the position of subsidizing a government agency (the Welfare Department) on the cost of day-care. Women on welfare who take part in government training programs are given $2.00 per day per child for care at a day-care center, where the cost per child per day may be $3.00 to $5.00. Therefore, some form of adjustment is needed in this area, she stated.

St. Martin Day Nursery: St. Martin Day Nursery, a project of St. Vincent De Paul Society, is a UGN agency and has been in existence since 1939. It is licensed for 60 children age 2½ to 6, and is open from 6:45 A.M. until 6:00 P.M. Approximately 35 requests which could not be filled were received from September to January. There were also calls for night care, which the nursery does not provide. The maximum fee is $3.50 per day per child. A sliding scale based on ability to pay is determined with the social worker. In November the average was $1.39.

The nursery is financed by UGN funds, fees, private donations and the St. Vincent De Paul Society. It is open fifty-two weeks each year. No transportation is provided. Many of the children enrolled have working mothers who are the family's sole support. Most children are at the nursery 8½ to 9 hours depending on the mother's working schedule.

Sister Mary Benigna, the director, feels very fortunate to have the amount of volunteer help she has, such as a nurse and doctors. College students from Marylhurst and women from the Christ Child Organization come in to help once a week. Sister Mary Benigna is hoping that they will be acquiring a new facility in the near future to house 120 children. She favors the Day-care Certification Bill. (SB #32)

Volunteers of America: The Volunteers of America of Oregon, Inc., A UGN agency, (Lt. Col. Ray G. Eckland, Executive Director—Lt. Major Janrose Healey, Director of Social Services) has a day-care program for preschool children. The day nursery and kindergarten have been operating since about 1927. The family day-care program has been functioning since about 1953.

At the present time, Volunteers of America is the only agency with two types of day-care. Mrs. Eva Klein, supervisor of day-care would like to see other agencies adopt this format. One form of care is the group day-care nursery, housed in its own building, and caring for children ages 2½ through 6. The nursery is open from 6:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M. five days a week, 52 weeks a year. The children are present according to their parents' working schedule, usually eight to nine hours. There are 80 to 85 children being served daily; all are in attendance during the hours of 10 A.M. until 3 P.M.

The other form of care, which also serves approximately 80 children, is the family day-care program. This type of care is centered in private homes that have been certified by trained social workers and public health nurses who study the homes. Children from birth until school age are served in these homes of community-minded women, who have been trained by the Volunteers of America informally, and formally by Portland Community College. These homes are scattered throughout the tri-county area. Family day-care mothers range in age from 19 to 68 years of age. They are paid $2.00 a day per child and are on the payroll of the Volunteers of America. A case worker makes the decision as to whether a child attends the group day nursery or the family care program. The family day-care mothers usually care for from one to four children.

Charges for both programs are based on family income and range from free care to $3.50 per day per child. Cost per child, however, runs from $4.50 per day. The day-care program is supported by funds from the UGN, fees, and money from the Volunteers of America. The parents of the children attend government training programs, are on welfare, are students at Portland State College, or are dental and medical students. The highest percentage are working parents. Parents supply their own transportation. There is always a waiting list. In September there were 65 calls and in October 77 calls that could not be filled.

Mrs. Klein feels that there are many unmet community needs—especially after-school facilities for children. She is in favor of the proposed bill before the legislature (SB #32) on certifying day-care centers. She feels it is the first important step in protecting children away from home.

The Day-Care Exchange Project: This is a pilot project sponsored by the Community Council and funded by the Child Welfare Research and Demonstration Program of the Children's Bureau of the Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The program is intended to find new ways to care for children. The grants are issued for the innovation of programs, not to maintain those already in existence. This project is for demonstration and research—it is not an agency. It is experimenting with services existing agencies can implement.

The project has three functions: 1. To improve the climate and to raise the status of day-care done in private homes; 2. To help to convey to the general public what has been found in research on private care for children in N.W. Portland; 3. To run a service with six day-care neighbors, who give day-care in their homes in their own neighborhood. These six day-care neighbors receive $25.00 per month from the grant. There is no other subsidy. These women have their own families and are family-centered people. They act as exchange agents to recruit, match, and maintain children in the homes of those women who are interested in caring for children. No attempt is made at formal training; however, there is informal training. The project staff works closely with the six day-care neighbors who, in the past year, in turn talked to about 120 mothers and 80 day-care givers who care for children from birth to 12 years of age. It is felt that not only do the children cared for benefit by being in a family situation, but the children of the women also benefit from this service—a form of "preserve mental health measure" for young children.

The project is also trying to do something for the abused, handicapped or disturbed child by helping people to recognize these situations and refer them for help. The philosophy permeating this project is the restoration of neighborliness. Although the project is at the end of its three-year grant, it is hoped it will be renewed to do some research on the forces that cause the lack of continuity of care for children and results of these facts. The research phase of the project has shown that there are many more women doing private day-care than the census has shown, and other women who would be interested in caring for other people's children if it was a steadier source of income.

Discussion Question—Day Care: 1. Should Welfare and ADC mothers be encouraged to enroll in training courses or should they be encouraged to stay home to care for their children?

Headstart pre-school program

The National Picture: The children from impoverished families often have difficulty in school because they lack the rudimentary knowledge that middle and upper class youngsters pick up at home. Many have never seen a book or held a pencil or used scissors to cut paper. When such children enter first grade, they are apt to be either passive and withdrawn or overly aggressive and unruly. They rapidly fall behind their fellows, becoming mental drop-outs long before they physically leave school.

Purpose: To meet the need for attention and affection by tending to medical needs which drain their energy; to set the poverty children on the road to successful lives by opening their minds to the world of knowledge; to break the vicious cycle that would turn them into poverty's parents.

Previous Programs: The nationwide mammoth pre-school program during the summer of 1965 enrolled 560,000 youngsters in 2,400 communities. Some 45,000 teachers, doctors, nurses and social workers were involved in the program, as well as thousands of paid and unpaid volunteers who helped in a variety of ways.

Costs: Salaries, rent and utilities, toys, equipment, teaching materials and books, transportation, food, health, psychological and social services, insurance, staff training and expert consultants.

Services Rendered: Medical and dental, social and psychological, hot lunch and snack, parent education, guidance, and social workers.

Financing: 80% federal assistance is available to cover the cost of developing, conducting and administering a program such as in the David Douglas school district. The district must provide 20% as "cash" contribution or "in kind" which means the use of services or property. The services of an employee and rental value of a building can be considered as the 20% "in kind."

Qualification: Members of household:	*Family income*
1	$1,500
2	2,000
3	2,500
4	3,000
5	3,500
6	4,000
7	4,500
Over 7	5,000

It should be pointed out that the level of the family income need not be a specific requirement for admission as long as the program primarily reaches the poor within the neighborhood. Ninety percent of the children taking part should be from the poor.

David Douglas School District—Headstart: During the summer of 1966 there were Headstart programs at Ventura Park, Mill Park, Lincoln Park, West Powellhurst and North Powellhurst schools. Each project was set up to include about 20 children ready to enter first grade. Each class included one teacher, one counselor and two aides. Transportation was provided for each child to and from his school. Between the hours of 9:00 and 12:45, the children were allowed a period of unsupervised play as well as supervised activities such as swimming and field trips to such places as the zoo, airport, Laurelhurst Park, etc. Lunch was provided in addition to a snack. The counselors visited with the families in their homes every week for continuity and closer cooperation between child, parent and teacher.

III. ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Earl Boyles School—David Douglas School District:

Introduction: Earl Boyles is an elementary school, (grades 1–6) in the David Douglas School District. Boyles and four other schools in the district were selected to participate in projects for educationally deprived children under the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, Public Law 89–10, Title I. Under this Act, grants are available for local educational agencies having high concentrations of children from low-income families to provide programs to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children, including those who are low achievers and those with physical, mental and emotional handicaps. Children in private and parochial schools, those not in school may also participate in these public school projects.

Grants were applied for through the David Douglas School District for Earl Boyles, Gilbert Primary (grades 1–5), Gilbert Elementary (grades 5–8), Russellville (grades 1–8), and David Douglas High School, Senior Building (grades 11–12). These schools were chosen because they had a percentage-concentration of children from low-income families that was as high or higher than the percentage for the district as a whole. The qualifications were determined through Multnomah County Welfare information and through administrative office records which showed the children with the highest incidence of low-achievement level and the highest rate of transfer.

The programs began in February, 1966, and carried through the summer. They are in effect this year. Unlike the Headstart program which was also operating during the summer of 1966 in this district, these programs drew only *from* their own school area. Once the criterion of an economically deprived area was met, it was not necessary for the children participating in the project to be economically deprived, as long as they lived in that area. Headstart schools, on the other hand, were chosen because they had volunteered to find 50 preschool children in the David Douglas District who would qualify under the Headstart program.

In applying for funds, each school stated its purpose as follows:

Earl Boyles: To expand the primary base for effective learning. Enriched educational

environment to meet the needs of disadvantaged children through more individual instruction in all areas; special emphasis in music and physical education.

Gilbert Primary: To provide instruction for the disadvantaged child.

Gilbert Elementary: To expand guidance service, and to provide a team approach to reading difficulties.

Russellville: To include library and audio-visual aid services, guidance and counseling services, remedial and tutorial reinforcements, physical education and an in-service program for teachers working in the project.

David Douglas High School: To provide an educationally-oriented home for the children and to prevent students from dropping out of school. To offer individualized and professional instruction to under-achievers.

The preceding information was obtained through an interview with the principal at Earl Boyles School. Following is a detailed account of the program as it operated at Earl Boyles:

Earl Boyles Elementary School:

Project: Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, Public Law 89–10, Title I, Federal money—no matching funds necessary; state supervision of program through State Department of Education.

Purpose: To expand the primary base for effective learning. It is designed to involve the students in an enriched educational environment that is vital, stimulating and meets the needs of educationally deprived children through more individualized instruction in all areas, but with special emphasis in reading, music and physical education. A two-part program, it provides money for, (1) establishing a summer pre-school for incoming first graders and summer classes for first through third grades; (2) additional staff, expanding facilities, and purchasing equipment for first through sixth grade classes during the regular school year.

When was program initiated? Who qualified? It took several months to clear the program, which began February, 1966, and carried through the summer. The school year program covered grades 1, 2 and 3. The summer program also included those who would be entering first grade in the fall. Earl Boyles was the only school with a pre-school program among the five schools in the district that were participating in the project.

The program included all children who were by definition educationally deprived, but not necessarily economically deprived. The school was originally chosen for the project because of its location in an economically-deprived area, but age and grade alone were the determining factors as to which children participated in the program. The David Douglas District does not provide kindergarten, so theoretically, those entering first grade can be considered to be educationally-deprived. According to the principal, enrichment was an important part of this program; the program definitely was not remedial in nature.

The program is again in effect this year. However, next summer's plan will cover only pre-school, because of a cut to 85% of last year's budget for this year.

Budget: $32,489 was the largest amount for any of the five participating schools. The total for all five was $129,495. The money enabled the school to hire a full time developmental reading teacher in February who has continued on the staff this year. The music and physical education teachers who formerly worked half time, were employed on a full time basis with half of their salary being paid out of these funds. The money also enabled the school to finish two small classrooms to be used for individualized instruction in music and reading. The latter was a small fraction of the total budget, the bulk going for teachers' salaries and the summer program.

Costs: A breakdown of the new staff made possible through this program is as follows: developmental reading teacher, physical education teacher and music teacher—full time; library assistant—daily from 1 to 5; a counselor in summer sessions only for counseling and testing. Other staff supplied during the summer were three kindergarten teachers, a nurse, school secretary, a bus driver and two teacher aides. Money was also used for various educational materials, including tape recorder, tapes and headphones.

The principal pointed out that their costs were less than $3.00 a day per child in contrast to $9.00 for half day per child for the Headstart program due to the involvement of more adults per child in the latter program. The school did not spend its entire budget last year.

Effect of summer program on adjustment to first grade in the fall: The pre-school program was geared to broadening the educational background through activities such as field trips, and to increasing the attention span. It was, during both summer and the school year concerned with physical development as it affects reading-eye-hand coordination. They have found that the physical education program for the entire school is helping children relate better to the total learning situation as well as improving their ability to listen to directions. The principal felt that if the school had to give up any part of its project, it would not be the physical development program.

During the school year the grant made it possible for the first four grades to have music three times per week instead of two, thus improving listening skills. A reading teacher worked daily for 25 minutes with one-third each of eight classes (nine children). This had the effect of reducing the class size and left the regular teacher with only 18 children.

The principal and teachers were extremely enthusiastic about the program because of the opportunities it provided for educational enrichment and more individual attention. The summer pre-school was an unstructured situation with a "school work is fun" attitude. Fewer problems were encountered and increased first grade readiness was apparent. Many children with anxieties changed to "positive learners". The music classes provided more opportunities for self-expression.

Discussion Question:

1. Should federal aid be limited to disadvantaged pre-school children or should it be an enrichment program that would include all children?

2. Should pre-school programs be limited to summer programs only or should they be continued on a year-around basis?

3. Should these programs be brought down to the three-year-old level?

IV. COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Valley migrant league

Project: Valley Migrant League—a program under Title III–B of EOA operating in the counties of Clackamas, Marion, Multnomah, Linn, Polk, Washington and Yamhill.

Financing: Supported entirely by Federal grant requiring no local matching funds. 1965—$681,000; 1966—$1.2 million; 1967—about the same as 1966.

Purpose: To enable seasonal migrant families to settle and become participating citizens able to support their families year-around.

Recipients:

1. Employment must be seasonal and for more than one employer.

2. At least 50% of the annual income must come from agricultural employment.

3. Annual income must be below the poverty scale.

Programs:

1. Opportunity Centers—These are the core of the project. They serve as meeting places for discussion groups, some types of classes; headquarters for staff, supplies, and communications; center for health services, counseling, study and informal recreation. The seven centers are staffed by: supervisor, assistant supervisor, area teacher, job counselor, three program aides, and VISTA Volunteers. Whenever possible, migrants are hired to work in the centers. About half the staff are migrants who are earning while learning new job skills.

2. Bilingual Newspaper—A weekly publication with summer circulation of 8,000 and winter mail circulation of 2,000–3,000 in over 40 states.

3. Adult Education—Individual and class instruction under state certified teachers aimed at including both parents so that they may progress together. Under this program it is possible for a migrant to learn the English language, and to receive basic education leading, in some cases, to a high school certificate.

4. Vocational Education—Counseling some training, and placement services available.

5. Day Care Centers—Involve children from 3 to 5 years of age. About 1000 children were cared for in 98 day-care centers.

6. Day Schools—Involve children from 5 to 12 years of age during the summer. About 1,000 individuals received basic education. This part of the program is being transferred to the State Department of Education in 1967.

7. Research and Evaluation

8. On-the-job Training—A new program funded through the Department of Labor.

Summary: In studying the work of the VLM it must be remembered that the migrant population is fluid. The VLM is never able to work for long with any sizeable fixed group of people.

About 150 former migrant families have settled in the Woodburn area. After the family decides to settle there are the problems of a job and housing. The actual job search is up to the migrant, but the VLM is there to advise and encourage. Housing is very difficult and the VLM tries to help find housing but pays no rent. The migrant needs the assistance of churches and community service groups in finding household furnishings and winter clothing. Funds are not provided for this purpose and more community aid is needed. For those who settle, the first year is the hardest and often the VLM is their only refuge for friendly advice and encouragement.

Automation in agriculture is rapidly taking over the jobs now being done by hand labor. The Executive Director hopes that the VLM will be phased out in about five years. This would be due to: 1. Increased automation in agriculture, 2. More migrants settling permanently, 3. Other agencies taking over services that may still be needed for the migrants that remain.

Discussion question: 1. Is the migrant receiving the help he needs to become a settled and participating member of a community?

Church-community action programs

Stated Philosophy: "The purpose of the Portland area Church-Community Action Programs (C–CAP) is to relate the resources of the churches to the needs of the community. Establishing personal relationships at the point of human need and seeking to effect societal changes that free the disadvantaged, the Church-CAP programs work hard for human dignity. Through a realization of worth comes dignity which in turn may enable people from poverty and other problems to help themselves. The Church-CAPs operate with non-governmental funding from churches and the community, believing that this keeps the programs more flexible and adaptable to local needs."

There is a constant attempt to ascertain needs and establish direction and "to move only with the people as they are ready." Since needs in individual areas are different, action taken in given areas is dependent on those needs. For instance, C–CAP is mainly concerned with matters of education and economics in the predominantly Negro com-

munity of N–NE Portland and serves the larger metropolitan area by attempting to "interpret the dynamics of race and poverty." East-CAP serves a virtually all-white community pocketed with poverty and noted for high percentage of transiency. If people from disadvantaged backgrounds are unaware of or suspicious of governmental and other established agencies, the "CAPs" attempt to establish confidence and direct the individuals to the correct agency, thus often acting as informal liaison and keeping the lines of comunication open.

C-CAP (Church-Community Action Program) 1123 N. E. Fremont was organized by the churches of north and northeast Portland during the summer of 1964. A deep concern by laymen and clergy in the Albina area, an offer of money by the Oregon Methodist Women's Society of Christian Service, coordination by Greater Portland Council of Churches and generous funding from the churches of the Portland Presbytery with matching funds from the Commission of Religion and Race of the United Presbyterian Church of America, resulted in the formation of C–CAP.

The stated purpose of C–CAP is "to develop a more intensive and realistic involvement of the churches in the life and needs and challenges of the community."

The director is the Reverend Paul J. Schulze; his administrative assistant is Mrs. James P. Varner. The budget for C–CAP this year is $40,000.

Samples of what C–CAP has done and is doing:

1. Was instrumental in the formation and early operations of the Albina Citizen's War on Poverty Committee.

2. VEAPS (Volunteer Education Assistants' Project); volunteers help in the classrooms of the community—tutoring, classroom and library helpers, instructing in knitting, sewing and piano.

3. In 1964–65 set up "Headstart" program prior to Project Headstart of Federal Government.

4. Set up Student Summer Service project whereby college students from as far away as Mexico and Illinois have come to help in the community involvement programs with children and their families.

5. Has given to the entire community meaningful interpretation of problems relating to poverty and integration. This has been achieved through such medias as the "Black Power" Conference at which local-regional civil rights leaders were present (the League was represented), and through small informal discussions with various groups throughout the city.

6. "Operation Contact", an attempt to reach the young people of the disadvantaged area.

Two full-time trained workers are on the streets, in parks, in pool halls and driveins, wherever youths gather. They discover the leaders, and work within the group. With the help of ministers in the area and many volunteers they give individual counseling, offer help and guidance, stress law and order, job readiness (good grooming, work habits, need of education, etc.). An attempt is made to interest youth in obtaining instruction in basic skills (math and English) through tutorial programs with volunteer groups and individuals. "Operation Contact" hopes to ease racial tensions. It hopes to coordinate services of established agencies such as Juvenile Court, MacLaren, local schools, Youth Opportunity Center, Child Guidance Clinic, Police, OEO, county welfare, etc.

EAST-CAP: (East Central-Church Community Action Program) 239 S. E. 13th covers the area from 39th Avenue west to the river and from the Banfield Freeway south to Holgate. East-CAP was formed in the summer of 1965 following the basic pattern and purpose of C-CAP to involve the area churches more intensely in the life of the community.

The director (on part-time basis) is the Reverend Paul J. Schulze; his administrative assistant is Mr. Dave Lyons. The budget for East-CAP is $14,000.

Areas of activity for East-CAP:

1. Emergency Service (food, clothing, transportation to County Hospital),

2. Counseling and referral to proper community agencies.

3. Drop-in center for elderly.

4. Family-to-family adoption.

5. Support of citizens organizations in seeking answers to community problems (i.e. urban renewal).

6. Weekly get-togethers (coffee-klatches) especially with women on welfare in area to find natural leaders, get people to communicate with each other, discuss problems, invite speakers (i.e. LWV, city officials, physicians, etc.).

HUB-CAP: (Hub of City: Central Church Community Action Program) 718 W. Burnside. Covers area from N. W. Thurman to S. W. Terwilliger. The Reverend Robert K. Menzel, has been named director and will assume office July 1st 1967. The budget for HUB–CAP this year is $17,500.

At the present time the emphasis is on a "Listening Minority" as four teams are busy investigating and establishing needs for homeless men, single young adults, family and youth, and the elderly and lonely. HUB–CAP may soon be able to assist persons who are forced to leave their present quarters due to Urban Renewal north of the Civic Auditorium in downtown Portland.

SNOW–CAP: (Mt. Hood East Multnomah County Church Community Action Program). Tentatively plans to open office in mid-February at 18415 S.E. Stark Street. SNOW–CAP covers the area east of 82nd Avenue from the Columbia River on the north to Clackamas County on the south and the city limits of Gresham, Wood Village and Troutdale on the east.

Since the geographical area covered by SNOW–CAP is so large it has been broken down into three subdivisions and it is hoped that in time each will have its own permanent office.

SNOW–CAP South: the David Douglas-Cherry Park region.

SNOW–CAP East: the Rockwood-Reynolds region.

SNOW–CAP North: the Parkrose and Gateway region.

Tentatively, the direction for action in the SNOW–CAP North will be in the area of family counseling services (broken homes-youth). The two other SNOW–CAPs are still establishing needs and direction each should take.

Policy and program for each of the above named Church-Community Action Programs is determined by a Board of Directors from churches within each respective community. Coordination and consultation are offered each program by the Greater Portland Council of Churches through its Church-Community Action Commission.

Neighborhood Service Centers: At present there are four Neighborhood Service Centers;

Albina—59 N.E. Stanton Street—Director—Mr. Mayfield Webb—Area—N. & N.E. Broadway to Ainsworth Street—N.E. 15th Avenue to Minnesota Freeway—from Fremont Street; the area extends south to the Willamette River.

Buckman—1925 S.E. Taylor Street—Director—Mr. Robert Johnson—Area—S.E. Hawthorne Street to the Banfield Freeway—S.E. 30th Avenue to the Willamette River.

Brooklyn—1223 S.E. Powell Boulevard—Director—Mrs. Peggy Eckton—Area—S.E. Holgate Street to S.E. Division Street—S.E. 26th Avenue to the Willamette River.

Richmond-Sunnyside—3525 S.E. Hawthorne Street—Director—Mr. Al Charf—Area—S.E. Stark Street to Division Street—S.E. 30th Avenue to S.E. 50th Avenue. Director of the three Southeast Service Centers is Mr. R. E. Collins.

These centers have started to involve the residents of the area in solving their own problems, both in community organization and in the administration of their programs. Of these poverty areas, Albina is the largest (total population 36,000) with at least 10,000 underprivileged. It should be noted that there are more poverty pockets in Multnomah County that have not yet been reached, but work is under way in some by the Church Community Action Programs.

Area residents were hired to do a door-to-door survey to determine the needs of the people for food, clothing, better housing, more education, or employment. Then "Block Leaders" were assigned to keep check on their own areas to determine whether the needs were being met and to encourage the people to participate in helping solve their own problems.

Statement of needs expressed by the area residents: "A Neighborhood Service Center should: 1. coordinate services in the community; 2. provide a focal point for community organization; 3. provide a referral center for those seeking help; 4. offer job counseling; 5. provide a central meeting place for classes; and also for meetings where citizens can express themselves; 6. be staffed by persons from the community with policies determined by the citizens of the area."

The present Centers are meeting the needs expressed above in varying degrees. Classes are being held in sewing, home demonstration, speech and mathematics; mothers' discussion group, ADC group; home repair, consumer interest, installment buying-interest rates; Negro heritage, and civil rights, and others. If at all possible the Centers try for volunteer instructors from the area, otherwise they call on the County Extension Services, schools, universities, and colleges.

The Service Centers are also attempting coordination and communication with other agencies through meetings and published reports. Participating agencies working in these areas are: 1. Family Counseling Service; 2. Legal Aid; 3. Planned Parenthood Association; 4. Youth Opportunity Center; 5. Multnomah County Welfare; 6. Multnomah County Food Stamp Program; 7. Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, etc.; 8. Multnomah County Juvenile Home.

In Albina, The Neighborhood Service Center employees have set up a scholarship fund. They have also organized a Low Income Family Emergency Center (L.I.F.E.) where food, clothing, furniture and other necessities will be available.

A Dental Clinic for all southeast areas is ready to open. It will be located in the Buckman area and will provide much needed dental care for low-income families.

Tutoring—Reed College Community Education Project:

Project: Tutorial program.

Agency: "Reed Community"—personnel are not necessarily connected with Reed College.

Purpose: To tutor illiterate adults—10,000 of whom are said to exist in Portland.

Statistics: Approximately 200 people are presently being tutored on a one-to-one basis by volunteers—there is a waiting list of over 100.

Financing: Partially supported by two federal grants—one administered through the Multnomah County Welfare Department and one through the Equal Opportunities Act.

Summary: The project does not discriminate in any way, and all motivated applicants are accepted for tutoring. Each person needs at least three hours of tutoring a week, preferably all with the same tutor. Tutors are free to use any method of teaching they prefer and training sessions are held once a week for the purpose of

acquainting them with different methods. A large supply of materials is kept in the project library in the music building of Reed College, where all tutors are free to pick out the books to use.

Each beginning student is given three tests—the Slosson Intelligence Test (completely oral), a Slosson Oral Reading Test and a simple arithmetic test. After six months of tutoring, each student is retested to see how much progress has been made. So far, the average rate of progress has been two school months for every month of being tutored. No rate-of-progress difference has been found in students tutored by certified teachers (of which there are presently 20%), and those tutored by people who have never taught before.

The federal grants provide money for transportation and babysitting costs of tutors, transportation costs of students, books, and office expenses.

One of the main purposes of tutoring on an individual basis is to build self-confidence in the student and to help establish a relationship with someone who shows an interest in him alone. Many project students have passed the high school equivalency test and have been able to go on to further training and obtain better jobs.

Portland State College education program:

Project: Tutorial programs.

Agency: ASPSC (Associated Students of Portland State College).

Purpose: To provide academic tutoring for grade school children at Buckman and Abernathy elementary schools and East-CAP center.

Statistics: Approximately fifty college students are working on a one-to-one basis with the children.

Financing: PSC Educational Activities budget (no federal funds).

Summary: Volunteer college students work with teachers and principals of the Buckman and Abernathy schools in obtaining children who are in need of tutoring. The work is done in the schools' physical plant once or twice weekly, depending on individual schedules. Further relationships are encouraged through field trips and parties sponsored by the college in which tutor and child participate together.

Budget: January 1 to December 31, 1967. The following program has been approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.:

Federal grant approved	$691,240
Non-Federal share	92,111
Total approved budget	783,351
Albina Neighborhood Service Center (7-1)	196,516
Family counseling (7-6)	48,527
Albina administration (originally administered by community council) (7-11)	9,429
Adult literacy classes (Reed College tutoring) (7-13)	71,874
Program administration (war on poverty) (7-16)	95,239
Buckman Dental Clinic (for all southeast service centers) (7-21)	67,832
Family planning (7-22)	32,190
Southeast neighborhood service centers (Buckman-Brooklyn-Richmond-Sunnyside) (7-28)	190,166
Foster grandparents (administered by county welfare) (7-30)	71,578
Total	783,351

Discussion Questions:

1. How can community action programs be implemented to reach the greatest number of people?

2. How can lines of communication be kept open between agencies?

3. In working toward success of these programs—

(a) should there be greater involvement of the recipients?

(b) should there be flexibility in order to meet local needs?

(c) can distrust be overcome between recipients and community agencies?

V. APPRENTICESHIP

The Oregon Apprenticeship and Training Program: Oregon's Apprenticeship program in the State Department of Labor, one of the oldest in the nation, provides a supply of highly skilled craftsmen to meet the needs of Oregon industry. As of January 1, 1967, 2423 men were apprenticing in 62 different trades. Apprentices completing the program are recognized as journeymen in their trade.

The State program has been administered by the Apprenticeship Council consisting of eight appointees—four from industry and four from the craft unions. The Council sets overall policy and supervises a big network of local trade-training committees which are also composed of volunteer appointees from industry and the unions. A paid staff, consisting of a director, an assistant, and ten field representatives, carry out the activities of the Council and the local committees.

Recent criticism of the Apprenticeship program has focused attention on the fact that a changing labor market requires expansion of the number and types of positions for which skill training is required. While the Oregon program has shown a steady growth in these respects, it has been restricted by the 4000 hour minimum on-the-job requirement. Consequently, many industrial trades, in contrast to the old-line craft trades, have been excluded from the program.

Charges of nepotism and discrimination in the selection of appointees have been made, with critics pointing to the fact that only seven Negroes were enrolled in the program between 1959 and 1964. Selection procedures for apprentices have been scrutinized and thoroughly revised in the past two years and Equal Opportunity Standards adopted in order to comply with Title 29, Part 30 of the Federal Labor Department directive on "Nondiscrimination in Apprenticeship and Training."

Other remedies to update the Apprenticeship program were contained in HB 1105, which passed both houses of the Legislature in January 1967. The major provisions of this new law are:

1. *New programs of "training":* Non-apprenticeable skills are to be included under the Department of Labor's direction under the new classification of "trainee". Official state recognition of a "training" program in industrial occupations will qualify approved programs for use of public education facilities and services as well as certain federal funds. It is anticipated that this new classification will serve to greatly expand the state program.

2. *Pre-apprenticeship training:* The Apprenticeship and Training Council is directed to cooperate with the Department of Education in analyzing manpower surveys to determine the need for additional skilled persons. Where such need is found, a program of pre-apprenticeship training is to be established in community colleges and other educational institutions in order to qualify additional persons in such fields.

3. *Administrative changes:* The Council is renamed "The Apprenticeship and Training Council" and is expanded to ten members appointed by the Governor; two each representing the apprenticeable crafts, industrial occupations, industrial employers, employers from the apprenticeable crafts, and the public. The inclusion of "public" members was designed to provide a check on discriminatory selection procedures and to insure a broad public view of the program. In addition, the Commissioner of Labor will serve as chairman of the Council and will have power to appoint, with the advice and consent of the Council, a Director and Assistant Director, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Commissioner. Previously, the Council held the power to appoint and remove the Director and Assistant while the Commissioner was authorized to supervise these officers. The new bill places responsibility for administration of the program directly under the Commissioner of Labor and should avoid certain administrative conflicts experienced in the past.

VI. YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTER, 25 NORTHEAST ELEVENTH AVENUE, PORTLAND, OREG.

The Youth Opportunity Center is a division of the Oregon State Department of Employment designed to assist young people, ages 16 through 21, to secure suitable employment. The Center's services include job placement, employment counseling, and referral to vocational training and remedial education programs. In addition to vocational counselors, the Center operates an active outreach program. Many of the youth in need of the services available cannot be reached except through an individualized effort. Community Youth Workers are deployed from the Center into the neighborhoods of Portland. These are in regular contact with other social service agencies and organizations operating in the area. Youths are contacted in small groups and on an individual basis to discuss services of the Youth Opportunity Center and to motivate youth to avail themselves of these services. The outreach program includes an individualized contact with youth who drop out of high school.

Whenever possible, young people are placed in full or part-time jobs. The poorly trained or untrained may be counseled and referred to one of the Manpower Development and Training Programs established by the Oregon State Employment Service in cooperation with the State Department of Education.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps serves as a training ground for applicants who have had little or no work experience, or provides temporary employment until openings occur in the job market or various training programs.

Young male applicants may also be referred to the Job Corps. Girls in the Portland area are referred to the Job Corps through Women in Community Services with offices in the Neighborhood House.

The number of young people who can be satisfactorily served by the Youth Opportunity Center is limited in many ways. There is a problem of communication—getting the word to the young people who would benefit from the services. A need for confidence is another. Solid results are needed to demonstrate that the Center is indeed able to help. The time lag between initial contact and actual placement on a job, or in a training program, can be discouraging to the applicant who then may break contact with the Center. A legal income ceiling of $3,000 for a family of four restricts the number of young people who can qualify for the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Continuing and expanded efforts must be made to publicize the services available. Revision of the income ceiling, incorporating regional guidelines, is being discussed.

Although the Youth Opportunity Center cannot insist that its advice and assistance be sought or accepted, it provides service to the young people of the Portland Metropolitan Area and makes contribution to the effective use of human resources.

Discussion Question: 1. Are youth in need of more education and job training being reached? How can professional people relate to youth who need help?

VII. SKILL CENTER

Occupational skill center—Milwaukie Union High School, District No. 5: This is a pilot program, the first of its kind in

Oregon, for teaching job skills to high school students. It is open to all students in Milwaukie, Union High School, District No. 5 which is the area now served by Milwaukie, Clackamas, and Putnam High Schools. The Occupational Skill Center is under the direction of Mr. Robert L. Crain, who was formerly Director of Adult Education in the District.

Why: Although about 50% of high school students are college-bound, and some of the remaining 50% are fairly well trained for job entry, many high school students remain who need more than the usual general high school education.

How: 1. A Task Force Committee was formed of lay and school personnel to plan the project.

2. The plan was presented to the public by slide-tape programs at coffees and other meetings as well as through the news media.

3. May 2, 1966 the voters passed a serial bond levy of $175,000 per year for three years. The program is eligible for matching federal funds which are channeled through the State Department of Vocational Education. This year Oregon received $250,000 in federal funds of which Union High District No. 5 has qualified for $100,000.00 from the State Department of Education.

4. An Advisory committee was formed representing many areas of industry. This committee has been meeting every other week since June 6, 1966. It has no authority but advises in all areas such as which job clusters and which areas within the different job clusters should be included, advises on equipment and buildings, etc. The final authority and decision making rests with Union High School District No. 5 Board.

Physical Plant: A building site has been purchased which is centrally located for the area to be served, at the junction of Lake and Johnson Roads. It is expected that by September 1967, two buildings, each 120' x 120' connected by a covered work area with concrete floors, will be completed. The buildings are planned for flexibility and the initial stage will take care of about 300 students. It is expected that ultimately facilities will be needed to accommodate 1,000 high school students per day, 500 for each half of the day. There will be evening classes which may include other than high school students.

Curriculum: Juniors and seniors who live in Union High School District No. 5 will be eligible. They will remain enrolled in their regular high schools where they will receive their general education and participate in regular school activities. They will be transported to the Center for about three hours per day. The fields or Job Clusters to be included are:

1. Building Construction: carpenter, plumber, mason, estimator, construction electrician.

2. Electrical-Electronics: maintenance electrician, electronic technician, appliance servicemen, electric repairman.

3. Graphic Reproduction: off-set printing process, platemaking, rough paste-up and layout, sign painting, calligraphy, silk screen, photography.

4. Metal Fabrication: machinist, foundryman, welder, sheetmetal worker, machine operator, metal plating, wrought iron work.

5. Industrial Mechanics: small motor repair, auto mechanics, equipment mechanic, parts man, service station operator, marine service man, maintenance mechanics, production mechanic, also some pneumatics, and hydraulics.

6. Child Services: elementary classroom aides, recreation aides, volunteer organizations, child care aides for nurseries, day care centers, kindergartens.

7. Drafting and Design: draftsmen, tracer, blueprint reading, furniture design.

There are few pre-requisite courses that student must have completed to qualify for Skill Center training, but there are recommended patterns. For instance, home economics would be a logical precedent for child services, industrial arts for building construction, etc.

Aims: The learning process is more important than the finished product. In teaching job skills the "broad brush" approach is used. That is, it is not aimed specifically at producing a skilled carpenter. Rather, it aims at giving the student familiarity with the tools, terminology, some of the processes and the general field in which he will be working. When he is finished with his training at the Center he may go into an apprenticeship training program and the Apprenticeship Council may allow him some credits for the courses taken at the Center. He may be prepared for job entry, but should continue his training on-the-job or through additional schooling or apprenticeship program. He may enter a community college to continue his skill training.

Faculty: A teacher at the Center must have a vocational certificate and must have three years experience in his vocational field. One year of this must have been within the last three years. He may receive a one-year vocational certificate and must then take some education classes to get a second-year certificate.

Enrollment: High school juniors and seniors are eligible for job training. Of the 1800 eligible in the area, 497 indicated interest in the program. The first year about 300 students can be enrolled. When facilities permit, students from outside Union High School District #5 may be enrolled at the Center on a tuition basis.

Problems already apparent:

1. How to get teachers from industry for teachers' pay?

2. Transportation—how to use the buses and the students' time most efficiently?

3. Selection of students—how to choose the individuals who should take the training and will stick with it? A change of course after a few weeks is very undesirable as it would result in a serious loss of time for the student.

To have arrived thus far in the program in so short a time indicates great dedication and hard work on the part of the advisory committee and the school officials. The Occupational Skill Center may have great potential for helping solve some of our modern problems.

Discussion Questions: 1. How is the community meeting the need for vocational education in Community Colleges, High Schools, Skill Centers (Milwaukie High School, Youth Opportunity Center), Apprenticeship programs, On-the-Job Training?

VIII. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

The Manpower Development and Training Act was passed by Congress in 1962 and amended in the 1963, 1965, and 1966 sessions. A primary goal of the act is to "promote and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs, including on-the-job training, designed to qualify for employment the many persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without such training, and to equip the nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are, or will be, required."

The terms of the act are broad and encompass a wide range of training, but the purpose, and the end objective, of training under the act is a *job*. The training projects are established to train or retrain individuals to supply qualified job applicants in those fields in which there are, and will be, "reasonable expectation of employment" at the end of the training period. (Note: This does not mean that all trainees who successfully complete their training courses are *guaranteed* a job—in the free labor market of our economic system this is not practicable.) All trainees enrolled in M.D.T.A. "institutional" training programs are tested, counseled, and screened for selection and referral by Employment Service Counselors.

The continuing downtrend in the rate of unemployment and an analysis of the characteristics of past and potential trainees have brought about a clarification of program guidelines for Fiscal Year 1967. Manpower training must focus on two major problems of our economy: (1) the emergence of some selected skill shortages that accompany declining unemployment, and (2) the residual pockets of hard-core unemployment among fairly well-defined disadvantaged groups, even at low gross unemployment levels. The Fiscal Year 1967 training program is structured to meet these two problems:

1. A minimum of 65 percent of the training will be directed to the hard-core disadvantaged unemployed, including the 25 percent devoted to the training of disadvantaged youth (individuals under 22 years of age). The adoption of the trainee-oriented approach to training is a virtual necessity if the hard-core unemployed are to be reached.

2. Up to 35 percent of the training effort will be directed to less-disadvantaged adults to rapidly meet emerging skill shortages which are adversely affecting the development of the local and national economy when those skill shortages are in occupations susceptible to M.D.T.A. training. This portion of the program will be job-oriented, focusing on the need for more and better trained personnel in vital occupational categories.

(NOTE.—Whenever possible, the Oregon State Employment Service requests and assists in structuring training projects which attack both of these problem areas at the same time.)

With the analysis of past and potential trainees it has been discovered that disadvantaged individuals fall into one or a combination of the following categories:

1. Disadvantaged Youth (between ages 16 and 22).

2. Educationally Deficient.

3. Handicapped (physical, mental, or emotional disability).

4. Inmate of Correctional Institution.

5. Long-term Unemployed (involuntarily out of work for 15 or more weeks).

6. Member of Minority Group (racial, religious, or ethnic group).

7. Older Worker (age 45 or older).

8. Member of a "Poverty Level" Group.

9. Prison Releasee.

10. Selective Service or Volunteer Rejectee.

Two basic trainee characteristics factors and interrelating Employment Service operations had to be taken into account in planning the M.D.T.A. Area 1 Multi-Occupational Training Program for Fiscal Year 1967:

a. The only Youth Opportunity Center in the state is in Portland. As a Youth Opportunity Center is the backbone of trainee and training support service for "disadvantaged youth" trainees, it is obvious that the bulk of "disadvantaged youth" referrals, 25% of the total trainee referrals to the program" will be from the Portland area.

b. The bulk of the state's disadvantaged "minority group" population is located in the Portland Metropolitan Area.

To overcome the problems of reaching and dealing with the disadvantaged youth and adults in the Portland Metropolitan Area, the Oregon State Employment Service has reorganized its operations to establish a Youth Opportunity Office, 25 N.E. 11th Avenue, and an Adult Opportunity Office, 1407 S.W. 4th Avenue, in the Portland area. These offices inter-act with all public and private agencies dealing with disadvantaged throughout the area and act as the screening and selection offices for M.D.T.A. program trainees. In addition, the Fiscal Year 1967 M.D.T.A. program has been inter-related to all other

public and private manpower development and training programs through the area. Through these inter-agency actions the Oregon State Employment Service hopes to reach and serve the disadvantaged, hard-core unemployed who previously would not contact or register with its offices, due to their feeling of hopelessness in obtaining suitable, full-time employment.

Primarily, M.D.T.A. program training projects fall into three categories:

1. *Institutional Training Projects*—developed jointly by the Oregon State Employment Service and the Division of Vocational Education on an "individual referral" or "group class" basis. These training projects may combine (1) Basic education/general educational development preparation of occupational training and/or employment, (2) vocational orientation for training and/or employment, and (3) general or specific occupational training for employment.

In the development and operation of institutional training projects:

a. The Oregon State Employment Service:

1. Determines the occupations for which training is needed.

2. Selects and refers the trainees to the projects.

3. Pays training, transportation, and subsistence allowances to the trainees who meet eligibility requirements for such allowances.

4. Provides (with assistance of the training facility staff) job development, placement, and trainee follow-up services.

b. The Division of Vocational Education:

1. Provides the required training facilities, including education, supervisory and supporting staff and instructors.

2. Determines the appropriate methods of, and curriculum for, training.

3. Evaluates the progress of the trainees.

c. Both agencies work cooperatively to:

1. Develop training and employment support services for the trainees.

2. Maintain a smooth flow of trainee-vocational goal assessment and trainee counseling support prior to, during and following training.

3. Maintain cooperative liaison with other public and private social service agencies working with the trainees.

4. Evaluate training project results to determine methods to improve future training projects.

2. On-the-job Training (OJT)—Developed by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, and coordinated through the State Employment Service. OJT programs are created to give job skills to the unemployed, underemployed, and workers whose jobs are endangered by changing technology. OJT may be defined as the actual performance of the work duties in any occupation, under the supervision and guidance of a trained worker or instructor. OJT provides an opportunity for partial reimbursement for training costs for:

(1) Individual employers who can provide job-entry training, skill-improvement training or retraining.

(2) Labor organizations which provide pre-apprenticeship, refresher, up-grading, or skill-improvement training.

(3) Trade or industrial associations which provide or arrange for training by retraining in specific pre-apprenticeship or other skills.

(4) Government, community, or other public or private agencies which provide directly or indirectly job-entry or skill-improvement training.

Reimbursement to employers cannot exceed $24.00 a week per trainee. The training period cannot be less than four weeks or exceed twenty-six weeks. Low-profit type industries such as hospitals can benefit greatly from such a program; training orderlies, nurses aides, practical nurses, kitchen helpers, retraining registered nurses, etc. The Urban League has an approved OJT project for 150 job slots, and the Portland Metropolitan Steering Committee, as of January 20, 1967, has an approved project for 200 job slots. Such agencies, with the assistance of the Oregon State Employment Service, provide help in individual counseling, provide information to those who need training, contact employers to determine job availability and possible training programs, counsel employers on realistic tests to fill jobs; motivate, recruit, refer and place the unemployed.

Statewide, though less than 15% of M.D.T.A. funds were originally reserved for on-the-job training, during the current fiscal year more than 34% of the funds and 50% of the training opportunities are reserved for on-the-job training. For fiscal year 1967 the number of opportunities for OJT will be in excess of the number of opportunities in institutional training.

3. Combined Institutional/On-the-Job Training Projects—developed through the combined efforts of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, the Oregon State Employment Service, and the Division of Vocational Education.

These projects are normally structured with an initial period of institutional training which gives the trainees the basic, general preparation for their on-the-job training by the employer; a limited amount of "vestibule" (classroom) training may continue throughout the on-the-job training phase. During the on-the-job training phase, no more than 15% of the training hours may be utilized in "vestibule" training activities.

For manpower study, planning, and administrative control the state has been divided into six areas. Each area is a group of contiguous counties which have similar social, economic, and industrial characteristics. For example, M.D.T.A. Area 1 is composed of Clackamas, Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, and Washington Counties and this area maintains planning liaison with Clark County, Washington which is the fourth county of the 4-county Portland Metropolitan Area. To assist in inter-agency liaison, the analysis of manpower problems, and the interrelated planning of manpower training programs each M.D.T.A. area has: (1) A Manpower Co-ordinating Committee composed of professional representatives of all public and private agencies dealing with the disadvantaged and their interrelationship with manpower training; and (2) A Manpower Advisory Committee composed of representatives of labor, management, education, minority or disadvantaged groups, the general public, etc. The latter committee analyzes manpower problems, recommends the development of certain manpower training programs, discusses and makes recommendations with regard to all manpower training programs proposed for the area (when those programs will utilize government funds), promotes and assists in the development of required supportive services for approved manpower training programs, and reviews the progress and results of past and current training projects.

Since the inception of M.D.T.A. training program in Area I, over 1,500 individuals have been referred to "institutional" training projects and approximately 1,000 of these trainees completed their training courses. Group classes have been conducted in the following occupations or occupational areas:

Formal Waiter/Waitress (entry), Hotel-Motel Maid/Houseman (entry), Insurance Specialist (entry), Clerk Stenographer (entryman & upgrading), Dental Assistant (entry), Dental Technician (entry), Cook, Dinner/Fry (entry), Cook Helper (entry), Draftsman, General (entry), Bookkeeper (entry), Bookkeeping Machine Operator (entry), Clerk, General Office (entry), Clerk, General (entry), Key-Punch Operator (entry), Shipping and Receiving Clerk (entry), Audiovisual Specialist (entry), Sales Person (entry), Nurse Aide/Orderly (entry), Janitor/Janitress (entry), Service Station Attendant (entry), Groundskeeper (entry), Clerk Typist (entry & upgrading).

Trained workers receive average rates of approximately $1.30 to $3.15 an hour. Hourly rates range from $1.30 for a cook's helper to $2.17 for a cook; $1.80 to $2.16 for a janitor; $1.31 to $2.26 for clerical work; $1.70 for nurses aides and orderlies.

Funds of $907,920 have been for the Fiscal Year 1967 M.D.T.A. Multi-Occupational (institutional) Training Program for Area 1. This program includes Basic Education/Vocational Orientation and occupational training for 605 trainees. The current status of the program as approved by both the Manpower Coordinating Committee and the Manpower Advisory Committee is:

1. Basic Education/Vocational Orientation—Initial project for 400 trainees has been approved and funded. This project will be amended to cover the total of 605 trainees. All trainees will be referred to this phase for at least one week for additional trainee assessment and training orientation. It is estimated that one-third of the trainees will require only one week of enrollment in this phase of training; but, two-thirds of the trainees will require an average of 12 weeks in one or a combination of the following subtraining phases:

a. Basic Education/General Educational development Test preparation.

b. Automotive Trades Orientation.

c. Clerical Occupations Orientation.

d. Driver Orientation (to obtain an Oregon Driver's License when necessary for employment).

e. Food Service Orientation (to obtain City of Portland Food Handler's Health Certificate when necessary for employment).

f. Hospital Service Orientation.

g. Metal Fabrication and Machining Trades Orientation.

h. Public Contact/Sales Occupations Orientation.

(NOTE.—It is estimated that over one-half of the trainees who complete training in this project will go directly to a regular job or enter an on-the-job training project.)

2. Occupational Training Projects:

a. The following occupational training projects are being prepared for final approval and funding:

1. Bookkeeper (upgrading) 15 trainees.
2. Clerk Stenographer (upgrading) 15 trainees.
3. Clerk Typist (upgrading) 15 trainees.
4. Clerk Typist (entry) 30 trainees.
5. Welder, Arc (upgrading) 60 trainees.
6. Dairy Herdsman (entry) 20 trainees.

(NOTE.—Depending on the availability of potential trainees Project 1 through 5 will be repeated this year.)

b. The following occupational training projects are being considered for inclusion in this year's program:

1. Cook, Dinner/Fry (entry/pre-OJT)
2. Automobile Mechanic (entry/pre-OJT)
3. Automobile Body Repairmen (entry/pre-OJT)
4. Machinist (entry/pre-OJT)
5. Meat Cutter (entry/pre-OJT)
6. Dry Cleaning/Laundry Occupations (entry)
7. Audiovisual Specialist (entry)
8. Nurse, General Duty (refresher for renewal of Registration)

Problems: Since, in a fundamental sense, poverty is inextricably connected with the opportunity for employment, many federal, state, and local agencies are making efforts to solve employment problems (ex. Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, State Welfare, OEO agencies, etc.) Through many functions of these agencies overlap, ways of solving various problems sometimes need to be approached from various points of view. Overlapping is not necessarily bad, but a better job of coordinating must be done. Though there are

examples of various means of coordination, there is no *single* coordinator for *all* these agencies, which are at different times submitting different plans to solve employment problems. A coordinator could do needed fundamental research to develop a realistic job-development program and assure maximum utilization of federal funds.

Since M.D.T.A. institutional projects are submitted and funded on a yearly or set-time basis, there is a problem of continuity of programs. This naturally creates problems in guiding trainees and holding a competent staff.

Large-scale programs to help the disadvantaged find employment are relatively new and counselors who can be competent in both areas of counseling the disadvantaged and counseling for employment, are hard to find.

Many jobs such as the OJT projects in hospitals are resented by prospective trainees because they are looked upon as "service jobs" and recruiting is difficult. Though many "service jobs" are available, their status is low and interest is lacking in this type of vocational training. The dollars in one's pocket can make it seem worthwhile, but there is a problem in motivating possible trainees.

Discussion Questions:

1. Is lack of coordination simply a matter of growing pains and should it be left alone?
2. Should there be a single coordinator from a single agency in the Governor's office to provide a centralization of knowledge about preparation for training needs to be made available to all agencies concerned?
3. Should a coordinator define clear-cut guidelines regarding capabilities and limitations for all agencies?
4. Should projects be funded for a longer period of time? 2 years? 3 years? 5 years?
5. Should more evaluation be done before considering funding projects for more than one to two years?
6. Should emphasis be given to the development of counselors who are competent in both areas?
7. Should scholarships, fellowships or other incentives be used to train such persons?

IX POSITION ON HUMAN RESOURCES—1966

As announced by the National Board of the League of Women Voters on March 28, 1966:

The members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe that the federal government shares with other levels of government the responsibility to provide equality of opportunity in education and employment for all persons in the United States. Employment opportunities in modern, technological societies are closely related to education; therefore, the League supports federal programs to increase the education and training of disadvantaged people. The League also supports federal efforts to prevent and/or remove discrimination in education and employment and to help communities bring about racial integration of their school systems.

In more specific terms, the kinds of programs the League supports include:

Programs in basic education, occupational education and retraining, when needed at any point of an individual's working career.

Expanded opportunities in apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs.

Day-care centers for disadvantaged preschool children to give parents the opportunity for employment.

Greatly increased educational opportunity through compensatory programs for disadvantaged groups beginning at the preschool level and extending through secondary education.

Federal financial aid to help needy students remain in high school and to take advantage of post-high school training and education.

A regional approach to problems of economically depressed areas which cut across state lines. This approach can be handled administratively by such means as interstate cooperation, more formal interstate compacts or commissions made up of representatives of state and federal governments. Development programs should reflect the needs of the particular area and can include such measures as provision of education and training for available jobs, encouragement of new industry in the area, development and conservation of natural resources, and the building of public facilities.

Programs which would inform individuals of their civil rights in education and employment and of the opportunties open to them in education and employment.

Full use of mediation and conciliation in efforts to bring about integration of minority groups into full participation in communty life.

A federal clearing house for the exchange of information on solutions communities have found to problems of integration in employment and education.

Programs to bring about effective integration of schools through federal technical assistance, such as training programs and institutes for teachers and school administrators.

Withholding federal funds from school districts which fail to meet realistic and effective guidelines and standards for school integration.

Withholding government contracts from business and industry which discriminate in employment.

An effective federal fair employment practices agency.

In evaluating federal programs which have been, or will be, established to provide equality of opportunity, the League will support those programs which largely fulfill the following criteria:

1. The nationwide effort to achieve equality of opportunity in education and employment should include participation of government at all levels and encourage the participation of private institutions.
2. Programs should be carefully tailored to the educational or employment needs of the people they are intended to reach.
3. People for whom community action programs are designed should be involved in the planning and implementation of those programs.
4. The programs should be carried out by personnel competent to meet the specific requirements of their jobs.
5. Programs should assist people to become self-supporting, contributing members of society.
6. The programs should be nondiscriminatory.
7. Research, pilot projects, and continuing evaluation should be encouraged and, where feasible, built into programs.
8. Programs may be closely related but should avoid unnecessary duplication.
9. State and local governments should contribute to the extent their resources permit; at the same time, adequate federal funds for the establishment and continuation of programs should be available if necessary.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
McMinnville, Oreg., March 10, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The members of the McMinnville League of Women Voters wish to advise you of our interest in and support for federal legislation to provide equality of opportunity in education and employment for all persons in the United States. The League supports federal programs to increase the education and training of disadvantaged people, and endorses federal efforts to prevent or remove discrimination in education and employment and to help communities bring about racial integration of their school systems.

We are concerned that cuts in EOA appropriations and earmarking of funds by the 89th Congress will drastically curtail locally developed programs (such as neighborhood centers, consumer education and family planning) in fiscal 1967. Anticipating further attempts to cut and dilute existing programs for fiscal 1968, we want you to be aware of our support of community action programs.

We feel these programs should be maintained because of their development of local initiative and stimulation of active participation by formerly apathetic groups in planing their own destinies. We recognize that specific programs have been subject to valid criticism for personnel difficulties and organization problems. Such problems were predictable but should not overshadow the basic soundness of community action in solving the serious problems in our society.

We urge your support for the continuation of locally developed projects by approval of unrestricted CAP funds and favorable consideration of a supplemental appropriation for these projects in fiscal 1967.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GLEN C. MACY,
President, League of Women Voters.

LORENZO DE NEVERS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on March 29 Rhode Island lost one of her most distinguished residents and America one of her fine artists, when Lorenzo de Nevers, of Woonsocket, died at the age of 89.

Best known for his portrait of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr. de Nevers had also painted President Dwight D. Eisenhower, former King Albert I of Belgium, King Alphonse XIII of Spain, and others. His painting "The Resignation of Jesus" now hangs in the Vatican Art Gallery and was a favorite of Pope Pius XII.

During the past few years I had occasion to be in touch with Mr. de Nevers, and although his eyesight was failing and his health was far from robust, he remained alert and interested in the world around him. He was a truly cultivated person, educated and talented in the field of music as well as art.

Lorenzo de Nevers was born in Baie-du-Febre, Quebec, on June 13, 1877, one of 16 children of the late Abraham and Maie (Biron) de Nevers. His family moved to Rhode Island in 1898 and he enrolled in the Rhode Island School of Design. A year later he went to Paris for further study where he remained for 15 years until 1914 when he returned to to America. He opened a studio in New York City, where he worked for the next 17 years.

The art of Lorenzo de Nevers will remain his eternal tribute. We mourn his passing.

APPOINTMENT OF WILLIAM ROTH AS SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to the appointment of William M. Roth as the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. Ambassador Roth previously served for 3 years as deputy representative to his predecessor, the late distinguished and esteemed, Christian Herter.

As President Johnson said of the new appointee:

He has had a part in every step on this long road. He knows the fellow negotiators and they know and respect him.

The importance of the office of special representative is indicated by the President's statement at Ambassador Roth's swearing in on March 24. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

I am pleased that Ambassador Roth was born and began his career on the west coast. He is thus familiar with the trade potentials and problems of that part of our country.

He has also been a working executive and policymaker in the fields of shipping, insurance, leasing, and banking, among others. This experience has given him a firsthand knowledge of techniques and innovations, such as containerization, which the Matson Line did so much to pioneer, and which is ushering American trade into a new era.

The Congress has reason to be grateful to Ambassador Roth for appearing before a joint session of the Senate Small Business and Agriculture Committees in September 1965, to deliver what was probably the first of several congressional briefings on U.S. policy in the Kennedy round tariff negotiations at Geneva. His testimony made a favorable impression.

Mr. President, the interests of American businessmen and farm producers confront formidable obstacles in GATT negotiations at Geneva. Ambassador Roth thus faces a difficult assignment in conducting the final stages of the negotiations and, beyond Geneva, in shaping long-range U.S. trade policy. We wish him well.

In order that the Members of this body and the public can become better acquainted with Ambassador Roth, I ask unanimous consent that his biography also be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

(Statement by the President on the swearing in of Ambassador William Roth)

The fortunes of the Kennedy Round will greatly influence the future of international trade. Agreement by the United States and other trading nations on tariff reductions providing new opportunities and stimulation for productive enterprises everywhere will open the path to a world economy of abundance.

On the other hand, if such reductions cannot be managed, if narrow special interests prevail, divisive forces may gain the upper hand, with grave damage to the economic and political fabric of the world community.

William Roth combines all the assets this Nation should bring to bear on so important a problem.

He was Governor Herter's Deputy for more than 3 years. He has had a part in every step on this long road. He knows his fellow negotiators, and they know and respect him.

Ambassador Roth has just returned from Geneva, where he reports that agreement has been reached on a timetable for bringing negotiations to a successful conclusion. This is good news for all nations. The world may be certain that the United States will be ready to move as quickly and imaginatively as our partners.

Successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round will not mark the end of the drive toward trade liberalization. Ambassador Roth will begin preparations for a long-range study of our foreign trade policy. He will recommend such legislative and other measures as may be required.

Ambassador Roth will focus this study on ways of improving the trade positions of the developing countries as well as further reduction of trade barriers between industrialized nations.

A Public Advisory Committee will assist Ambassador Roth and will consult with Members of the Congress and other interested and knowledgeable people both here and abroad.

(NOTE.—Ambassador Roth was sworn in shortly after 11:30 a.m., on March 24, in the President's Office at the White House.)

WILLIAM MATSON ROTH

Present position: Special Representative for Trade Negotiations (with rank of Ambassador), Executive Office of the President, United States Government.

He was born in San Francisco, California, on September 3, 1916, and received an A.B. degree from Yale University in 1939.

Ambassador Roth has held the positions of Treasurer and Director of Matson Navigation Company, San Francisco from 1951 to 1956; Vice President—Finance and Director Matson Navigation Company, from 1956–1960; and Chairman of the Board Pacific National Life Assurance Company, San Francisco, from 1960 to 1963.

He has been affiliated as a director with the Atheneum Publishing Company, Crown Zellerbach Corporation, Crocker-Citizens National Bank, Mandrel Industries, Pacific Intermountain Express Co., and United States Leasing Corporation. He has also served as Trustee of Mills College, the Committee for Economic Development and as a Regent of the University of California.

Ambassador Roth presently resides in the Georgetown Section of Washington, D.C., with his wife and three daughters.

MIKE MARCUS, WINNER OF THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY BROADCASTING SCRIPTWRITING CONTEST

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few weeks ago it was my privilege and pleasure to meet a young man from New Haven, Conn., Michael A. Marcus.

I had a chance to speak to him for only a few minutes but this was enough for me to be very impressed by his intelligence and his abilities.

Mike Marcus, a senior at Hillhouse High School in New Haven, has been selected the winner of the 20th Annual Voice of Democracy broadcasting scriptwriting contest in my State.

His script, chosen from among six final entries from the six districts in Connecticut, is an outstanding piece of writing for someone his age.

Mike Marcus has captured the pride young people feel in the workings of democracy in our country.

At the same time he has indicated the trepidation they feel as they approach the time they will assume not only the rights but the duties and responsibilities of full citizenship in our democracy.

I ask unanimous consent to have this fine script printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Everybody knows *about* democracy: what it can do, what it can provide, and the meaningful way of life that can be established for those living under it. But no one knows for sure exactly *what* democracy means; for the simple reason that no two people ever refer to the same idea when the word is mentioned. Consequently, all interpretations of democracy are left solely to the individual, to decide for himself what he determines to be the exact nature of its meaning. Yet no tradition in America today is stronger than our high regard for human freedom and individual liberties. The ideal of democracy, embracing these concepts of personal rights, is then a changing idea by itself, and therefore it is a relative, and not an absolute institution.

To me, the meaning of democracy is something that transcends the host of individual freedoms that come with it. I feel that we, the American people, make up the backbone of our nation, and that our government can be no stronger, nor any weaker, than we are. I regard, therefore, the things that democracy, not of itself but as a motivating force and power, can produce and that which a people, once given the advantage of democratic living, can do for themselves and for others as sole testimony to democracy's viability. As citizens of the American democracy, we have the unique distinction of being a world power in which the people are both the rulers *and* the ruled; and in this sense *we* are the absolute, although democracy itself is not. Other governments, by which democracy has been fatefully put on the defensive, include concepts where the state is the absolute, and where the people mean nothing more than to exist as the vehicle for collective gain. Their freedoms have been taken away, and their incentive destroyed. But here, in the United States, every man remains free to do as he pleases, and to choose whatever path of life he wishes to take.

Since democracy is relative, I look at it as a concept that grows, much in the same way that we do. As we gain a more sophisticated insight into the crying problems of our nation, we can find the way that we, working *with* democracy and shaping its meaning, can eliminate them. Democracy to me, then, represents flexibility: firm in its basis yet capable of adapting itself to any situation in relation to the needs and to the desires of the people. In this way, it is vibrant, it is resilient, it "grows." This is not to say, obviously, that all of us can be ideally happy under democracy, but we can all rest assured that we have the chance for freedom, to merely reach up and assume it as part of our identity as a people; never to live in fear of an assault upon our personal liberty or upon our unique, personal individuality. As the late Adlai Stevenson, perhaps one of the greatest Americans of our time, so eloquently stated: "Democracy is a high privilege, but it is also a heavy responsibility whose shadow stalks, although you may never walk in the sun."

Democracy manifests itself in our land in many ways. Most of all, it is people; people who know freedom intimately not because it has been handed down to them, but because they have earned it through some sacrifice of their own. It is with this spirit of service and sacrifices that our generation will grow; growing alongside it, with us, democracy and what we know as the American way of life. This way of life, providing us with the very fibre of our strength and our responsibility, leads us along the road we will take in the future.

Today, democracy faces its ultimate challenge. In relation to the interpretation I have given in reference to what democracy means to me, I conclude therefore that *we* face the ultimate challenge. Now is the

time when our deeds here will measure either the rise or the fall of our nation, whether our principles will either collapse beneath our feet or keep firm upon the very ground left to us by the legacy of Americans in the past. This, then, to me dictates the meaning of democracy: the will of a nation to fulfill its destiny and to seek peace for all people. Impassioned with a love for our country, though not radical, we should achieve our goals. Over one hundred years ago, when the unity of America was threatened in a great, national crisis, Daniel Webster expressed our hopes best:

"Let us come out into the light of day; let us enjoy the fresh air of Liberty and Union; let us cherish those hopes which belong to us; let us devote ourselves to those great objects that are fit for our consideration and our action; let us raise our conceptions to the magnitude and the importance of the duties that devolve upon us; let our comprehension be as broad as the country for which we act, our aspirations as high as its certain destiny. Our daily respiration is liberty and patriotism; our yet youthful veins are full of enterprise, courage, and honorable love of glory and renown."

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMITH-HUGHES ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during the course of our hearings this session on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, S. 1125, which I had the honor to introduce on February 28, I am sure that careful consideration will be given to proposals relating to vocational education.

It is particularly appropriate that this review be taken this year since 1967 marks the 50th anniversary to the Smith-Hughes Act, Public Law 347, 64th Congress, which established this great educational activity. I commend to my colleagues the March 1967, issue of the American Vocational Journal. This entire issue is devoted to a review of the development of the discipline since 1917.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which appears on pages 10 through 12, and the text of the materials contained on pages 46 through 49, of the American Vocational Journal be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS

This issue of the Journal attempts to depict the progress made in vocational education since the Smith-Hughes Act was signed by President Woodrow Wilson on February 23, 1917. We salute the vocational educators who have been, and currently are, a part of this great movement.

The years ahead offer a great challenge. Technology is advancing at an accelerating pace, there are more people to be served by vocational education at all levels, and the confusion that exists over why, how, and by whom vocational education should be administered and conducted is overwhelming. The people best qualified to deal with the issues and problems in manpower training are found in the vocational education profession. I am confident that they will rise to the challenge, and that the history of vocational education for the next 50 years will be recorded as a period of phenomenal growth and improvement.

A FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICY

Educators must be aware of the attempt on the part of certain individuals, organizations, foundations, and even governmental agencies, to evolve a national manpower policy that would place the federal responsibility for developing (educating and training) manpower in a single agency of the federal government. Some proponents would assign this responsibility to the Department of Labor; others have suggested that a separate agency be set up. I have heard no suggestion that the education and training of manpower be delegated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is ironic that the concept of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, established under the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and later abolished by action of the Executive Branch of the federal government, is again being revived. Perhaps the Federal Board was not such a bad idea. When the responsibility for administering vocational education was relegated to a minor role in the Federal Security Agency and later in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, perhaps that should have been cause for concern.

Manpower planners close their eyes to the fact that manpower development is not training in the manipulative skills exclusively. Programs in manpower development call for basic education, related technical instruction, educational methods, teacher preparation, curriculum development, instructional materials, and many of the services that are supplied through education.

Technological development dictates that education be given a greater role than ever before in manpower development. In recognizing the part that education can play in manpower development, we in the United States have been unique. The case has been made over the past 50 years. Now, however, some of the proponents of a federal manpower policy are proposing that we copy countries not as economically advanced as the United States and adopt a plan which is not relevant to a democratic society. With more support, vocational education can give the education and training, but if we continue to siphon off funds and resources into other programs, we will "plow the same ground" under a new agency—and without benefit to education.

Education is traditionally a function of state and local governments with stimulation and leadership from the federal government. Federal, state, and local sharing in the funding of vocational education has worked remarkably well, as evidenced by the fact that the state and local governments expend better than $3 to each federal dollar.

What will happen when a federal agency unrelated to education attempts to impose a program on state and local education agencies? I predict that this cannot work.

The manpower planners should reexamine their approach to the problem to see if there isn't already a plan in existence that will work, if it is properly funded and supported. Certain services can be provided to vocational education by federal agencies, and to a certain extent, are being provided. These services need to be expanded and improved. Vocational educators welcome and solicit this help. However, we don't propose that the federal government "throw the baby out with the bath."

WORK STUDY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

In fiscal 1966, with a federal appropriation of $25 million, the work-study program authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 enrolled 85,100 students. For the current fiscal year, Congress appropriated only $10 million and it is estimated that 35,000 students will be enrolled. Justification for the reduction in 1967 (as stated in the Appendix to the Budget for Fiscal 1967) indicates that the Neighborhood Youth Corps, under the Office of Economic Opportunity, will begin taking over this function.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is administered by the U.S. Department of Labor. It does not reach youth in many areas of the nation, and as a result of this action by Congress, thousands of youth are denied enrollment in vocational education. If the work-study program were administered by vocational education, the qualified student who wants to enter vocational training but lacks financial resources could be identified and helped immediately.

Although the work-study program is not intended to be an education and training program, it often provides an opportunity for the student to work at jobs closely related to his vocational objective.

The federal budget for fiscal 1968 provides no funds for work-study under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. If the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget is upheld by the first session of the 90th Congress, thousands of youth will be short-changed.

The argument that all federal work-study programs should be put under one governmental agency to cut down the cost of administering programs would dictate that all in-school work-study programs be administered through vocational education, because the cost of administration has been less through this channel. Management experts at the federal level have—as in this case—recommended the separation of fiscal management and program operation. There is evidence that such an arrangement leads to confusion and inefficiency even when practiced within a single agency. It will be worse when two or more agencies are involved in program planning, policy making, and handling of funds. This is a serious matter that will have direct bearing on the purposes stated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

STUDENT LOAN ACT

Federal funds in the amount of $1.8 million to provide for interest payments on insured loans under the National Vocational Student Loan Act of 1965 were appropriated for fiscal 1967. Rules and Regulations issued by the U.S. Office of Education appear in the Federal Register, Vol. 31, No. 229, Nov. 26, 1966.

To obtain a loan, a student must be enrolled in an eligible institution which (a) admits as regular students only persons who have completed or left elementary or secondary school and who have the ability to benefit from the training offered, (b) is legally authorized to provide a program of post-secondary vocational or technical education, (c) has been in existence two years or has been specially accredited by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and (d) is accredited either by a recognized accrediting agency, a state agency listed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education or by an advisory committee appointed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

If communications concerning this legislation have not reached you through your state department of education, it is suggested that you request information from Dr. Walter Gale, Acting Chief, Institutional Eligibility Section, Division of Student Financial Aid, Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

LAWMAKERS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

(By Mary P. Allen, director of public information, American Vocational Association)

Since the turn of the century, the U.S. Congress has evidenced concern for vocational education. Through political processes this concern has been translated into a well-established federal-state partnership in vocational education. Bills to aid vocational education have been supported by many who have served in the Congress; yet during this fiftieth anniversary year of federal support we give special recognition here to those who have made outstanding legislative contributions. Vocational education in America has been enriched by their efforts, and no history of its development can fail to take note of these pioneers.

THEY SET A PRECEDENT

Sen. Hoke Smith of Georgia and Rep. Dudley Hughes, Georgia, authors of the Smith-Hughes Act (National Vocational Education Act of 1917) signed by President Woodrow Wilson, February 23, 1917.

Sen. Hoke Smith: "We have given a great deal of time at this session to preparation for war. We might well give some preparation for peace and to the better preparation of our girls and boys for the struggles of life, for its joys and trials. We might well present the fact that even in case of war more men and women would be required at home to prepare the instruments of war and to prepare the food and clothing for the soldier than those who would be required on the front. They should be prepared for their duties in war and in peace."

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

[Senator Smith continuing] "I have referred to amendments that I have suggested and [which] the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Page] and I have studied together. The truth is, on this side my colleagues seem largely to have looked to me to work upon the bill, as I have been working upon it for several years, and I know the Senators on the other side of the chamber realize the splendid work that has been done with reference to this measure by the Senator from Vermont. . . . The responsibility for the measure would have continued with him rather than to have fallen to me but for the change which took place in the organization of the Senate three years ago. With the Republican majority he was leading the work, and I was helping him. Since that time, as I am chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the situation is reversed just a little, but I am always glad to stop at any time the opportunity is presented to give the Senator from Vermont every possible credit for his splendid work upon this subject, and almost to regret that we have a Democratic majority and that he has not charge of the bill instead of myself."

SUPPORT FROM WISCONSIN

Among other congressional supporters of the Smith-Hughes legislation was Rep. Edward E. Brown of Wisconsin, who said: "Each year over one million school children stop school without having finished the sixth grade and without having been taught the first principles of supporting themselves. . . . Is an educational system that permits 97 percent of its children to go into the world without being taught any form of labor by which they can support themselves a success?"

Representative Hughes: "This legislation, Mr. Speaker, aims to reach that great mass of our citizenry which is unmoved by our present system and by the offer of the self-help which comes from the proper education and training of head and hand to insure a gradual elevation from the lower to the higher levels of mankind without changing from vocation to profession. . . . We propose here to open the road and point the way. When that is assured, something worthwhile will have been accomplished. Whatever else may be the function of government, the materialization of the potentialities of its collective citizenry must ever be one of the chief concerns as well as supreme functions of national sovereignty."

SENATOR GEORGE OF GEORGIA COSPONSOR OF FOUR ACTS

Elected to the U.S. Senate in 1922, Walter F. George of Georgia was co-sponsor of four acts providing federal aid for vocational education: the George-Reed Act, signed by President Coolidge, Feb. 5, 1927; the George-Ellzey Act, signed by President Roosevelt, May 21, 1934; the George-Deen Act, signed by President Roosevelt, June 8, 1936; and the George-Barden Act, signed by President Truman, Aug. 1, 1946.

Speaking in support of the George-Deen Act, Senator George said: "Mr. President, in 1935 there were enrolled in federally aided vocational schools 1,178,896 adults and minors above the age of fourteen. Training in some three hundred occupations was afforded to this vast enrollment. I may say also that in 1935, after the period of the depression had been continued to that year, the actual expenditures by the states and territories for every dollar of federal funds devoted to vocational education amounted to $2.13; so that the primary objective and the initial hope of those who fostered vocational education in the United States have been realized; that is to say, that the States have expended more than twice the amount contributed by the federal government for vocational education in the several states and territories."

Cosponsors with Senator George

Rep. Daniel Reed of New York, co-sponsor of the George-Reed Act: "I want to read a little excerpt made to us at the hearings: 'For every dollar of federal funds spent for vocational agriculture, there was a financial return of $2.25 realized by the boys from their labor. The total federal funds spent for salaries for teachers of vocational agriculture during the five-year period was $10,418,460, and there was realized $23,637,-924.25 from the practical work the boys did.' "

Rep. Lawrence R. Ellzey of Mississippi, co-sponsor of the George-Ellzey Act: "Under the operations of the George-Reed Act, there was $2,500,000 allocated. This bill carries an appropriation of $3 million but an additional $1 million has been added for the training in trade and industry. Mr. Speaker, this bill is needed to expand vocational training, and I hope it will pass."

Rep. Braswell Deen of Georgia, co-sponsor of the George-Deen Act: "I have no pride in authorship [of this bill], but I am concerned about the destinies of 8 million to 10 million people who are on our hands but who want to get on their own feet. The only way to get them off the hands of the taxpayers is to put them on their own feet and the best way of getting people off relief and keeping them off is to give them some training in a profession or business that will enable them to make a living. No American with pride, and most of them have pride, wants to be on relief. They want to work and they are entitled to it."

Rep. Graham Barden of North Carolina, co-sponsor of the George-Barden Act: "The public vocational schools, in peacetime and in war time, have demonstrated their ability to train people for gainful and useful employment. The availability of additional funds provided by S. 619 [the George-Barden bill] will make it possible for public vocational schools to make a necessary contribution to the nation's post-war reconversion program. New occupational fields in industries requiring new skills, new tools requiring dovelopment of other new skills, new materials, and new processes will require additional vocational and technical knowledge and skills. . . . This bill provides a way to encourage it. This is building and doing in the American way by Americans.'

NDEA FUNDS STRESS AREA SCHOOLS AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

The National Defense Education Act, signed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Sept. 2, 1958, was co-authored by Sen. Lister Hill of Alabama and Rep. Carl Elliott, Alabama.

In the preamble to the National Defense Education Act, co-authors Hill and Elliott stated: "The Congress hereby finds that the excellent programs of vocational education, which states have established and are carrying on with the assistance provided by the federal government under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and the George-Barden Act, need extension to provide vocational education to residents of areas inadequately served and also to meet national defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments. It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the states so that they may improve their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs approved by state boards of vocational education as providing vocational and related technical training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices, designed to fit them for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in scientific or technical fields."

Sen. Lister Hill, speaking in support of the George-Deen Act: "One reason we find ourselves at this hour in the throes of the depression is the fact that some years ago we did not have the vision to see that the old systems were passing and that with new scientific methods and modern technology, they had to go. Not recognizing these facts, we failed to educate and to prepare our people for the new scientific technological day in which we live. . . . The unemployed have got to be trained for new vocations and new trades . . . the good American citizen does not want to dole; what he wants is an opportunity to make his own livelihood. While we are spending billions on relief, we ought to be able to spend $12 million to help train and educate these people to make their own living."

Rep. Carl Elliott: "For those who are able to look beyond the immediate future to, say 10 years from now, it is obvious that every dollar we spend on vocational training programs will yield a tremendous return in savings to our economy. The returns will be twofold: savings in reduced welfare costs, and increases in income tax returns. The unemployed person pays no taxes and consumes few goods; the underemployed contributes little more to our economic growth. An enlarged and comprehensive vocational education program will strengthen or economy as a whole by strengthening the capacity of individuals to produce, consume, and pay taxes. It is economic as well as common sense that says we must invest now in vocational education and invest heavily."

MOLDERS OF MANPOWER LEGISLATION

Sen. Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, and Rep. Elmer Holland, Pennsylvania, co-authors of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, signed by President Kennedy, March 15, 1962.

Senator CLARK: ". . . Many unemployed workers whose skills have become obsolete because of automation or other changes in the economy, must be retarined before they can hope to be re-employed. This is particularly true of workers over thirty. There has been enough successful experience in several of the states . . . to prove that the objective is a feasible one. Retraining does make possible the re-employment of workers who otherwise have only the slimmest chances of getting jobs. By enabling these workers to contribute to the economy, and by reducing unemployment compensation and job assistance costs, we clearly more than pay for the cost of the training."

Representative HOLLAND: "All of us know that automation and technological advancements will continue at an even more rapid rate in the years ahead. With each advancement, more jobs in certain categories are eliminated. Without additional training, the future of these displaced workers points to only one place, our relief rolls. We must remember one thing: Not only does the worker go on relief, but his family does also. His children do not receive the necessary education and training to prepare them to work and live in our highly automated society of tomorrow, and we may end up with them on our relief rolls permanently.

"We must give these men and women who are raising families the opportunity to be

retrained, re-enter the work force, educate and support their families, become self-sustaining and active contributors to our national economy: This legislation is an investment in the future. The ultimate returns received by the nation will be boundless."

BREAKTHROUGH IN 1963

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, signed by President Johnson, December 18, 1963 Co-sponsored by Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon and Rep. Carl Perkins of Kentucky.

Senator MORSE: "It is in keeping with the American tradition that the many tasks of the world of work are equally important—that the man who works with his hands be just as well-trained, have just as many opportunities, be just as respected, as the man who works at a desk. It is also in keeping with the democratic ideal that every man and woman should have access to the education and training needed to develop to his highest potential."

Representative PERKINS: "This Act will prove a milestone in the history of vocational education, not merely because it meets a great crisis, but because it meets this crisis with imagination and vision . . . The time has come to accept our responsibility to our nation. The time has come to enact legislation which will permit those in charge of our vocational programs to admit rather than reject thousands of applicants, to train rather than ignore the youth with special needs, to build now for a future that enables people to acquire new skills necessary for new jobs."

Mr. MORSE. I regret that the Senate rules regarding the RECORD preclude the reproduction of the photographs of the legislators who have been associated with vocational education in this historic half century of progress.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION HELPS TO COMBAT AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, as a new Member of the Senate, I was extremely interested in the recent expression of the views of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], regarding the efforts that business firms in their respective States are making to combat air and water pollution.

My interest was aroused by their refence to the financing available to small firms from the Small Business Administration.

Since the problem of air and water pollution is one which we also face in South Carolina, I was interested to learn whether firms in my State are aware of this valuable Federal assistance and are taking advantage of funds available from SBA. I am happy to report that many are familiar with the financing available to them and are making use of it.

These firms are to be commended for the efforts they are making in helping reduce and eventually eliminate air and water pollution in our State. They are also to be commended for having the initiative to learn about and use this program which Congress has created for their benefit.

The firms in my State of South Carolina that have received loans to fight air and water pollution are: Industrial Chemical Co., Rock Hill, S.C., $35,000; Wright Contractors, Inc., Columbia, S.C., $20,000; Edenwood Water Co., Columbia, S.C., $50,000; Coastal Water Co., Charleston, S.C., $100,000; Hilton Head Water Co., Bluffton, S.C., $20,000; and Blue Ridge Contractor, Inc., Easley, S.C., $35,000.

I am confident that the work these firms are doing is going a long way in helping us make the air and water in my great State clean and pure. I join my colleagues from Washington and Wisconsin in recommending the use of the Small Business Administration's loan program as a means of helping combat the problem of pollution.

I might add that since my curiosity was aroused concerning this particular SBA program, I took the liberty of looking into the other services available to small business from this Agency. My examination of SBA programs indicates that this agency is doing an excellent job of meeting the needs of small firms. It is making an all-out effort to determine what business concerns require assistance and the kind of help that is needed. If SBA does not already have programs to provide the necessary help, new and imaginative ideas are being used to develop programs to meet these needs.

I believe SBA is doing an excellent job in serving our Nation's small business firms. It is assisting the Nation in attaining the goals which the President and Congress have set for this endeavor.

LOSS OF OIL PRODUCTION IN UNITED STATES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, nearly one billion dollars in investment potential has been lost to the oil industry of the United States in the past 10 years. In a National Petroleum Council report issued several weeks ago, it was noted that "since 1957, independent producers as a group accounted for the total industry drop in these expenditures of $890,000,000."

Mr. President, my State of Kansas ranks seventh in the production of oil in this country, and the majority of the production in the State is due to the efforts of the independent producer. If the independent continues to lose production and defer further investment in new oil wells, the Nation's total reserves of oil will suffer drastically.

We need only look at the statistics for Kansas in the week ended March 25, 1967, to understand the regression which is taking place throughout the entire State's oil industry:

Kansas petroleum index

WEEK ENDED MAR. 25

	This week	Year ago
West Kansas first reports	47	47
West Kansas completions	40	55
Drilling notices	54	74
Total to date	708	903
New oil wells	13	21
Barrels daily	905	1,097
Drilling wells	354	427
Active rotaries	40	62
Wildcats to date	151	177
Discoveries to date	54	63

If there is reduced exploration by independent oilmen, there are certain to be reduced reserves for the Nation. In the event of a national emergency, our present sources would not be sufficient to meet requirements.

The irony of the plight of the independent producer is that his production has been decreasing while imports have been increasing. The National Petroleum Council study noted that from a net-exporter position at war's end, the United States constantly increased its net import balance beginning in 1948. In the 10-year period from 1955 to 1965, imports equaled 50 percent of the gain in domestic petroleum liquids production. The council pointedly stated that "the effect of rising imports, including their effect on prices, helped limit the profit prospects on domestic oil."

Kansas oilmen have been concerned over these increasing imports for some time. I invite attention to an article published in the Wichita Eagle of March 26, 1967, which points up a plan being proposed by Kansas independent oil producers to stimulate oil production and increase the diminishing reserves of this country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Kansas Oilmen Launch National Oil Import Plan."

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

KANSAS OILMEN LAUNCH NATIONAL OIL IMPORT PLAN

(By Ted Brooks)

If you want to stimulate oil production and increase reserves, you stimulate producers and the drilling of oil wells.

That is the axiomatic contention of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association, which announced Saturday the launching of a national effort to halt the precipitous dive in U.S. oil exploration, development and reserves.

Within the context of present administration policies KIOGA members are starting to organize domestic producers behind a plan that would distribute any additional foreign oil import quotas directly to domestic producers.

Currently, the Department of Interior now assigns refiners shares of foreign oil imports in proportion to their refining capacity. In theory, this would protect the entire domestic industry, bolster crude prices and insure exploration and development sufficient to hold oil reserves at a level consistent with national security requirements.

This is not what is happening, the independents insist.

In practice, they contend, "import quotas now are used as windfall income to finance expansion, marketing wars and the highest profits in history."

Meanwhile, they demonstrate with the recitation of 10-year record of declining crude prices and rising costs, domestic producers have been driven to the wall and reserves have fallen to the point "where this nation would find itself helpless in the event of a major national emergency."

Last fall the Defense and Interior departments, alarmed by the steady decline in reserves, asked domestic producers to submit plans that would encourage exploration and revive falling reserves.

The answer proposed by Kansas independents is RECAP—short for Reviving Exploration, Capacity and Production.

The principal virtues of RECAP, the Kansans say:

It would attain desired goals by plowing imports into the industry where needed—into U.S. oil fields.

It is not a subsidy; it is self-financing.

It requires no legislation, no new policies, no change in import percentages, no price-fixing.

It is practical, easily administered, and the mechanics are based on readily available data.

Most important, it puts oil import quota incentives where they belong—with the small companies that find and develop 80 percent of the nation's crude reserves.

The recap plan, independents point out, suggests alterations, not drastic changes in the present quota system. No present importer or import quota holder would lose a single barrel.

In short, it is contended that RECAP will achieve in the direct-to-the-producer approach what the refinery quota system, by itself, has failed to bring about; satisfaction of the trade expansion program's national security clause, which calls for a healthy domestic oil industry capable of meeting the requirements of national security.

Recap would work and find its justification on the same principles now in effect for refiners.

It proposes that beginning Jan. 1, 1968, all import quotas above present quotas shall be allocated to qualifying producers. These consist of domestic producers actually engaged as working-interest owners in U.S. production. It excludes producers that already hold quotas or are directly affiliated with quota holders.

As refiners are now assigned quotas according to their refining capacity, so would all additional quotas be assigned to producers. They would be allocated quotas on a pro-rata basis according to production of up to 1,000 barrels daily.

The producers would exchange their import quota barrels for domestic barrels through a paper-work process such as presently practiced by refiners; like refiners, they would benefit from the price differential, currently estimated at about $1.25 per barrel. This would be effected through trade association clearing houses.

As imports increased, producer quota-holders would get all of the rise until their allocations were equal to those of refiners. Subsequent increases would be shared equally by the two groups.

In operation it may be supposed that about 500,000 barrels daily of domestic production would qualify for quotas. Assuming that by 1968 a total of 100,000 barrels daily would be available for allocation, then each barrel produced by a domestic operator would earn a quota of one-fifth barrel of foreign crude. In other words, an operator producing 100 barrels daily would get an import quota of 20 barrels daily.

In the first year, it would provide an estimated $45,000,000 in producer capital. "If that seems like a lot of money," a KIOGA official notes, "consider that the refiners are now reaping more than $830 million annually as figured from the value of imported oil over domestic—the figure would go to $1.4 billion if foreign producer profits were added."

George Bruce, Wichita, one of the prime movers of the Recap plan, said that its equitable distribution of import quotas would result in returning the domestic industry to the levels of 1956, when three billion barrels of new reserves were found. The reserve discovery level has since declined to around two billion barrels annually.

"This plan can be put in motion and it will work," Bruce said. "Our biggest hurdle will be in overcoming the defeatist attitude that has gradually settled over independent producers—many think they are being overcome by history and trends beyond their control.

"Actually," Bruce contended, "the trends are man-made and inequitably slanted to economically favor one group over another. The production-to-reserve ratio has declined to the point where national security is no longer a theoretical issue. We have everything going for us, and a determined effort will permit the domestic industry to revive the productive capacity the country must have.

"We can't do the job by ourselves," Bruce concluded. "We are asking every domestic producer in the U.S. to contact us and pledge his support to the Recap plan."

Though the deal is consummated through crude oil trading, in effect the domestic producer would buy the foreign oil for about $1.75 and resell it to coastal refiners at domestic prices, or about $3, thus realizing $1.25 per barrel from the transaction just as refiner quota owners do at present.

In practice he swaps about 11.66 barrels of his domestic oil to pay for his 20-barrel quota. He is credited at the pipeline for 20 barrels worth $60 and debited with 11.66 barrels worth $35, thus realizing a $25 gain. The overall result is that the producer grosses an extra 25 cents per barrel for his 100-barrel per day production.

The importing coastal refiners get a bargain even at $3, since they have to buy considerable domestic oil anyway and the paper-work swap lays down the oil at their dock without pipeline and gathering charges. In addition, most of them produce the foreign crude and nominally sell it (mostly to themselves) at $1.75 per barrel, from which they reap a handsome profit.

They would prefer, of course, to augment the producing profit with the import refining profit since no profits are so high as to seem unjustified by the profit maker. The independent producers therefore anticipate a gory battle before they are able to alter the status quo.

Recap grows with import quotas. Assuming that another 100,000 barrels daily would be available for quotas after another year had passed, and 600,000 barrels daily qualified for quotas, a domestic producer with 100 barrels a day would get a quota of 33-plus daily worth nearly $42 a day.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I wish to note also that oil producers in my State of Kansas are not the only segment who fear that the situation is becoming more critical each day. Looking at other than imports, Mr. David Francis, of the Christian Science Monitor, outlines the touchy margin between reserves and market needs. He explores many possibilities but always finishes with an alarming outlook at what is occurring to our domestic petroleum supply. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "U.S. Reminded To Reconsider Oil and Gas Policies," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. REMINDED TO RECONSIDER OIL AND GAS POLICIES—IMPORT QUOTAS, TAX INCENTIVES NOTED

(By David R. Francis)

NEW YORK.—Within the next few years, the United States will need to reconsider its crude-oil and natural-gas policies. Indeed, in the view of some oil economists, the sooner the better.

In the political furnace, oil and gas burn at a high temperature. The power of domestic crude producers to influence Congress is well known.

However, the economic facts are pressing for reexamination of such touchy matters as import quotas, tax incentives, and compulsory unitization of oil fields.

Figures on oil and gas reserves at the end of 1966, just released by the American Petroleum Institute and American Gas Association, confirm this need.

The nation's proved recoverable reserves of liquid hydrocarbons at the end of 1966 are estimated at 39.781 billion barrels. This is an increase of 405 million from 1965.

That looks healthy. But a closer look shows a trend of long-range concern.

Much of the gain in crude reserves occurred on the West Coast and Alaska. These form a separate oil market from the area east of the Rockies. Not much oil flows over the mountains.

RESERVES DROP

East of the Rockies, the crude reserves dropped 100 million barrels.

In addition, the ratio of annual production to reserves has been declining.

In 1958 the United States had enough proved recoverable reserves of liquid hydrocarbons (crude oil plus natural-gas liquids) to last 13.5 years at the then current rate of production. By the end of 1966, this ratio had dropped to 11.5. Reserves had gone up. Production, though, went up even faster.

At the end of 1965, the ratio was 12.1.

The decline between 1965 and 1966 is even worse looking at crude-oil reserves alone. There the ratio dropped from 11.67 to 9.8.

This doesn't mean that in 11.5 years the United States will run out of crude and hydrocarbons. New wells will be drilled, new discoveries made, new reserves established. It is unlikely that all wells, present and future, will dry up within the current average life span.

SIMILAR PICTURE

The decline in the production-reserve ratios does mean that new energy policies will become necessary.

Adds John H. Lichtblau, research director of the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, Inc.: "There is no evidence that this decline has come to a halt."

In natural gas, the picture is similar.

Gas reserves advanced to 289.3 trillion cubic feet during 1966. This is up only 2.86 trillion cubic feet.

Production increased a trillion cubic feet to 17.49 trillion cubic, a larger gain than in any previous year.

This meant that the ratio of production to reserves dropped from 17.6 at the end of 1965 to 16.5 at the end of 1966. It was 22 in 1958 and has been declining ever since.

If it were to decline much more, investors might become chary of making long-term investments in pipelines.

A recent study by Mr. Lichtblau clarifies the problem for crude oil.

Between 1965 and 1980, the study finds, United States oil producers must lift 61 billion barrels of crude oil out of the ground. This is necessary to meet an annual growth rate in oil demand of 2.7 percent in those years. Total United States energy requirements are projected to grow slightly faster at 3 percent.

PRODUCTION TARGET SET

Simultaneously, oil firms must develop gross reserves of almost 80 billion barrels just to stay even with the production-reserve ratio of 1965. They fell behind last year.

By 1980, this means daily crude-oil production of 13.2 million barrels a day. By comparison, 8.9 million barrels were produced each day last year.

In short, the United States is faced with a 51 percent hike in its total crude-oil requirements above and below ground for the next 15 years, just to hold its own.

Some idea of the magnitudes involved can be seen from history. In the 107 years since the drilling of the first oil well at Titusville, Pa., the United States has produced about 80.6 billion barrels. To stay even over the next 15 years, new reserves of the same amount must be found.

It won't be easy. It may not be wise.

Costs of finding and getting oil out of the ground have been rising. Oil reserves found per wildcat well drilled have declined steadily in recent years.

IMPORTED CRUDE LIMITED

In 15 years, the electric car is unlikely to replace the gasoline-powered vehicle. Nor are the huge reserves in the oil shales likely to become a major factor in that period.

Possible solutions may be unpopular in Congress.

For one thing oil-import quotas could be hiked. Imported crude now is limited to 17 percent of total refinery production.

If more crude was imported from the Middle East, where production-reserve ratios may run as high as 40 years, domestic production wouldn't have to grow so fast. But domestic wells are already restrained from producing at full capacity. And the domestic oilmen don't like it. It might depress prices as well.

At some point, too, the matter of national security enters. If imported oil becomes a larger factor in the supply, what is the danger of its being cut off?

This danger is not so real in the case of Canadian oil. It is not included in the quotas. But the growth of Canadian imports is limited informally.

The Athabaska tar sands and the recent new Rainbow field offer huge North American reserves. Domestic United States producers, however, again don't want Canadian crude imports to expand rapidly.

Another possible solution would be to improve further the economic incentives to finding more oil in the United States. These are already extraordinary because of special tax advantages. The oil industry, though, would like even more encouragement to wildcat for oil.

A final possibility is to improve the efficiency of present fields. Too many wells often reduce the amount of oil that can be extracted from a field. Compulsory unitization could improve yields in some cases.

Perhaps a mixture of all these measures may be required. Nor should the government wait too long.

If it procrastinates, the United States will have to launch what Mr. Lichtblau describes as a "crash program" to get the oil needed.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is becoming obvious that some attention must be given to the plight of the independent oil producer. We cannot let this mainstem of our oil industry merely slide away into oblivion because of unfortunate and unusually large commitments to foreign countries for the importation of their oil. Some protection must be developed for our domestic producers as well as those who prosper on imported crude oil. At an appropriate time, I shall make a recommendation to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate the independent oil industry in the Nation and report on the depression which has left an otherwise healthy industry in an emaciated condition.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the February 1967 issue of School Management, under the heading of "Curriculum," there is a series of articles relevant to programs which fall within the scope of the International Education Act of 1965.

Because of my belief that these articles can be most helpful to my colleagues when later this session funding of the International Education Act will be considered, I ask unanimous consent that the articles in question be printed in the RECORD.

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

CURRICULUM: INTERCULTURAL STUDIES

HOW TO JOIN A GROWING REVOLUTION

Some revolutions arrive overnight, others first travel a long road. A curriculum revolution that has been on its way in the liberal arts college for two decades may well be set into high gear by the enactment of the International Education Act of 1966.

The somewhat deliberate sluggishness of the legislation's getaway—it was enacted in October but without funds to put it into operation—is expected to stimulate more colleges (and universities) to prepare to take advantage of its provisions. This activity is foreseen especially since grants, the earliest not expected before 1968, are likely to go to institutions with programs already under way or planned.

And as college preparations for the grants go, so will go the revolution called intercultural, or non-Western, studies.

NEGLECTED KNOWLEDGE

Educators know that intercultural studies refers to examination of the cultures of those world areas which have been largely neglected in American higher education: Africa, Slavic Europe (including Russia), Asia and Latin America, the last scarcely "non-Western." These areas have been outside the mainstream of American college and university curriculums with their stress on Western civilization. (The term *intercultural* is gaining ascendancy over the widely used *non-Western*. Users of the latter term were aware of its inadequacy but couldn't come up with a better one. *Intercultural* is also felt to be more accurately descriptive than *international*, which tends to connote political rather than cultural division of the world.)

The words, however, are essentially euphemisms. What is actually being called for is a complete overhaul of thinking on the part of college and university faculties and administrations. Intercultural studies is an academic revolution—one in which most colleges will want to take an active part.

HOW YOUR INSTITUTION CAN GET STARTED

Catch up with the world. The American higher education establishment is being challenged to lift its students' heads out of Western educational sands and let them sniff at least a few breezes from the remainder of the world.

"Base your teaching on the experiences of all the world," proponents say, "not just on the limited portion that contains Athens and Rome and the Western tradition." Although the intercultural approach and need are equally valid for graduate levels, particularly spotlighted are the undergraduates. Permeate the whole undergraduate curriculum with a broader perspective, is the plea. How can a liberal arts graduate, it is asked, be said to be well rounded in these days of a changing, tumultuous world, to have the breadth of outlook of a civilized man, if his learning is based on a partial view of this globe?

Merely adding a few courses on non-Western areas isn't enough.

Nor is it a matter of tossing together a few existing courses on non-Western subjects to make an intercultural salad.

The key to the movement is institutional commitment to a "new look."

Electives no answer. Even where liberal arts and other four-year colleges carried courses on non-Western subjects, a 1964 survey found, fewer than 10% of the students took such courses, since many were upper-year electives. The aim is to focus undergraduates' eyes on the world as a whole, and to expose them to at least one other world culture in addition to their own.

Another survey, "Non-Western Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges," published by the Association of American Colleges, found that in 1963–64 at least 482 colleges, or 70% of the 685 surveyed, had some non-Western activity, and 440 listed formal course work in that area. "Thus a majority of liberal arts colleges have clearly tried to do something about non-Western studies," the report stated.

But this was faint praise.

Out of the 440, the surveyors decided that some 49 colleges, all offering 20 or more courses with non-Western content, could be regarded as firmly committed to the intercultural idea, and a total of 150 (including the 49), offering more than 10 such courses, could be considered as having a "significant" commitment.

The report's conclusion:

"At most, the college effort in non-Western studies can be said to represent a modest beginning."

And timidity or overenthusiasm could kill that beginning, the report warned.

Director of studies for that report, and a man who has been deeply involved in the intercultural movement is Dr. Howard A. Reed, now executive associate of the nonprofit Education and World Affairs (EWA). He is, in fact, a peripatetic prophet of the movement, and a frequent visitor to the nation's campuses. To learn how colleges have integrated intercultural studies into the undergraduate program, COLLEGE MANAGEMENT visited Dr. Reed at EWA offices in New York City.

Who in a college starts the intercultural ball rolling? Almost anyone, it seems—president, dean, professor, department head, even students. But absolutely essential to success is institutional commitment to the idea and its implications. "If I were an administrator trying to consider what to do about the multicultural world in which we live, and for which we are trying to prepare ourselves to be intelligent citizens," says Reed, "I would focus first of all on taking a fresh look at the basic aims and objectives of my institution, and then how I was going to implement those aims."

Clarification of the institution's goals is vital. The sometimes pious statements about goals contained in many college catalogs aren't clearly understood even by faculty and administration, Reed observes.

Start with what you have. An inventory of resources must come early in the game. "Find out just what experience is available on the faculty and what the library contains, and what needs to be built up," Reed advises.

There has been a tendency to want to hire the "ideal teacher"—well grounded in, perhaps, sociology or history or physics, speaks a foreign language or two, or has had foreign area experience and is competent to teach about at least one other culture—but these people are in short supply. Lately, Reed has detected a gradually growing awareness on the part of administrators that they must work with what they have. "Just as you have to start with your basic curriculum and reorder that, you also have to start with your basic faculty."

This inventory can reveal special skills, experience or potentialities of teachers, point out potentially helpful foreign students and professors on the campus, and often recall to attention special art or library collections.

Materials available. The library is an area that usually needs attention and build-up. This can be complicated and expensive, but many materials are now available in English that didn't exist 10 years ago. Part of the problem is selection, not finding materials. Textbooks are in very short supply and are not adequate. Various professional study associations are working at textual materials, but more needs to be done in this area.

"One of the great pitfalls an administrator must avoid," Reed notes, "is moving without

surveying what has been done by other institutions and seeing what the state-of-the-art is now, and planning accordingly. Not that he has to copy exactly what others have done, but he certainly ought to know what some of the basic guidelines are."*

Cooperation is key. Because of costs and shortages involved, the development of intercultural studies will hinge very much on cooperation on various levels within the institution and—especially for smaller colleges—on an inter-institutional basis.

Within the institution, the faculty seminar has been a device used by many colleges to bring together teachers in various disciplines to start learning about an area or a culture about which they may be largely inexpert. The group, meeting regularly, may even start from a base of common ignorance, Reed notes, or perhaps it could discuss a topic such as modernization in new nations. Possibly a more specialized subject—agrarian reform and land tenure in Latin America—might be selected. "By their several approaches to a topic of this sort," Reed observes, "they can begin to learn about an area and also teach about it with a kind of nonspecialist familiarity after awhile."

Of course, this means additional work for the professor, who already must expend effort to keep up with his more established specialization.

Interest senior faculty members. Engage the so-called "old elephants" of the faculty in the seminars to broaden and extend their competence—shift their sights just a little—so they will help lead the way toward a refurbished curriculum, Reed recommends. "Their importance should not be underestimated—these tenure men and women, many very able if perhaps a little set in their ways—make many vital academic decisions."

Make sure the seminars have adequate leadership, perhaps a faculty member or visitor who is an expert on the area or topic under discussion, to provide guidelines and to stimulate the participants. Where has the seminar approach been used? In many institutions throughout the nation. A group of southern colleges, at Atlanta University Center, has used it effectively, mainly to view India, Africa and China. In North Carolina, Winston-Salem State College, Salem College and Wake Forest have cooperated on an intercollegiate faculty seminar focusing mainly on South and Southeast Asia. The Connecticut Valley Colleges—University of Massachusetts, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Amherst—have used it in their African-Asian program. In the Midwest, Earlham and Antioch Colleges have found the seminar approach helpful, as has Mills College in Oakland, Calif.

Cooperation in faculty seminars is only one example of the interinstitutional approach that is practical in intercultural studies. Some colleges share consultants, lecturers, library facilities; coordinate book and audiovisual purchases; jointly sponsor concerts, exhibits; and cooperate in research and study-abroad programs.

The faculty seminars tend to be a preparatory and screening device to develop interest and a degree of competence on a campus, or on several campuses where they are a cooperative effort. The result? "What happens normally," Reed explains, "is that the faculty begins to get geared up and then, either out of the institution's own resources or out of other available resources, interested faculty members go on to a summer or a year's further study and training program at a major university center where they can go into more depth, perhaps revise their courses, and then introduce new courses in the colleges."

Who conducts an intercultural program? Reed has found that most colleges that have moved with some success in intercultural studies have found it necessary to have at least one person who took both administrative responsibility and leadership in the studies. Ideally, such a person has competence in some major foreign culture or area. Where an institution has focused on a particular culture, it usually has brought in specialists unless the faculty already contained such person or persons (the presence on the faculty of such an expert can well determine the area or culture to be studied). For infusion programs, retraining of faculty members has often proven satisfactory as at Chatanooga University. But, again, individual circumstances on a given campus will most often decide the direction to be taken.

Avoid a crash program. World War II forced U.S. higher education into a number of crash programs, and there is a danger some institutions may tend to set up hastily assembled programs in intercultural studies. A purpose of the re-examination of the institution's goals is to set up some system of priority so that the program may move in an ordered way.

The approach is important. It's easy to overemphasize a regional or area approach, as some institutions have done, Reed warns. "Part of the issue is looking at the world in a new way—the whole world, that is," he points out. "And then perhaps you get into the key issues involved through focusing on the Far East or North Africa or Latin America. But some of these issues transcend a particular area despite the local variations and differences. These issues can be such things as disarmament or food production or population, or other types of more sophisticated or limited topics."

The curriculum's the thing. The curriculum is the vehicle that will take intercultural studies to victory or failure. The problems can be numerous, the possible solutions often limited, but the institution must keep aiming at the goal: broadening the perspective of the student.

The challenge to the colleges is clear. Ideally, a college should tear apart the fabric of its curriculum and reweave it to include the best of the wealth of all world cultures. Teaching about God? Other cultures have a wide range of views on whether God is personal or impersonal.

Delving into the nature of man? In the West, it is his uniqueness that counts; in the East and other cultures, his importance depends more upon his relation to family or group.

Economics? The basic economic theory doesn't operate in a standard fashion throughout the world—Chile, for example, survives despite fairly chronic inflation.

Many curricular areas can benefit from the experiences of other cultures. But an institution would be foolhardy to attempt an outright overhaul of its total curriculum. There are many alternate approaches.

Since a good 40% of students in colleges drop out before the end of their sophomore year, considerable attention should be paid to introductory courses and the courses taken by most students in their general education, or lower division years, Reed counsels. "Then, even if students should drop out," he notes, "they have gotten some new perspective and awareness, and perhaps a network of conceptual and factual tools with which to work in looking at this rapidly changing, pretty complex world." Infusion of intercultural content into existing courses, stressing its relationships to Western ways, is a frequent procedure. Another possibility is the offering of a Western civilization course to freshmen, to be followed in the sophomore year by a look at at least one other culture.

In revamping the curriculum, once again it is the person who counts. "The curriculum has to be adapted to the given teacher, his course, and the institution," says Reed. "If the teacher doesn't want to change his ways, it's very hard to implement the changed goals that have been defined."

The student is important, too. Usually more responsibility is placed upon him to study independently.

What history do you read? On possible specific shifts in emphasis, Reed observes that "the typical college course in American history is being supplanted, in a sense because there are better high school courses, but also because most of it is taught from the point of view of Americans, and some of our distinguished people in this field have pointed out that the War of 1812 certainly looks different in a Canadian text than in an American one.

"Carrying this thought further, I would suggest that the structure of American history ought, if possible, not be so chronological but might start with some of the major issues that the U.S. faces today and then show how it arrived at this point, using a sort of reverse approach to history." Another approach being tried is where student and teacher ask the question, 'How do Americans and American history look to a Japanese, an Egyptian, a Frenchman?' "Right there," Reed comments, "you introduce some new perspective immediately and get a chance to look at yourself in a fresh way."

If a college maintains a chronological approach to history, Reed believes, it had better come up to 1967 and also face up to the direction American history is likely to take in the next decade—which almost automatically means bringing in non-Western studies.

In literature, English and in any language work, Reed sees a need to introduce new content matter, cutting out some of the old. A better understanding of linguistics and of how people learn any language ought to be taught, he believes.

Wrong stress. Reed contends that too many academic institutions have tended to stress content and fact accumulation and underemphasized developing habits of hypothesis formulation and testing. He sees a need to develop more fully capacities for looking at fresh situations, dealing with fresh information. "But, draw material for testing hypotheses from a universal base," Reed urges. "Too much instruction, even today is drawing on experience that comes either mainly from the United States—as is so much of sociology taught in this country—or from the Atlantic community or Western civilization."

High schools on the move. Not the least reason for reworking the fabric of higher education is to keep ahead of the high schools which are increasingly doing more on the language and world social studies levels. This rate of growth is more rapid than many college teachers and graduate school people appreciate, Reed has found, unless they happen to be the parents of students involved and "find their children engaged in, say, the politics of Lebanon or the art of the Ashanti in Africa, which they themselves may not have heard much about." A study several years ago showed that some 70 secondary schools were teaching Chinese during the same year that only 35 liberal arts colleges were teaching the language. (One of the problems involved in college teaching of languages, Reed says, is that many of the new developments in linguistic science and in audio-oral teaching of languages have not been wholeheartedly adopted by modern language departments. Only one major university—Cornell—has reordered all of its language and literature teachers into one major department, he notes, for example.)

*To learn what six universities are doing in the field of intercultural studies, see "The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities." Published for Education and World Affairs, 511 Fifth Ave., New York City by The Walker Press, New York City. $2.50 paper.

Cost implications. Although the major hurdles to initiating an intercultural program in a college are more psychological than financial or instructional, there are definite cost implications. New books, teachers, materials, preparation cost money. A key criterion is certainly, 'Can we afford it?' But Reed believes the real key is how the institution allocates existing resources. "Any institution already has some money, just as you and I do," he comments. "And just as faculty members have, in a sense, to be reallocated, retrained and reinvigorated to change the curriculum, similarly if the administration and faculty together can internally reallocate resources or more clearly define new ends they're much more likely to attract outside sources of support than if they seek it without having done very much."

Reed sees passage of the International Education Act of 1966 as a very promising start to federal strengthening of the international-intercultural dimension in higher institutions.

"It is," he says, "a welcome recognition on the part of the federal government that it has been drawing on the perhaps very thin sources in the academic and university world to meet its manifold international responsibilities, and that it must help to replenish this reservoir.

"The act is designed to build up the human and library and other resources necessary to produce more people with greater skills in interational affairs, but also—as the President said in his Smithsonian speech—to enable all students and all teachers in our country to have a better understanding of man's cultures and world events so that they can operate more responsibly as citizens of this country and citizens of the world. It is a worthy objective."

HOW COLLEGES HANDLE INTERCULTURAL STUDIES

New York's State University College at New Paltz, an early starter among public colleges in introducing intercultural studies, requires undergraduates to take four introductory non-Western courses in general education. This is part of a curriculum revised in 1957 and 1963–64 to give more international depth to its brand of education. The New Paltz curriculum includes majors and electives on Asia and Africa. Among languages taught are Chinese and Russian. In hiring, the college favors teachers with non-Western training or experience. They teach non-Western courses in addition to their disciplinary specialty. New Paltz college has used a combination of specialists and "retreaded" faculty members to good effect. Faculty members are encouraged to seek Fulbright and other foreign-study opportunities.

Mills College in Oakland, Calif., has developed a one-semester, interdisciplinary course, "styles of culture," for all students during their sophomore-junior years. The course explores key elements in the cultures of India, China and the West. The course was worked out during three years of faculty seminars. With a strong tradition and faculty support for Asian studies, the West Coast women's college has been moving since 1959 to strengthen its new intercultural program. In developing the program, studies were made of other institutions' experiences. Faculty members spent summers in Asia. Over one-third of the top administration and faculty have found means to study and travel in Asia during the past five years. A Ford Foundation grant was received by Mills for Asian studies. The college has infused world perspectives into introductory and upperclass courses and added electives on non-Western cultures.

Earlham, a Quaker college in Richmond, Ind., has been developing since the end of the 1950's a program of non-Western studies concentrating on East Asia, mainly China and Japan. Specialists have been added and existing faculty members have broadened their knowledge of other cultures through study and field experience. Courses have been infused with non-Western material; Japanese and Russian language courses have been added. A new library with a capacity of 200,000 volumes was opened in 1963. Students have participated in a foreign-study program since 1956. Earlham has cooperated with Antioch College in a program of Japanese studies and conducts a study abroad program at Waseda University, in Tokyo, for the Great Lakes Colleges Association of which it is a member. The GLCA itself has as a major aim the providing of greater intercultural experience for students.

Among GLCA members, Antioch serves as the focal institution for Latin American studies in the U.S. and at centers in Bogota, Colombia, and at Guanajuato, Mexico, Kenyon is taking the lead in Middle Eastern studies and Oberlin and Wabash in Chinese studies.

At another Indiana college, Hanover, juniors take two courses infused with non-Western content as part of a curriculum revised in 1962 to include increased emphasis on other cultures. The two courses are world literature and an introduction to the civilization of East Asia, or South-Southeast Asia. Both are among 15 required courses for graduation. Also, more world perspectives have been included in basic and other courses. Students may major in Russian studies or concentrate on Latin America if they wish. The college has relied primarily on developing faculty skills for its intercultural program. Gifts have aided library expansion.

Florida Presbyterian College in St. Petersburg, which opened in 1960, designed a core system which focuses during junior year on Asian studies keyed to China. Comparison and contrast of different cultures are stressed, three lectures or other presentations are scheduled weekly, and independent study and research projects by students are encouraged in the third-year program. In its first year (1962–63), literature, art and philosophical works of the area were studied, but this was revised the following year to a study of the history, geography and institutions of China and related regions, currently supplemented by intercollegiate mid-winter area institutes and independent and off-campus studies in the Middle and Far East, Europe and Latin America

Another new institution, California State College at Hayward, has keyed its curriculum to a world view. In early recruiting, a number of teachers were appointed because of competence and experience in non-Western areas. As part of general education, freshmen study Western culture and follow it in sophomore year with comparative studies in Asian cultures. A committee on Asian studies, including faculty members from the creative arts, humanities and social and behavioral sciences division, heads up the project. A major in Latin American studies, with a similar committee, is expected to be offered in 1968. Languages offered include Russian and Indi.

San Diego State College offers majors in Asian and Latin American studies, the latter for more than 20 years. Another area study concentrates on Africa and the Middle East. More than 80 non-Western courses, excluding languages, are offered. Languages include Portuguese, Russian and Japanese.

State University College at Plattsburgh, N.Y., has instituted a center for international studies with a professor coordinating campus efforts and acting as liaison with the remainder of the state university system. Offerings at Plattsburgh include a Latin American studies program and cultural history of India among some 37 non-Western courses. Asian and Russian area programs are in development stages.

Wisconsin State University at Oshkosh has established an institutional studies department in its social science division to handle its international program. Since 1964 the institution has offered an international studies major.

Ball State University at Muncie, Ind., offers in its college of sciences and humanities majors and minors in Latin American and Afro-Asian studies, under an international area study program begun in 1963. The program is directed by a coordinator aided by the international relations committee, a university policy group. The coordinator has compiled for university use a foreign interest directory, listing facility by regions and countries, special fields and departments.

HOW THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL SUPPORT IT

The International Education Act of 1966 embodies a new legislative role for the federal government: fostering a long-range, broadly conceived development of the international aspects of American higher education.

The act is part of a comprehensive government plan to encourage, within the academic milieu, a deeper treatment of the international side of education.

World War II had brought home to many U.S. educators and government officials the broad gaps in our knowledge of the world.

An early postwar move to help close these gaps was institution of the Fulbright scholarships. The Point Four Program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas, authorized in 1949 by Congress, further involved the United States educational establishment in international affairs. However, only a limited number of universities participated in this particular program.

Limited participation was still reflected a decade later. A study committee financed by the Ford Foundation found that the universities' response to the nation's new involvement in world affairs had been thus far "largely sporadic and unplanned." The report, "The University and World Affairs," was published in December, 1960. Chairman of the committee was J. L. Morrill, former president of the University of Minnesota.

The Morrill committee termed obsolescent the traditional preoccupation of American universities with education that is domestic in scope and character. "An adequate perspective must include the old cultures and new nations outside the familiar landscape of North America and Western Europe."

The committee strongly felt that the federal government and private foundations should aid universities and colleges in improving studies in world affairs. It was this report that spawned the organization, Education and World Affairs.

In 1964, the Hazen Foundation financed a study headed by John W. Nason, president of Carleton College. It presented a still gloomy picture of education in respect to international studies in the four-year undergraduate college. Liberal education would need a fundamental overhaul if it were to meet the requirements of a new kind of world, the committee concluded. Primary and secondary teachers would have to be better prepared "to interpret the world scene" and better college textbooks would be needed.

On February 2, 1966, in a special message to Congress, President Johnson outlined a broad program to stimulate advances in international education. He urged passage of the International Education Act which contained three parts of his program that needed legislative action. The administration bill was introduced the same day in the House of Representatives by Adam Clayton Powell and John Brademas, and in the Senate by Wayne Morse. The 89th Congress passed a much strengthened and enlarged version of the same bill the following October 21, the next to last day of the session. It was signed into law eight days later.

Title I of the law provides for grants to

institutions for international studies on both graduate and undergraduate levels. The grants will be administered by the Center for Educational Cooperation now being established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Criteria are yet to be determined for awarding of the grants but likely directions are indicated in Congressional reports and in recommendations of witnesses at hearings held prior to passage of the bill. Development of these criteria are expected to "present a major challenge to administrators of the program," the House Committee on Education and Labor has noted. Clear and usable, but not rigid, formulas are held to be essential to the program. Among factors sure to influence grants are imaginative leadership, faculty competence and institutional commitment to a broader perspective of international culture. Apropos the last factor, the House committee observed in a report last spring that it expects an institution seeking a grant to show that it considers its proposal "part of its central concerns, rather than a peripheral activity prompted primarily by academic fashion, external pressure, or the potential availability of outside financing."

Aid is to go to graduate centers of research and training in international studies. These funds may be used for equipment, teachers and materials, and to bring visiting scholars and faculty to the centers. Costs may include training, improvement and travel of the staff in connection with the grant's purposes. Students may receive stipends and allowances for dependents and for travel for research and study.

It is expected that graduate institutions getting grants will probably already have taken some substantial steps toward development of the international programs for which they are seeking funds. The House Committee on Education and Labor indicated it expected that strong graduate centers would be favored over proposals for undergraduate programs during the early years of the grants.

The HEW Secretary can approve grants to aid in undergraduate institutions such comprehensive programs as:

1. Planning for the development and expansion of undergraduate programs in international studies;
2. Teaching, research, curriculum development and other related activities;
3. Training of faculty members in foreign countries;
4. Expansion of foreign language courses;
5. Planned and supervised student work-study-travel programs;
6. Programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit institutions as visiting faculty; and
7. Programs of English language training for foreign teachers, scholars and students.

On both educational levels, grants may be made to public and private nonprofit agencies, including professional and scholarly associations, when their contributions would be "especially significant" to the programs.

Congressmen saw as a primary objective of the grants on the undergraduate level the infusion of an international dimension into the curriculum. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare intended that the undergraduate grants be used to encourage an international influence in all parts of the educational institution, particularly professional schools, in which over 60% of U.S. undergraduates are enrolled.

In the enacted bill, funds authorized were $1 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $40 million for fiscal 1968, and $90 million for 1969. The initial $1 million was to be used solely for preparation of a report containing recommendations for carrying out the grant program. This report is supposed to be submitted by the HEW Secretary to the President and Congress not later than April 30 of this year.

However, as Senator Morse sadly informed the Senate just before final passage of the bill, the Appropriations Committees of the two houses had eliminated the supplemental appropriation that would have financed the study.

That the study will not be completed by April 30 is certain. It is to be made by a 15-member National Advisory Committee on International Studies to be appointed by President Johnson. The assistant secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for education is to be chairman. The advisory committee is also to have a strong hand in preparation of a yearly report on the effect of the act by the HEW secretary.

In allocating grants for undergraduate programs, the HEW Secretary is to distribute them as equitably as possible throughout the state. However, he is to give preference to those institutions that have the greatest need for money for international studies programs and which show "real promise" that they will use the money effectively.

Title II of the International Education Act amends the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to remove the requirement that precludes instruction in such "nonexotic" languages as French, German, Spanish and Italian. The HEW Secretary has been given authority formerly held by the Commissioner of Education to administer language and area centers under Title VI of the NDEA, in order to consolidate planning and operation of these NDEA and the newly authorized programs. Another important amendment provides for international affairs institutes for secondary school teachers under NDEA.

A strongly worded section of the act forbids federal control over the administration, personnel, books or library resources used in these educational programs or over research findings.

In what is probably the major cue to institutions interested in implications of the International Education Act, the House Committee on Education and Labor has stated that helpful guidelines for grants are expected to be established from successful existing programs, particularly interinstitutional efforts.

The coming months are seen by William W. Marvel, president of Education and World Affairs, as a time of preparation by the private educational community to build the foundations of the new program. The response of the academic community will significantly shape the future of the act, he believes.

A firm response from the academic world, added to the present strong support of President and Congress, can guarantee the future of what is intended to be a continuing adventure in learning more about our world neighbors and ourselves.

THE PEACE CORPS AND MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the questions in the current debate about our system of selection for military service that deserves very careful and thoughtful analysis is the credit that should be given for voluntary service overseas. Our young people serving with the Peace Corps and other volunteer Government programs are contributing in a significant and effective manner to world peace, freedom, and orderly development.

In a recent letter to the New York Times, Mr. Stanley A. Frankel, a member of the President's Advisory Council to the Peace Corps, has presented with impressive insight the need to equalize credit given for voluntary service and military service. As Mr. Frankel indicates, service in such programs as the Peace Corps is often more hazardous and demanding than service with the Armed Forces.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Frankel's letter, published in the New York Times of March 18, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TO CREDIT PEACE CORPS SERVICE

To the EDITOR:

Burke Marshall's Commission on Selective Service has done a superb job on its report to the President suggesting changes in the draft. However, the commission missed a golden opportunity more clearly to equalize the sacrifice to national needs of our young people by concluding that "no fair way exists to equate voluntary service programs with military service."

This conclusion reveals a lack of understanding of the relative sacrifices made by those in the armed forces and those in other national services, such as the Peace Corps.

HAZARDS COMPARED

It is obviously unfair for some young people to be drafted into the armed forces for several years while others, equally eligible, escape military service entirely.

Most military service is less hazardous than the Peace Corps. For every infantryman, marine, flier, sailor in the "front lines," there are dozens of servicemen down the line supporting them in less hazardous posts. Most men in the military service are better paid than Peace Corps volunteers, receive better food, clothing and lodging, and put in fewer hours in actual work.

Without playing down the role of the nonfighting branches of service, I wish to point out that there is more inequality of sacrifice in the armed forces than there is between the military services, in general, and the Peace Corps, Vista, et al.

Consequently, to draft a youngster destined to be a clerk, cook, quartermaster, etc., and admit an inability to equate this service with the work of a Peace Corps volunteer teaching English or raising rice in Africa, Asia or South America is eminently unfair.

As this commission itself later suggests, this glaring omission demands that another commission be quickly set up to study the possibilities of equating one national service with another.

Why not credit Peace Corps service against armed service? Why not offer an alternative to the military—not to permit volunteers to escape service, but to make certain that as close as possible to 100 per cent of our young people contribute something to their country?

Rather than rely entirely on a lottery to determine who is drafted into the armed forces, why not examine our nineteen-year-olds, physically, mentally, vocationally and psychologically? Within the restrictions of these examinations, why not permit each youngster to opt for that branch of military or civilian service which he prefers, and for which he is best suited?

Until, in the years ahead, we return to a volunteer base for all services, let us try to make certain that every youngster contributes time and talent to well-defined national needs, domestic and foreign.

STANLEY A. FRANKEL.

NEW YORK, *March 8, 1967.*

The writer is currently serving as a member of the President's Advisory Council to the Peace Corps.

INDEPENDENCE AND THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for the Washington Post of March 27, 1967, the

noted syndicated columnist, Mr. John Chamberlain, has written a column in which he discusses the real and present need of Congress to have its own lawyer, a Legislative Attorney General. Support from a member of the press of Mr. Chamberlain's stature is certainly gratifying. His analysis of the growing problem of legislation and interpretation of congressional intent by the executive is particularly forceful and telling.

I think that there is a growing awareness throughout the Nation of a need for Congress to move apace with the changes that so vitally affect the lives of us all. Congress must be able to respond in an authoritative and timely fashion in situations that represent a threat to its functions of making the laws and overseeing their execution. There must be no further erosion of the separation of powers.

Aside from the fundamental philosophical and constitutional issues at stake, there is a multitude of practical situations that would astound the Founding Fathers, as they do myself and a goodly number of the Senators who are intent upon preserving the rightful stature of Congress.

The catalog of such situations is practically endless, and I intend, as my bill to establish the office of Legislative Attorney General moves through Congress, to speak on some of the current situations that demonstrate the need for the Congress to have this tool of self-expression and self-protection.

Mr. Chamberlain sees the present need. I hope that his colleagues will study the proposal and find they too see the need for such an officer of Congress. The press is presently concerned with credibility gaps. One credibility gap relating to the press is one too many. I feel that to make Congress more articulate would be in the best interest of the press. Surely if Congress speaks to the press in an unequivocal manner, the press will communicate that much more clearly to their readers.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Chamberlain's column, entitled "Independence and the U.S. Senate," be printed in the RECORD.

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

INDEPENDENCE AND THE U.S. SENATE

(By John Chamberlain)

The game of opposing Lyndon Johnson has uncertain penalties. If you are Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon, you can be as dove-like on Vietnam as you please; the White House will still talk to you. But if you are Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana, with a slightly less dove-like stance than Morse's, the White House won't like you at all.

The key to the mystery could be that everyone expects Wayne Morse to be a maverick, whereas Vance Hartke came into the Senate as a relatively orthodox character. But surely this isn't the whole story.

Morse doesn't question the President's right to try to force his program on Congress on most issues. But Vance Hartke has emerged as a crusader for the theory (which he incidentally picked up from a profound study of the debates of the Founding Fathers at the Constitutional Convention) that Congress is a coordinate branch of the Government which should not wait upon the President to provide leadership in the legislative field.

Presumably Hartke has incurred the enmity of the White House because he is independent not only on a particular issue but independent as a general proposition.

At the present moment Hartke is pressing the idea that Congress, as an independent arm of the Government, is entitled to its own lawyer. Not so long ago he offered an amendment to the pending reorganization bill calling for the establishment of an Office of Legislative Attorney General, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, with the approval of the two Houses of Congress. Hartke's argument is that Congress must rely for legislative advice and legal representation on a Cabinet officer, appointed by the President. The Attorney General, as things are constituted, belongs to the executive branch.

Without criticizing motives, Hartke questions whether the President's lawyer is the best witness in the world to the legislative intent of Congress. The Attorney General must, in the nature of things, be the President's, not the Congress's man.

Hartke's position has logic behind it. On the matter of the legislative intent of Congress, the Senator refers to the case of wiretapping, or "bugging," by the Department of Justice. "A law on this subject," he says, "was passed in the 1930's, when relatively few so-called sophisticated devices were used for wiretapping. Now the Attorney General is trying to expand on the legislative authority granted at the time the law was enacted.

There has been no factual information which could be considered from the standpoint of the intent of Congress. In other words, the Attorney General has been legislating for Congress.

Hartke argues that if Congress had its own Legislative Attorney General to advise on the meaning of existing wiretapping law, there would be less chance of the executive arm of the Government acting as both judge and executioner of the law.

Since he was venturing on completely new ground when he first proposed the establishment of a special "lawyer" for Congress, Hartke originally thought it would take him at least two years before he could get any real movement out of the Senate in support of his idea. But just about a week after the Senator had first broached his proposition, the Adam Clayton Powell case forced the House of Representatives to ask an outside lawyer, Bruce Bromley, to defend its right to deny the chosen representative of Harlem his seat. Hartke thinks this is adequate proof that Congress needs its own Legislative Attorney General.

Beyond the particularity of Hartke's latest proposal there lies the historic generality he is seeking to revive: He wants Congress to assert its right to be considered an independent and coordinate arm of Government.

In short, he wants to go back to the brave days when a Henry Clay and a Daniel Webster could tell the man in the White House to stick to his knitting as the executive, not the legislator or judge, of the laws.

RECESSION INSURANCE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have just read an article published in the latest edition of the U.S. News & World Report, dated April 10, 1967. It is entitled "Recession?—What Latest Facts Show." The facts, to my mind, make one thing very clear: Something must be done immediately to stimulate the economy before the "lull" or the "pause" or "the slowing," or whatever other terminology may be used, to express the present economic situation becomes something no one wants—a full-blown recession. I am not talking scared about recession, but I most certainly am talking with a lot of concern. What we need is recession insurance. Concern for business, concern for the consumer, concern for the wage earner, concern for those whose present economic lot cannot stand even the smallest diminution; concern for the total economy and what a weakening in its posture could mean.

Economists, and those who necessarily deal with the economy, use and rely on "indicators." The present indicators, to my mind, are marvels of clarity and worthy of consideration.

What are the indicators saying now, Mr. President? They are saying that the trend is definitely downward. I speak here specifically of automobile dealers whose sales are off 25 percent from this time last year. Housing still remains extremely low and as Chairman Martin of of the Federal Reserve Board said, the restoration of the tax credit will not help and may hurt the housing industry by permitting easier access to funds to be drawn again from mortgage sources.

Mr. President, I think a recitation of the indicators will be more effective than any rhetoric they may evoke.

First. Output of industry down 1.9 percent from the 1966–67 high.

Second. Corporation profits, unchanged.

Third. Capital spending down 13.9 percent from 1966–67 high.

Fourth. Retail sales down 1.7 percent from the 1966–67 high.

Fifth. Homebuilding down 33.2 percent from the 1966–67 high.

Sixth. Auto sales down 24.6 percent from the 1966–67 high.

Seventh. Hours worked down 2.9 percent from 1966–67 high.

Eighth. New orders down 12.2 percent from the 1966–67 high.

Ninth. Business inventories, as a change in rate of increase, down $9.1 billion from the 1966–67 high.

Tenth. Consumer debt down $4.4 billion in rate of increase from 1966–67 high.

Eleventh. Raw-material prices down 14.8 percent from the 1966–67 high using 1957–59 as 100.

Twelfth. Total spending unchanged.

Mr. President, these certainly are not indicators of economic growth. Something must be done to stimulate economy and it must be done now before the situation has a chance to worsen.

To my mind, Mr. President, the most effective and immediate way for the Congress to strengthen the economy would be to couple excise taxes in automobiles and communications to the tax investment. These tax breaks to the consumer and, I might add, to the producer of these consumer items, should be given to stimulate the economy. They should be given to lower cost and they should be given in order to treat the consumer as fairly as we treat business in restoring the tax credits. They are a form of recession insurance.

Mr. President, I gave a floor speech yesterday in which I treated these economic problems at some length. In my remarks I stated the fact that every tax cut in recent history has resulted in

greater revenues to the Treasury. In light of this economic-historical fact I should think the Treasury would be anxious to see these tax reductions effected.

The time is now. For the sake of the economy, I propose a cut in auto taxes. For the sake of the economy, I propose a cut in communications taxes.

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

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

A RECESSION?—WHAT LATEST FACTS SHOW

(Maybe this isn't "recession" officially. But in some key lines it looks and feels like one in everything but the name. Reading of current business indicators show why. Yet it is one of the strangest slowdowns the U.S. has ever known.)

Look at the official figures that point to trends, and it seems clear that this country now is in a recession—the first in six years.

"Recession," however, is being treated as a forbidden word. What's happening is described as a "lull," or a "pause," or a "slowing," or even "receding."

Yet the home-building industry, of immense importance to much of business, has been in a real depression from which it is recovering only slowly. The auto industry, also of major importance to business, finds sales down nearly 25 per cent and can hardly be described as in anything but a recession.

Retail trade is sagging generally. People are cautious about buying. Output of industry is off moderately. Businessmen have made substantial cuts in the investment they are making in new plant and equipment and in inventories.

New orders, as a result, are down substantially. There have been some layoffs in particular industries. Average hours of work per week in factories have dropped.

The White House view. The President's advisers, however, say that there can be no such thing as a "recession" unless the nation's over-all level of spending—known as the gross national product—has been lower for two consecutive quarters. Nobody will be able to say whether this situation exists until after July. This figure, in terms of constant prices, was about unchanged in the first two months of the year.

Commentators generally wait for the National Bureau of Economic Research—a nonprofit organization—to give a pronouncement on whether "recession" is under way or not. This pronouncement has not yet been made.

If the present situation is a recession, there are some points about it that are unusual.

For one thing, the setback in business is taking place in the midst of war—a very unusual situation.

Then, too, the stock market of late has been strong—not sharply declining, as is usual in a recession—indicating people with money are betting that business is not headed for any prolonged decline.

On top of that, there have been few large-scale layoffs of workers. Employment is holding up well and unemployment is not rising to any large degree, although there is much less overtime and some shorter workweeks.

Looking at causes. Then what has happened to produce this pause, or lull, or slowing, if it is not a recession?

The big thing was that the Federal Reserve Board, managing the nation's money, once again proved it has the power to bring an expansion to a halt by cutting down on—or limiting the expansion of—the money supply, and by permitting interest rates to rise sharply.

Residential building was hit on the head, as though by a club, through this policy of tight and expensive money. Autos were hurt. Installment selling on very liberal terms was discouraged.

Money policy probably was the chief cause of today's setback.

On top of that, the White House induced Congress to suspend the credit against taxes allowed to businessmen for new investment.

This action discouraged many industries from pushing ahead as rapidly as originally planned with their modernization and expansion programs.

Then there was talk of a tax increase to affect individual and corporate incomes. And, in the case of autos, there were the campaigns about auto safety and front-page emphasis on call-backs of cars for minor defects, call-backs like those that had been carried out without fanfare in years past.

It all added up to trouble.

The official unwillingness to call the present setback a recession is traced to a number of origins.

The President and his advisers obviously do not care to admit that any of their policies had misfired and that maybe the "new economics" cannot guarantee against recession. The Federal Reserve Board is not inclined to draw more political fire by confessing that its policies, now as in the past, can produce a recession.

So now the emphasis of policy all along the line is on changing signals. Government, with its vast power, is moving to stimulate business.

Tax hike? Probably not. A tax increase for individuals and corporations seems dead, although officials still speak of its need. Congress has the whole idea in a deep freeze.

The investment credit against taxes, designed to encourage expanded activity by business, is being restored.

Spending programs of Government, which had been held back, are being increased again.

Government is making more money available for the mortgage market, so that home building can be financed.

Money policies of the Federal Reserve Board have been eased, and interest rates have declined. The supply of money has been increased to assure against severe tightness.

These policies, in turn, are credited with influencing investment markets. The recent rise in the stock market is regarded as reflecting the confidence of investors that easier and cheaper money, together with changes in the tax outlook, will bring a revival of expansion in business generally.

Pent-up demand. The building industry even now, shows some signs of revival since there is a larger supply of mortgage money at a slightly lower rate of interest. A boom in residential building is expected to reach its first stage later this year. There is agreement that a large pent-up demand for new housing exists and will grow.

Automobile firms have been through two years of declining sales. Prospects are strong for a turn to the better with the 1968 model year. Less excitement is being shown about the safety scare. Installment credit is more readily available.

Housing and autos affect a wide range of other industries from steel to household appliances to textiles—in fact, most lines of business.

People are expected before long to adopt more-normal buying habits—to save less than the abnormal amount being saved at present and to spend more out of incomes that are at or near a record. When that happens, all of retail trade will benefit. When retail trade moves up, new orders rise and inventory liquidation slows or ends. An important part of the present "recession" or "adjustment" or "lull" is related to a cutback in forward buying as business uses up stocks on hand.

The result is that most observers now are predicting that later this year trends again will be moving upward into what they hope will be a period of active and sustained rise.

War and the dollar. Yet on the horizon there are two uncertainties that will remain:

One is the possibility that war might end suddenly, raising questions about the effect of cuts in arms spending. Plans are being shaped in Government to counter that situation if it develops.

The second problem is that of the U.S. dollar. The dollar remains vulnerable to assault from abroad. This vulnerable position is increased by the near certainty that there will be a huge deficit in the 1968 budget of the Government—one of 15 billion dollars or even more. Again, plans are laid to meet that problem if it should arise.

So this is a situation in what may become known as the strangest recession on record.

SOME MEASURES OF THE DOWNTREND IN BUSINESS

Output of industry (1957–59=100): 1966–67 high, 159.0; latest, 155.9. Down 1.9%.

Corporation profits (annual rates, earnings after taxes): 1966–67 high, $48.2 billion; latest, $48.2 billion. Unchanged.

Capital spending (monthly orders for new plant and equipment): 1966–67 high, $6.28 billion; latest, $5.41 billion. Down 13.9%.

Retail sales (monthly rates): 1966–67 high, $25.7 billion; latest, $25.3 billion. Down 1.7%.

Hours worked (average in factories): 1966–67 high, 41.5; latest, 40.3. Down 2.9%.

Consumer debt (change in rate of increase): 1966–67 high, $7.79 billion; latest, $3.36 billion. Down $4.4 billion.

Home building (permits for private houses, 1957–59=100): 1966–67 high, 111.9; latest, 74.7. Down 33.2%.

New orders (durable goods): 1966–67 high, $25.3 billion; latest, $22.2 billion. Down 12.2%.

Raw-material prices (1957–59=100): 1966–67 high, 123.5; latest, 105.2. Down 14.8%.

Auto sales (annual rates): 1966–67 high, 9.3 million; latest, 7 million. Down 24.6%.

Business inventories (change in rate of increase): 1966–67 high, $20.5 billion; latest, $11.4 billion. Down $9.1 billion.

Total spending in U.S. (gross national product, annual rates): 1966–67 high, $759.3 billion; latest, $599.3 billion. Unchanged.

Source: U.S. Dept. of Commerce.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 80, H.R. 6950, to restore the

investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, what is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall discuss in greater detail the overall issue that we have before us later. I do wish to point out, however, that the subject of providing either public funds or a tax arrangement to make it possible to finance presidential campaigns and thereby reduce undue influence and special privilege that is potential in government has been considered for a great number of years. At long last we have something on the statute books undertaking to provide a method by which presidential campaigns can be financed for two major parties in a way that neither party's candidate need become subject to undue pressure, undue influence, or have to go hat in hand to corporation presidents or others to find money to finance his campaign.

There has been a suggestion by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that this was not a good proposal and that we should continue the present campaign financing method, which, in my judgment, involves all sorts of improper activities and all sorts of activities that sow the seeds of undue influence and all sorts of improper activity in government.

We all hear talk about someone receiving a $2,500 campaign contribution, and later getting something in return. That sort of conversation just scratches the surface of the overall problem. May I say that, in my judgment, when people talk about or suggest that there is bribery of someone in government, whether it be in the Federal Government or a State government, he is really not discussing where the most improper influence in government comes from. Most of it comes about as a result of candidates seeking money from persons of wealth to finance presidential campaigns. The expenditures of that race for the two major parties amount to as much money, in my judgment, as the entire expenditures for all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives put together.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has taxed the senior Senator from Tennessee and the senior Senator from Delaware with wishing to continue the iniquitous conditions which the able Senator from Louisiana has described. I wish to point out that the law of which the able Senator from Louisiana was the author, and which the pending amendment seeks to repeal, in no sense and in no way puts an end to the situation which the Senator has described. Indeed, it makes it worse by commingling public funds with private funds, from whatever source or however questionable. It makes identification and segregation of those funds, and publicity with respect thereto, almost impossible; and it has the further basic fault of making public funds available only to two men who are seeking the presidency, while denying public funds to others, and thereby leaving them completely at the mercy of the situation which the Senator has described.

Further, I wish to point out that the law which would be repealed by the pending amendment in no way cures the situation of which the able Senator complains, but instead makes it worse.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if I am able to demonstrate to the Senator that the measure for which I am speaking does exactly the opposite, perhaps the Senator might be persuaded to change his view of the matter. In any event, that is what I hope to accomplish.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I started out with the theory that by providing adequate financing for both major party candidates for President of the United States, we would eliminate the necessity of either of those candidates having to seek or accept any private contribution which might in any wise tend to prejudice or even cast the suggestion of prejudice upon the activities and conduct of such candidate, should he be elected President of the United States. Candidates would not be placed in a position where they would be required to accept private campaign contributions. They would have adequate funds available to them to make their campaigns without accepting private contributions, and if they wanted to accept any, they would be in a position to be very circumspect about what they did accept.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Just a moment. I ask that the Senator permit me to go forward for a moment or two.

The genesis of this proposal, which led to its being offered as an amendment and ultimately enacted, was that in the Committee on Finance, the then Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, suggested that the measure under consideration be amended to prohibit either the solicitation or the acceptance of private contributions by anyone in connection with the two major party campaigns.

At that time I felt that it might not be wise to accept the amendment, because while that result would perhaps be desirable—and I believe it would be desirable—the amendment might prejudice the possibility of enacting a measure to provide honest financing and strict accounting by both major parties with regard to their campaigns for the Presidency.

Frankly, Democrats had historically felt that Republicans had about three times as much private contribution money available to them as the Democrats. I personally felt that to deny the Republican Party the advantage that it had with regard to private contributions might make it very difficult to attract Republican support for what I thought would be a measure to provide better and cleaner government, favorably affecting both major parties and their candidates.

Unfortunately, it happened that only one Republican vote was attracted, anyway—although I must say that if I could have only one, I could not have been more flattered than by the identity of that one, who is one of the most outstanding Republicans of this Nation.

In that situation, I felt it would be well to go along with the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois and the argument of the Senator from Tennessee that we amend the proposal to prohibit any private contributions from either being solicited or accepted. A candidate would have to choose whether he wanted to avail himself of the money available—approximately $30 million—as a candidate of that party, to make his approach to the American people, or whether he wanted to go the private contribution route. In the event he chose to avail himself of the funds available, then he would have to account for every cent used, and both his party and the opposing party would know exactly how much had been devoted to that purpose and how it had been spent.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator will agree, will he not, that under the existing law or even the modified proposal of the Senator from Louisiana, we would do nothing to take care of the situation of the primary elections, where a lot of the money is spent for a man to obtain the nomination?

I believe it is generally recognized that the incumbent does not usually face a primary fight, and therefore does not need this extra money; but, on the other hand, candidates of the party which is out usually do.

As I understand it, however, even the modified proposal of the Senator from Louisiana does nothing whatever to eliminate the danger of the practices he has described as related to primaries. Primaries are just as important as is the general election, and in some areas of our country the primaries are more important than the general election, because that is where the election is really decided.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, all we are talking about here is the election of the President of the United States. That is where about one-half of the election money that is involved every fourth year in the nationwide campaign is spent. At least half of it is spent in the presidential election. That is what we are talking about.

Some might contend that preferential primaries have much to do with the identity of the person who wins the nomination. That could be true. It may well be that if the procedure that is suggested here to protect the Presidency from the pressure of undue influence in the general election were to prove successful, it should be extended to the primaries. But after 70 years of inaction along this line, it would certainly

seem to be better that we proceed to acquire from experience a way of financing the presidential campaign that would be above improper influence, before we proceed to apply the suggestion to ways in which the presidential primaries could be financed.

All one can say for any good bill is that it is a good bill as far as it goes. It is my best understanding that even the suggestion which the Senator from Delaware sponsored would not have done any good with regard to primary campaigns, anyway. His own bill related only to the general election.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, my bill, which much to my regret was rejected by the Finance Committee, was identical to the proposal originally made by President Johnson when he recommended a $100 allowance. As President Johnson originally recommended, my bill would have referred to nominees for primary or general elections.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Delaware will find that he is in error. His bill was not identical to the proposal which the President made.

The Senator from Delaware modified the President's suggestion so that it would meet the Senator's own thinking and views. That modification made it somewhat different from the President's recommendation. However, the proposal of the Senator from Delaware was parallel to the recommendation of the President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill was offered in the Committee on Finance and was rejected. Not only was it rejected, but also it was rejected after support for the President's own recommendation had been withdrawn. The bill was identical to the President's recommendation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What the Senator suggested and what I voted on, to the best of my recollection, was the recommendation of the administration with some modification to fit the views of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The recommendation of the President was also rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps so, but my recollection is somewhat different with respect to the presidential election.

Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and others have exerted considerable energy telling all that is bad about the tax checkoff method of financing presidential elections. Fortunately, not everyone shares their dismal outlook.

Many notable people, including the President of the United States, applaud the new method of combating political corruption. I would like to identify some of them and collect their thoughts at this point in the debate.

When he signed the tax checkoff act into law, the President stated:

An important addition to this act breaks new ground in the financing of presidential election campaigns. * * *

The approach adopted by this act allows the individual taxpayer—voluntarily—to have $1 of his tax payment placed into a presidential campaign election fund. * * *

Presidential candidates will no longer have to rely on special interest groups and the rich to meet the heavy financial burden of a campaign.

Instead, they will rely on all Americans from every walk of life—the ideal way in a free country.

And thus our deeply rooted system of free elective government will benefit.

House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK was equally impressed. In summarizing the accomplishments of the 89th Congress, he remarked:

For the first time, we passed legislation that will provide for the financing of presidential campaigns from voluntary tax revenues. This revolutionary plan permits the individual taxpayer to divert $1 of his annual tax payment toward the financing of the next presidential election.

It is a totally new proposal, and it is a useful one. The average man and woman in this country is too often cut off from the electoral process. We must begin to encourage the small contributor to take an active interest in the party of his choice. For too long our political parties have relied on large contributions by the "fat cats." This bill will help to change that trend, and let me say—I welcome it.

John Kenneth Galbraith, well-known economist and former Ambassador to India, has urged public financing for the election campaigns of public officials in the State of Massachusetts. He wrote the chairman of the Finance Committee and commented as follows on the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act:

That is an excellent statement * * *. We shouldn't elect people with quite so many debts of the wrong kind.

Adm. H. G. Rickover—the Navy's "atomic admiral"—recently spoke highly of this method of financing presidential elections and pleaded for its extension to congressional elections as well. When he received the Franklin Medal for Distinguished Service in January, he commented on the principles which guided our Founding Fathers in their efforts to limit power so men could be free. He stated:

The first principle (that sovereignty is vested in the people) places public officials in the relation of agent to principal, thus making them accountable to the electorate. To make this principle fully effective, we must take steps to eliminate campaign costs as a factor in choosing candidates and electing men to public office. I hope everyone will take advantage of the recent law which permits taxpayers to assign one dollar of their taxes to a fund for presidential campaign expenses.

This novel and imaginative method of socializing the cost of election campaigns should be expanded to cover congressional elections as well. This would give us a wider choice of candidates. Those elected would not be beholden to any man or group for campaign contributions. I have never met a legislator who did not resent such obligations; who would not have preferred to be accountable solely to the people who elected him. By freeing our elected representatives, legislation demanded by the people for protection against injurious technologies and for preserving our heritage would have easier passage.

Prof. Jasper B. Shannon, of the Department of Political Science of the University of Nebraska, wrote the chairman of the Committee on Finance, praising the new act, as follows:

I am very much interested in the campaign finance legislation passed in this last session of Congress. I am naturally very much in favor of it as I suggested a similar plan years ago as a member of a Subcommittee of a Parties Committee of the American Political Science Association and also in my book, *Money and Politics* (1959), Random House. * * *

May I congratulate you on sponsoring what I believe to be a very progressive piece of legislation.

The Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, spoke admiringly of the plan in a speech before the Rubber Manufacturers Association in New York last fall. These are excerpts from his remarks:

In the midst of the legislative pulling and hauling, Senator Long of Louisiana came forward with his proposal for a tax-supported Presidential Campaign Fund. He ultimately offered it as an amendment which we call a "rider" to the Foreign Investors Tax Act—the form in which it was approved.

Therefore, it fell to the Treasury to testify in the hearings on his proposal. We were forced to take a look at precisely what he was suggesting.

The resources of the Treasury were brought to bear on the plan. We called in a distinguished consultant in the field. We analyzed it in terms of our own earlier researches on political financing as well as outside studies in the area.

The longer we looked at the proposal, the more intrigued we were. Ultimately we became convinced that the plan constituted a major breakthrough in the financing of political campaigns. * * *

. . . there are many strong arguments in favor of this new procedure—strong enough arguments to induce the Congress to pass and the President to sign the legislation. * * *

I would like to stress one which may well be the strongest single argument in support of the Presidential Campaign Fund.

My personal experience and observation lead me to believe that there is, at any given time, a relatively fixed and finite supply of campaign funds. * * * To use an economists' term, the supply is inelastic.

If you accept my hypothesis—which I believe is a valid one—and if you also consider the incontrovertible evidence that the cost of campaigning is rising steadily, then you will agree that we must provide some relief for the pressure on the limited supply of campaign funds.

That is precisely what the Presidential Campaign Fund accomplishes. In the process, I believe it will alleviate the difficulty of financing State, local, and Congressional elections. I think this process will also make it easier for third parties to raise campaign funds.

Candidates will find, I believe, once they are freed of the competition from Presidential fund raising, that they can be much more discriminating in the monies they accept. Thus, although this legislation was designed to improve Presidential campaign financing by making it more of a public responsibility, it will in fact provide far-reaching benefits to our political processes at other levels.

It should be recognized that this is the *first* successful major attack on the problem of political financing since the Hatch Act of 1939, and, before that, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

Although responsible people in both parties have recognized for years that the question of political financing was becoming more acute and was exposing our democratic

processes to suspicion and cynical charges of undue influence, we as a nation have been unable to come forward with a viable solution that would pass the Congress.

The Treasury participated in the 1962 examination of the whole area of political finance carried on by the distinguished Commission on Campaign Costs, which was chaired by Alexander Heard, the Chancellor of Vanderbilt University. We have many excellent proposals on the shelves of our library. But no prosposed solution has been passed by the Congress *except this one.*

I feel confident that, when all the evidence is in, this solution will stand on its merits.

The Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, found something good in the tax checkoff plan. He played a most significant role in the enactment of this plan by persuading the House of Representatives to approve this new dimension in campaign financing. During debate on the conference report, which included the new plan, he stated:

This is a provision about which I was originally somewhat apprehensive. The more I listened to it, the more I became convinced that something needed to be done. * * *

After a thorough consideration of the many proposed solutions to the problem of how to finance presidential election campaigns, I have concluded that this provision is at least a good starting point. I cannot assure the Members of the House that this, in all respects, is the final solution to the problems of funding a presidential election campaign. However, I believe it, at the least, is a good beginning and I believe it is important that we start now. * * *

But what is wrong with it? What is wrong with the effort here being made to induce 70 million people over a 4-year period to provide $70 million so that 7,000 or 70,000 or whatever the number would be, would not have to provide the same amount of money?

Is it wrong to create a circumstance wherein every voter in the United States, if he wants to, can of his own volition make available $1 a year or $4 every 4 years, not to help his political party necessarily but to go into a fund which will be divided between the two major political parties?

Why, we even saw fit to make provision for some of it to go to a third party under the circumstances involved in the conference report.

I do not see anything wrong with it. But I do see something wrong with not trying to do something about the impression that exists on the part of many people, the impression that something ought to be done to minimize the possibility—I am not saying it exists; they are thinking it exists—of people having a greater influence than they ought to have because of the size of their contributions.

Martin Lobel, assistant professor of law at the University of Oklahoma, in a thoughtful law review of the problems of campaign contributions, pointed out several advantages of this type of campaign financing in the Minnesota Law Review of November 1966. He wrote:

The use of these funds, however, would be restricted to reimbursing presidential campaign expenditures. Of all bills thus far proposed, this one seems closest to achieving the desired goals of encouraging competent candidates to run and eliminating "corrupt" influences. It would greatly improve campaign planning because a presidential candidate would know that he could count on receiving at least a predictable minimum of campaign funds and thus would not continually have to change his plans as the flow of funds varied. It might even improve the quality of national party leaders by attracting more altruistic individuals, since party fund raising duties would not be as onerous, and patronage, as a motive for seeking party positions, would decline in importance.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON, Senator from Kentucky and former Chairman of the Republican National Committee, found reason to support the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. He is a man who knows the difficulty of running a political party with no regular source of funds. In hearings before the Committee on Finance last summer, when several proposals to solve campaign contribution apathy were explored, he was particularly impressed with the impact the plan could have on off-year elections. He saw the advantage of not having to pay off large deficits remaining after a presidential election, when contributions could be more beneficially used for congressional campaigns. He said:

I at first was not very much impressed with the Chairman's proposal, but, after studying it and after hearing his statement this morning, I think it certainly deserves the study of this committee, as well as these others.

And the Senator voted for the bill.

Most recently, the distinguished Congressman from the 12th District of Texas, the Honorable JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., wrote of his experiences with campaign financing in the April issue of Harper's magazine. Mr. WRIGHT is a man who would not compromise his conscience by making "commitments for contributions." As a result of his forthrightness, he was unable to raise sufficient funds to make a race for the Senate which he considered a few years ago. This is a man who knows, and he writes that, in his opinion, the tax checkoff plan is "worth a try."

As far back as 60 years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt recognized the need for the public financing of election campaigns. In his seventh annual message to Congress in December of 1907 he stated:

The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties, an appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which requires a large expenditure of money. Then the stipulation should be made that no party receiving campaign funds from the Treasury should accept more than a fixed amount from any individual subscriber or donor; and the necessary publicity for receipts and expenditures could without difficulty be provided.

President Theodore Roosevelt spoke in favor of this type of proposal 60 years ago.

In 1936, the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures of Presidential, Vice-Presidential and Senatorial Candidates, published a report which recommended the following amendments to remedy defects in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and read in part:

It was suggested that private contributions to political campaigns be prohibited entirely and that instead all election expenses should be defrayed from public funds. Application of this system to nominations of Senator and Representatives in Congress would require action on the part of the several States. The same would be true with respect to the election of delegates to national conventions for the purpose of nominating presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

Puerto Rico has had a favorable experience for several years with public financing of its political campaigns. There have been no charges of misuse of these funds, nor have there been any allegations that the caliber of public officials has suffered because of this procedure.

(At this point, Mr. Moss assumed the chair.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana. This matter does not involve a question of whether we are for or against some form of Federal contribution to finance the cost of elections. I have long advocated such a policy. But the question is, is the law which is now in effect, the one we are proposing to repeal, the right answer?

Many of the letters which the Senator from Louisiana has read from distinguished Americans have endorsed the principle of devising some method of encouraging and expanding participation by the smaller contributors so that they will be making contributions to the party of their choice.

Mr. President, I emphasize the words "party of their choice." I agree fully with that. However, it is interesting that under the existing law, whereby any American is allowed to check off $1 on his tax return, he must contribute 50 cents to the Democratic Party and an equal amount to the Republican Party. He must contribute equally; he has no choice. Also, there is no provision for the third party. The Republican Party was formed as a splinter party years ago. How it could have been organized if this provision had been in effect I do not know.

I am very much in favor of some form of Federal assistance to finance campaigns, but to provide such assistance we must rewrite the law as related to financing campaigns and eliminate the many abuses.

The Senator from Louisiana read the letter from the gentleman from Texas with regard to the difficulty he was having in his campaign for the Senate. There is nothing in the present proposal which would in any way reduce the problem of that man running for congressional office.

Likewise, I was interested to note that President Theodore Roosevelt, a man for whom I have great respect, was quoted as endorsing this principle. I have always had a tremendous amount of respect for President Theodore Roosevelt, but I wonder whether the remarks of President Theodore Roosevelt 60 years ago were an endorsement of this proposal today. I raise that question because the income tax law was not in effect at the time that President Theodore Roosevelt made those remarks. The income tax law was not enacted until several years later. With as much respect

as I have for Theodore Roosevelt I doubt that he looked into the future that far.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator perhaps noted from the quotation that Theodore Roosevelt was advocating an appropriation for defraying campaign expenses of both major parties. Incidentally, the amendments which I requested that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] send to the desk yesterday, to be made available, included the approach that we have a permanent appropriation every fourth year of the amount to be made available under the checkoff system, so that both parties would know that this $30 million would be available to them. In that way they could budget their money, make plans as to how it might be spent, and plans for carrying out the campaigns. The Republican Party would know what the Democratic Party was doing with its money, and the Democratic Party would know what the Republican Party was doing with its money.

The Senator indicated that he favors the general principle, speaking in the broadest terms, but he would like to see persons contribute according to their choice. How would a person know in January, February, March, or September, if he were an independent voter who wants to hear what both candidates have to say, which party he wanted to contribute to until the debate was completed? Think how dissatisfied a person would be if he had made a small contribution to one party and then heard a closing speech of the man speaking on the other side and then concluded that he was the better man.

In my case my heart was touched by the closing speech—a 10-minute speech—by Harry Truman when he was seeking reelection for the presidency. It looked as if he had no chance of winning. However, I heard that speech and I said:

> If he wins, I do not think it could happen to a nicer fellow. I think the man is right.

Under this proposal there would be made available an amount of money equaling the $1, multiplied by the number of votes both national parties receive, divided by two, and there would then be subtracted $5 million from both. That would be about $30 million each. My information is that that would be a realistic figure of the amount that it would take to finance a good campaign. We Democrats suspect the Republicans have a good deal more money than that, and they may also suspect that of us.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana if the following is a correct statement of his position.

As I understand the position of the Senator, it was his position when we passed this measure last year that this was not necessarily the perfect answer to all the problems of financing political campaigns. As I remember, it was the attitude of the Senator from Louisiana that something had to be done, and he was primarily interested in getting something on the statute books so that from that point thoughts could be focused on it, improvements could be made.

Is my understanding correct that it is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the Committee on Finance, at some later date within the near future, to have hearings before the Committee on Finance at which time people with ideas could be heard? We could then determine whether or not this should be expanded to cover senatorial and congressional elections, how much the Federal Government should match, if anything, and at that time all of these matters could be gone into.

Is it not the intention of the Senator to have that type of hearing and develop this matter in the future?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. That is what I would prefer to do.

Mr. SMATHERS. When we offered his proposals yesterday is that why they were not offered as amendments to the bill but as amendments to the 1966 act, so that the Senator at that point could move toward hearings and discussions of what could be done? Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has ideas—no doubt he has ideas. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] could make a real contribution. However, the question is whether we do it this time on this bill, or more properly that we do it when the Committee on Finance, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, has hearings on this matter. Is that a correct understanding of the situation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is my feeling and that is how I would prefer to proceed.

There have been some suggestions of defects in this proposed campaign financing which I think are utterly erroneous.

It has been suggested that someone might corruptly use, appropriate to his own use, or in some fashion improperly use some of the funds made available to finance these two campaigns. In the first place, there is nothing in the law to prohibit someone from improperly using money that is now privately subscribed. However, when the money comes from public funds we have the Corrupt Practices Act covering anything that the mind of man could conceive. In my judgment that law would apply to this situation.

If it would make anybody feel better about the matter, let us write it in this statute so that everybody understands that every nickel of this money is to be accounted for by the General Accounting Office, and the Republicans are entitled to know what the Democrats are doing with their money and the Democrats are entitled to know what the Republicans are doing with their money.

Mr. President, we have very fine men appointed to represent both sides. Here is a statement of the General Accounting Office. The Democrats named two of the finest and most highly regarded Democrats in America to sit on the board and to carefully watch how the money is handled and to advise.

The Democratic appointees are James A. Farley, of New York, former Postmaster General of the United States, and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and Arthur B. Krim, chairman of the finance committee of the National Democratic Party, and President of the United Artists Corps. I would be proud to have those two men serve and suggest the guidelines and how the money is spent and report to the Democrats, in effect, how this matter was being handled by the opposition.

The Republicans on the committee have been designated. They are Fred C. Scrivner, Jr., of Portland, Maine, former Under Secretary of the Treasury from 1957 to 1961, and now general counsel of the Republican National Committee; and Donald R. Ross, of Omaha, Nebr., former district attorney and vice chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Mr. President, here we have four of the very best men available, two from the Republican Party, and two from the Democratic Party. They are the kind of men who would like to have people understand what it is all about, who would want to see that both sides have their problems considered, and that both sides, in effect, know how the other side is using their money. Further, as I say, this matter began when the Senator from Delaware came forward with his version of a suggestion which the President had made, which in turn was a suggestion that had previously been made by the late former Senator Tom Hennings, of Missouri. He had made one of the first suggestions along that line, to my knowledge, although I am sure others previously had done so.

With the support of the Senator from Tennessee, I fought to keep that from being included in this measure, so that we could conduct hearings on how or what would be the best way to do it. That is when I suggested the proposal about which I had been thinking for many years which, in effect, would try to work it out so that the taxpayer would give $1 of tax for every vote cast for his particular party to pay campaign expenses.

This was the so-called party-of-your-choice suggestion which the Senator from Delaware made. At least, applied to the $1 instead of the $100, that would be adequate to finance campaigns, I thought. However, we would have to advance the money, anticipating how many votes a party was going to get, in order to carry out that suggestion.

It was suggested by former Senator Douglas, of Illinois, that it would be better simply to look at the number of votes each party had in previous elections and advance the money on the basis of the votes received at that time, and let both parties have the same amount of money, so that even though the Democratic Party received more votes than the Republican Party in a previous election, both sides would have equal financing in taking their case to and being heard by the public, and after both sides had had their say, the public would decide which candidate they wanted to vote for.

Something can be said for a person making a $1 contribution or permitting $1 of his money to be spent in a way that will benefit the opposing party as well as his party.

Mr. President, even though I may not vote for the Republican nominee for

President, if he is to become President I would hope that he would not be the captive of wealthy contributors who financed his campaign. I would hope he would be as free to do what his conscience dictated as the candidate of the Democratic Party would be. I would hope that he would be completely free to do what appeared to be right to him under the circumstances, and be under no pressure whatever to make any commitment contrary to his own deep convictions.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his comments. I think he is performing a great service in bringing this question of the extension of campaign contributions to the rank and file of the people of America.

I am in complete accord with him that some method must be worked out whereby we can have a broader base of campaign contributions. The Senator's suggestion is one method. However, I agree with the Senator from Delaware, and others, that there are certain defects in his proposal, one of which has been brought up, that there is a lack of voluntary contributions, that there is no way to know where the dollar is going.

The second thing I agree on is that in spite of the fact there is machinery in the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana—which is part of the present law—to take care of third parties, that machinery operates at a time 4 years in advance, so that for all intents and purposes it would be impractical and would not work for a third party coming into existence.

As I stated yesterday, I hope that our Democratic Party, the oldest party in the Nation, will continue to be the Democratic Party. I am also sure that the Republicans hope that in the future their party will also continue to be the Republican Party. But, as we go forward, with change and progress always evident, it could be that one of the major political parties will be replaced, as has happened in the past.

Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill because I wanted to discuss my own proposal on the floor to take care of these matters. My bill is similar to the idea which the Senator from Louisiana has expressed, to mark in a box on the income tax form that one wanted to make a contribution to a political party.

I have answered the problem of the Senator from Delaware on voluntary contributions by saying that the Treasury Department will send back to the taxpayer a voucher, either for a presidential election, or a senatorial or congressional election, and then that person, at any time he chooses, can make that contribution to a nominee as well as a political party, or he can wait until after the convention, and if the person he feels he wants to support for President is not nominated at the convention, he can say, "Well, I will make a contribution to the other party."

That answers the question which the Senator from Louisiana brought up. Of course, some time along the line one has to take a stand. We cannot wait until that last minute plea, if we are going to have a working party in operation. If we wait until after the primary, we would voluntarily determine where the individual contribution would go. That, of course, would take care of the third party problem.

Suppose Governor Wallace does want to run for President on a third-party ticket. He can go around and solicit these dollar vouchers and they can be made as contributions to him, or to his Vice President, or to his regularly organized political organization.

I want to talk about this in greater detail if it is going to be brought up, but I feel that it will be very unfortunate, once we have taken this step, to repeal this proposal at this time. I would rather have the Senator from Louisiana make a commitment—and I know he has made this point on the floor—that we should go into this whole question promptly. My bill should be made ready for hearings and arguments on the proposal, along with other proposals; but I believe that my proposal would take care of some of the arguments against the Senator from Louisiana. I should like to have greater latitude in having a proposal such as mine considered. Several political scientists have made similar proposals. They should all be considered and testimony taken on them to see how it would work out. My proposal does take care of senatorial and congressional campaigns because these vouchers can be contributed to an official, a senatorial club. They cannot be cashed by an individual. One cannot send it into the Treasury himself. A regular official designated by a senatorial or congressional campaign, or a presidential or vice presidential campaign, must send it in to get the money. That bill I introduced yesterday is now at the desk and I made a brief explanation of it yesterday, even if I am going to offer it as an amendment to see what disposition can be made, but we have not had an opportunity to have any hearings on the proposal, or the proposal which perhaps, the Senator from Delaware will come up with, and others, on these matters of early hearings.

All these matters should be the subject of early hearings. The Senator from Louisiana should bring it before the committee and let all of us talk about it, instead of talking about it here, in general, on the floor, without the background of hearings and expert advice, and then discuss it later.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I appreciate the Senator's statement. The situation of the Senator from Montana is somewhat parallel to what mine was a couple of years ago. At that time, we were talking about the $100 deduction proposal. I was prepared to vote for it, in the absence of anything better. Then I thought along the line of having everyone put in $1 and have what would amount to a tax credit. Thus, when the $100 proposal was offered as an amendment to the tax bill, I stated that I would like to have my own suggestion considered. There was no point in offering to kill it on the floor, it has not been discussed or considered, and I would like to hold hearings on it and discuss the $100 proposal, the $10, the $1 proposals and all these various other suggestions and then let the committee vote for the suggestion it thought best.

The suggestion the Senator is making he has made now for the first time, to my knowledge. I have not heard about it until today. He has evidently been thinking about ways to improve our approach and improve on what we have.

I personally would be happy and anxious to support any change or any amendment that, in my opinion, would improve the method of financing campaigns.

The one thing that is in favor of what we now have on the statute books is that with it we have made a beginning and we can now go forward to improve our handiwork. I will vote for any suggestion that will improve our present method. I voted against the proposed amendment to prohibit the acceptance of private contributions by a candidate only because I thought it might needlessly confuse the matter at a time when we were making a beginning to finance both sides, so the candidates would not have to rely on wealthy people to contribute large amounts of money.

I shall be happy to support some suggestions that have been made, and I will make some myself, if other Senators do not. Once we have something to work with, we have something to improve on.

If that is the direction in which the Senator from Montana is working, I agree with him 100 percent that we ought to keep what we have and try to improve on it, rather than to tear it down 100 percent and begin all over again. The Senator knows how hard it is to start something. If something is proposed, even if a committee agrees on it, those on the other side will say that they have not had time to study it.

As was stated by Mr. Joseph Barr, 1939 was the last time Congress did anything constructive in this area. In that year we passed a Corrupt Practices Act. The year 1925 was the last time we had a bill providing for the financing of campaigns. What was provided made it more difficult to finance campaigns, but no means were provided for enabling them to get campaign funds so candidates would not be subject to improper influence or conduct. When one makes it more difficult to finance campaigns, he makes the conditions which lead to corruption worse rather than better. Those who try to finance campaigns have to become more sophisticated to avoid the pitfalls of the Corrupt Practices Act and find ways to finance those campaigns.

As the Senator knows, the Corrupt Practices Act provides in great detail for the reporting of money contributed to the candidate, but it does not say anything about a committee that might be supporting a candidate. A great deal of money can be raised through committees and individuals, other than through the candidate, and these sums are not reported at all. So great amounts of money can be raised and those amounts do not have to be reported, and it may frustrate the purpose of the act. The act makes it more difficult to finance campaigns, because people have to develop highly sophisticated means of rais-

ing campaign funds, to avoid coming under the provisions of the act.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I agree with the Senator that we have broadened the base for campaign contributions when each person can put a dollar into campaign expenses.

As the Senator knows, Members of Congress have just as great difficulties in financing senatorial and congressional campaigns as is true of financing the presidential and vice presidential campaigns. Sometimes they have much more money in proportion to the votes than Senators or Members of the House have to finance their campaigns. So this is a first and faltering step, and I think a step in the right direction. Perhaps we can correct it in some ways.

I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that it would be unfortunate to backtrack and eliminate what we have done in this first step. I would like to see hearings held to modify, and I believe correct, some of the deficiencies and some of the problems that have been raised by the amendment adopted last year, instead of letting it go back to what we had before, which was nothing.

That is why I bring up the problem. That is why I make the suggestion in connection with the other amendments which have been proposed by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Delaware, and other Senators.

I am in complete agreement with the statement of the Senator from Louisiana that we would be taking a step backward by not permitting every person in America to have an opportunity to help finance a campaign with a dollar's contribution. I do not agree with the formula by which the funds shall be distributed, but I think we can correct that formula. However, let us not start all over again, but let us hold hearings and take another step.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

It was my impression at the time that the administration favored the $100 deduction plan until it heard the discussion and saw what the committee had voted for with respect to the $1 contribution plan. Then when the administration studied it, it concluded that the $1 plan was preferable to what the administration had recommended. I believe that if one pressed the administration as to where it stands on this question today, it would favor the $1 plan rather than the $100 plan.

The suggestion of the Senator from Montana might meet with widespread support once it was studied. If this is a better way to do it, the Senator from Louisiana would be interested in supporting it. If he is convinced that it is a better way, he will vote for it. But what we have now provides the two major parties with $30 million with which to make their campaigns, and account for every nickel of it. I shall make a proposal, applicable to both the Democratic and Republican Party, that will leave no question about it. Every cent must be accounted for. I believe it is provided for now, but we should make sure that we know exactly how every nickel is spent. I believe most persons thought it was a constructive approach.

I would be happy to study the approach suggested by the Senator from Montana, but I think hearings should be held on it.

Mr. METCALF. I am confident that, after hearing the advice of some of the students in this field and after a discussion of the potentialities, a good many people would feel that this is a voluntary method with a broader base, and takes into consideration a third party, and so forth. I would like to have a chance to offer it rather than just discuss it on the Senate floor, and, after the background is explained, have the help of the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sure the Senator recognizes that offering the suggestion on the floor is not fair to the Senate, and that it is preferable to have it explained to Senators, have questions about it answered, and have the judgment of the committee on the proposal. The Senator is on the committee. I am sure he understands the advantage of having the judgment of members of the committee, after the committee has heard the advantages of this plan as compared with another. After the committee has acted, if the committee agrees with it, I think the Senator will agree that it would be doing greater justice to the Senate to offer his plan at that time than to offer it on the floor first.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Of course, I absolutely recognize that. I also recognize that it is an injustice to the person who offers an amendment. He should have an opportunity to build up evidence and testimony to buttress his contentions as to the effect of the proposed amendment.

That is my whole proposition. However, when we get into situations such as this, when such an amendment is brought up as an extraneous matter on another bill, if we are to have any discussion or anything at all, it must be brought up without hearings, without prior discussions, without the background and the expert advice that are needed.

So I hope that we shall be able to talk about the investment tax credit here, and that the Senator from Louisiana will call early hearings of our committee, and we will be able to consider my plan and other plans, and, if the committee is in agreement, improve the present law; or, if they are not in agreement and they feel that the present law is adequate, to continue under that, which is at least a step, as I have said before, toward the kind of financing that I believe we should have.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say that what we are talking about in the pending amendment involves only about $60 million, but in my judgment it is far more important to this Nation and the future of our country than the $1.8 billion total effect of the bill to which the amendment is offered. This $60 million has to do with the kind of government we wish to have in America. It deals with the question, to what extent do we want our Government to be under the control and domination of the wealth of a few people, and to what extent do we want to enable it to be a government where every person, at least theoretically, has as much influence as any other man?

Mr. President, one fortunate thing that has helped those of us who have voted for this financing plan up to now is that we have had the benefit of whatever advice could be directed to us from intelligent and able people in the administrative branch of the Government. One such person is the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Henry Fowler. I read from his letter of April 4, directed to me.

He says:

> This is in response to your request for the Treasury's views on proposals to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.
>
> Enactment of the Long bill, after public hearings at which various proposals were presented, was the first tangible step toward solving the problem of financing ever-mounting political campaign costs. Its effect in forthcoming presidential elections should be to alleviate significantly problems which have long been the source of concern in the conduct of national political campaigns: reliance of political parties on small groups of wealthy contributors; and lack of certainty that sufficient funds will be available to those parties to assure the full and free public discussion of issues necessary for an informed electorate.
>
> Clearly we should not discard a law which has the potential of making a significant contribution to our political process without giving it a fair and reasonable trial.
>
> Indeed, its passage has already precipitated much thoughtful study and public commentary directed toward improving the basic approach embodied in the Act. This public concern and awareness have been beneficial.
>
> It has resulted in many constructive suggestions which merit careful consideration. For example, I understand that you have already proposed certain changes. The Comptroller General and the advisory committee appointed by him pursuant to the Act, are now studying this law and are in the process of developing regulations under it.
>
> The public hearings which you intend to hold concerning possible amendments to this measure will provide an opportunity for the consideration of constructive changes. The Treasury will be pleased to participate in this effort and offer whatever assistance may be necessary.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> HENRY H. FOWLER.

So the Senator can see that a suggestion such as his would certainly be considered at the executive level.

Mr. President, parallel to that, I have received a letter from the American Federation of Labor, written by Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the department of legislation of that organization. I think he makes a most significant point in the final paragraph of his letter, when he says:

> In sum we hope that the present law can be retained and improved, rather than running the risk of repealing the present law in the dim hope that, somehow, another and more perfect measure can be created and adopted. In our experience, perfecting existing legislation is a far surer route to travel toward resolving problems than throwing out everything and starting all over.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Mr. Bie-

miller to me, dated April 3, 1967, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1967.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to assure you that the AFL–CIO is strongly in support of the principle of public financing of campaigns for public office as the surest way of freeing candidates from improper influence because of interest group contributions to their campaigns.

It is for this reason that we support your effort to keep Title III of Public Law 89–809 on the books and that we oppose the efforts of Senator Gore and others to repeal that section. Please understand that we believe as you do and as do many other thoughtful people both in and out of the Congress, that improvements are needed in P.L. 89–809.

We strongly support your commitment to hold hearings and to work for amendments to the law in this calendar year. Your own principle amendment, designed to assure that Presidential campaigns be either publicly financed or privately financed, but not both, is one excellent suggestion. There are others that ought to be considered, including application of the principle to other campaigns than that for the Presidency, and the issue of a small tax credit for campaign contributions.

But let it be said clearly that we believe that the chief method in the present law of using a check-off on the tax form would easily produce the projected revenue of $60 million every four years, split evenly between the two major parties. After all, this would require only an average of 15% of the nation's 100 million tax-payers to check their forms in order to raise $60 million each four years.

In sum we hope that the present law can be retained and improved, rather than running the risk of repealing the present law in the dim hope that, somehow, another and more perfect measure can be created and adopted. In our experience, perfecting existing legislation is a far surer route to travel toward resolving problems than throwing out everything and starting all over.

Sincerely yours.

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I had hoped that we would have more Senators available by this time in the afternoon, because I have prepared a speech on this matter upon which I have been working for quite a long time. In the hope that we might be able to find a few more Senators available, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, before proceeding with the quorum call, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree that it would be nice if we had more Senators here to listen to the Senator's speech, but I wonder if we could not get them here better if we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the pending amendment at 3 o'clock. As far as I am concerned, the Senator from Louisiana could have an hour of the time; I do not need any time.

I suggest that we give the Senator from Louisiana ample time to make his speech, following which we vote. I believe that Senators, knowing we were to vote on the matter, would be more apt to come into the Chamber. The administration is very anxious to get this bill passed, and naturally I wish to do everything I can to help them out, so in the interest of expediting the vote I wonder if the acting majority leader would not propound such a unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, I would not propound a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at this time. I will say to the Senator, we will vote on the measure in due course.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana withhold his unanimous-consent request for a moment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Tennessee without prejudice to my rights.

Mr. GORE. I do not wish to prejudice the Senator's rights.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance that a careful study be made and that careful consideration be given to this subject. It is of sufficient importance to deserve and require careful consideration. I suggested that that procedure be followed before we acted so hastily in the passage of an unsound and unwise bill.

I know of nothing that would better illustrate the fallacy of hasty action in the closing hours of a session than the fact that the distinguished author of the presidential election campaign fund law has now proposed searching and far-reaching amendments, the mere description of which required two closely typewritten pages circulated in the press gallery yesterday.

If I needed a witness to summon to my cause that this was a faulty measure, I would summon its author. His testimony is already prepared. Many amendments are already offered, some of which would repeal the very heart of the law—a $1 designation by each taxpayer of his tax liability to this fund for political campaigns. I understand the Senator himself proposes to repeal it by a measure which he has now introduced.

The Senator, of course, has a right to do that. It is encouraging that he seeks to correct the mistake that we have made. But, Mr. President, a clean correction and erasure of this mistake is the wisest course of action.

I remember when, as a schoolchild, I was at the blackboard and made a mistake in calculation, the teacher very kindly pointed out my error, and then, with equal kindness, said, "ALBERT, please erase it and start over."

This is what we must do now: Erase this mistake and start over. Why must we erase the mistake and start over? An erasure of this mistake will facilitate more careful consideration. Indeed, an erasure of this mistake may be necessary to secure any action whatsoever in election law reform.

We just heard a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury read. I have been advised by colleagues that the White House had been calling all over the United States during the Easter recess of Congress seeking to keep the present law.

I do not wish to challenge the right of President Johnson and his staff members so to act, and I do not criticize them. The President is a part of the legislative process. He can initiate recommendations. He can make suggestions to Members of the Senate and petitions can be made by him and by his staff. He has the power of veto.

I would not exclude the President from the legislative process. So I do not speak critically. I only cite this as a part of the facts which the Senate must consider.

As long as the presidential campaign is handsomely financed, I doubt if we will have the urge and the leadership and the recommendation for election law reform that is necessary to secure adequate results.

We all know the practice of sugar coating pills and the technique of the carrot and the stick. Assistance in the financing of political campaigns must go hand in hand with restrictions and regulations upon fraudulent practices in elections in order to accomplish adequate reform.

The two must go together, just as tax reduction and tax reform must go together.

The present procedure is so faulty in approach and so basically in error that it should be repealed and repealed immediately. I, at a later moment, will suggest that we vote later in the afternoon. The senior Senator from Delaware suggested 3 o'clock, but the junior Senator from Louisiana was not prepared to agree to that.

Perhaps that would be a little hasty. That would be an hour and 5 minutes from now. Perhaps we could vote at 5 o'clock, 5:30, or 6 o'clock so that Senators could complete their committee sessions, sign their mail out for the afternoon, and return here to vote.

We are ready to vote. We could then have hearings and conduct a study of this problem. We should not handicap such a study with this monstrosity being the law of the land.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, did not the Senator from Tennessee vote for this proposal in the committee, the proposal that he now wants to repeal? Did he not vote for the bill with this provision in it?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am very happy to respond to that. It may well be that I acted unwisely in doing so. I am prepared to acknowledge that I did.

I had a reason. It was not to obtain enactment of the measure. I thought the mere reporting of the measure would stimulate consideration of this problem. I dare say, as much as any other Member of the Senate, I have devoted study and effort toward election reform.

Having met with such small reward in the way of results, I thought perhaps

this would stimulate some conversation. It never occurred to me that the Senate would seriously consider passing the measure.

I learned a lesson, and I learned a lesson that will stay with me as long as I am a Member of the Senate. Never again will I vote for an amendment in a committee merely because the administration or the chairman of the committee or anybody else wants to get the measure out for discussion.

Hereafter, I will go by the rule that the best place to kill a bad amendment is wherever one finds it, then and there.

I voted to report the amendment, and I erred, but I tried to correct my mistake when I discovered that we were about to enact that proposal into law.

I fought all day and nearly all night to prevent the commission of the error in which I acknowledged a part, not because I believed it was sound, not because I thought it should become law, but because I thought it might serve the overall objective of promoting consideration and conversation and examination of this subject.

If we repeal this provision today before it goes into effect, before it clutters up the tax return, then perhaps a good purpose will have been served after all. However, the final step to take is to repeal it before it goes into effect. We made a mistake. Let us erase that mistake.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, one of the reasons that this Senator proposed and suggested his approach for financing the presidential campaign had to do with the logic that the Senator from Tennessee himself has explained down through the years. It therefore did not come as a surprise to this Senator when the Senator from Tennessee voted for this approach and did not oppose it when the bill was passed.

I thought he was for the measure. Suddenly he finds it is very bad. However, with respect to the criticism that the Senator wishes to direct toward the proposal, insofar as——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to correct the statement of the Senator. I did not vote for the bill. I opposed the bill when it passed the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator made no criticism of the campaign proposal when it passed the Senate, and he voted for the amendment in the committee. Therefore, I felt he was for it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to keep the Senator correct in his statements. I voted for the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Delaware which would have struck this provision from the bill.

I have never been in favor of this provision becoming law. I must acknowledge that I voted for it partly as an accommodation to the Senator to get the measure out of the committee. I should not have done it.

Time after time we have a plea within the committees on which I serve that somebody, or the administration, is entitled to have a bill reported for the consideration of the Senate.

Never again will this plea be effective with me. I will vote against such a practice whenever I have the opportunity, if I think it is unsound, and I should have done so in this case.

I have confessed to the Senator my error and have given him my reasons for it. But I did not vote for the provision on the floor. I opposed it on the floor. I voted to strike it out on the floor. However, much to my surprise and chagrin, the provision came back from the conference still in the bill. Only one more step remained between the proposal and law—the adoption of the conference report. It was upon that occasion and at that time and in that situation that I inconvenienced many Members of the Senate by insisting upon a quorum. Many Members had to return from great distances, and they voted without having heard the question debated, and the bill passed—the conference report was adopted 31 to 22. That is the record.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am curious to know just what the Senator's views are in this general field. When the Senator voted for the amendment in the committee, my impression was that he was voting for it because of the belief that this was the general direction in which we should head to provide for honest financing of presidential campaigns, so that neither major party candidate need be unduly beholden to any small group of wealthy people. My impression was that the Senator had for a number of years favored that type of approach.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to respond to the able Senator, my distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee on which I am pleased and honored to serve.

The more we make public functions out of public elections, with proper safeguards, the more security we will provide for our democratic process. Did we not have a Federal-State relationship and governmental organization, I would gladly support complete public financing for election to public office, with absolute prohibition of private monetary expenditures. But that is a hypothesis. That situation does not exist.

Elections, in fact, are conducted by States, not by the Federal Government. Presidential electors are chosen not on a national basis but within each State. Senators are elected not by the House of Representatives or by national polls, but within each State. Officials of our Government are chosen by no franchise other than the franchise over which supervision is exercised by State governments.

The law sponsored by the Senator from Louisiana provides that the funds provided under this act be paid to the treasury of the two major national parties. No such legal entities are in existence. We have a Republican National Committee—not a Republican National Party—in existence. We have a Republican National Committee. And how is it composed? It is composed of two committeemen from each State, selected by the Republican parties within those States. No member of the Republican National Committee is chosen on a national basis.

The same is true of the Democratic National Committee.

There is no formalized corporate or legal entity or organization of a national political party.

I repeat: The two great parties that we have—disorganized as they are—are composites of the political parties within each State.

The chairman of the Republican National Committee, and of the Democratic National Committee, is selected by the committee members who, as I have said, are chosen and elected from each State.

When we have a national campaign, each party has candidates for President, for Senator, for Governor, for various offices. But the elections are conducted by the States and the territories. The laws governing the opening of the polls, the choosing of election officials, the printing of the ballots, the acquisition of voting machines, the regulation of poll watchers, the situs of the polling places, the hours at which the polls open and close, the counting of the ballots, the keeping of the records, the certification of the election—all are State functions. So, this is not a simple problem.

It is much simpler to provide public financing for all political election campaigns in Great Britain, which has one national system of elections and office holding. But ours is a Federal-State system. So it is difficult to provide complete public financing of elections.

This problem is inherent in the law that we unfortunately now have. The bill sponsored by the Senator from Louisiana, which is now the law—which I hope will not be law in a few days—provides only for campaign financing of candidates for President. Well, Senators seeking re-election next year, candidates for the Senate, aspiring to be Members of this body, will likely be running on the ticket with the nominees for President of the two major parties—that is, in 1968. How do you divorce the two campaigns? How do you segregate this slush fund of an estimated $60 million? We have two political parties as possible beneficiaries—and only two political parties. Only the presidential nominees of the two political parties can be beneficiaries in 1968 of this large campaign fund; but they will be heading the slate of candidates, including one for Vice President, candidates for Governor, candidates for Senator, candidates for Representative, and so forth.

If a candidate for President should come to my State—I am not a candidate next year; let us take some other State. Let us take the State of Oklahoma where Senator MONRONEY will, I hope, be a candidate for election next year and, if so, I am sure he will be successful. However, suppose the Democratic nominee for President goes to the State of Oklahoma and a large portion of this $60 million is spent to organize the meeting, to buy the television time, the radio time, and the newspaper advertising. How are they to dissociate the campaign

for a Democratic Senator from the State of Oklahoma from the expenditures of a President on a campaign trip to that State? The Senator's law is unworkable.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. It is a mistake. We should erase it. We should start over again.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I wish to answer the first question of the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator asked a question?

Mr. GORE. The Senator asked for some of my views as to what should be done. I am trying to give some background material. I shall yield shortly.

I would like to see some public contribution to election campaigns, but coupled with that there must be reform. There must be restrictions, regulations, and limitations upon the influence of private political contributions.

The Senator spoke earlier about how this measure was going to cure some of the present law; and would cure some of those evils. Has it? There is a law now.

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

Mr. GORE. I shall yield in a moment.

Has it? There is a law now. However, the price of a ticket to a Democratic dinner party soon to be held has risen from $100 a plate to $250 a plate. The President's Club, I understand, is still thriving. In order that we may not leave out the Republicans, I understand, acting under the benevolent influence of this law they have increased their price to $500 a plate.

What do we have? I know what we have. We have the same interests, but not for only tickets, but also for tables, for both parties. The interests who buy those tables, sometimes by the dozens, seek to feather their nests with contracts and policies of the Government. I would put a limit upon this practice, and I would have a limitation upon the interstate movement of political campaign contributions. Why should Wall Street dominate the elections in some small States?

In the investigation of campaign contribution, and expenditures which I conducted in 1956, I found that the Republican Party received more money from Manhattan Island than from all of the remainder of the then 48 States combined. I must confess that as I kept pushing those IBM buttons, I found that the Democratic Party also received a large portion of its funds from the same island and from the same sources. I would put a curb upon this. I would work some real reform to protect the right of an ordinary citizen to cast one vote and have that vote equal to the vote of another.

Why should we perpetuate a system that would permit one man, because of the size of his pocketbook, to offset the ballot of 1,000 ordinary citizens; or one industry, or one interest, because of its vast holdings and resources, to usurp the public will? This is a threat to our democratic processes. This is a threat to free government. And yet by this law that we now have, which brings about a commingling of public money with private money from whatever sources and however questionable, we make the situation worse, and we have the White House and the Secretary of the Treasury urging Congress to vote to keep this political slush fund for 1968. I shall go one sentence further.

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

Mr. GORE. I had told the Senator from Louisiana that I would yield to him. Then, I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

I would bring about real election reform. I would couple it with a means of making it possible for a poor man to run for public office. I would not freeze our system into immobility as does the Senator's law.

I would not say that a third party or the nominee of a third party could never be checked off with equality of opportunity. I would not foreclose the opportunity of a conservative movement, or a liberal movement, or a prohibition movement, or an antiwar movement. I would not foreclose splintering of our two political parties. The public welfare might be served. We were not wise in passing a law which had that effect.

I would couple reform with public contributions to election campaigns, and I would go further. I would reserve some of the medium of communication, the airwaves that belong to the whole people, for public use in the most vital performance of our democratic system; the choosing of our public officials. There are details in between, but I would provide limitations and regulations upon political campaign contributions and expenditures, and limit the movement of funds from one area to another across State lines. We should preserve to the people of a State the right to choose their own Senators and their own Representatives without undue influence from outside the State.

I had testimony from a fundraiser who told me that he went to a certain rich man in a certain State and asked for a rather liberal campaign contribution for a candidate for the Senate. He reported that the man looked at him and, with an oath, said, "Why, that would not have too much effect in this State. I can buy the election of a Senator in a Rocky Mountain State for that amount."

Why should a man in Pennsylvania be permitted, under the law, to make a campaign contribution sufficient to usurp the will of the people of a sparsely settled State?

We need many things by way of election reform. But what does the law sponsored by the Senator from Louisiana do? It makes conditions worse. It does not inhibit present practices at all; it merely adds to the slush fund an estimated $60 million from the public purse, commingling and making difficult of identification, separation, and publication the sources of private campaign contributions.

We need to repeal this law, because it hinders election reform. It is a hindrance and a stumbling block to people who want clean elections. Let us erase this mistake; then I shall be ready to join the Senator from Louisiana in hearings, in an examination, and in an exhaustive study of this vital element and great danger to our democratic processes. But the first step, I repeat, is the repeal of a law that we passed in haste and without consideration on the closing day of the session last year, as a part of the "Christmas tree" bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What the Senator spells out as his objection is substantially what I am trying to correct. It seems to me that we cannot achieve in a single day, with a single bill, everything we would like to accomplish.

We have two problems. First, we should provide an honest way for both major political parties—and if the mechanism can be devised to do so, even for a minor party—to make its case before the American people. Then, having provided an honest way for the parties to finance their campaigns without any taint of influence, proceed to cut off private contributions that are used for the same purpose. I shall seek to accomplish the second part of that plan during this year.

But it seems to me that when we try to become involved in all the complications of what is proposed to be done about so many different things, we tend to get lost in the minutia and accomplish nothing.

We have provided a way in which campaigns can be honestly financed. Frankly, I am of the impression that so far as the occupant of the White House is concerned, if this provision remains in the law, he will decline to let any of his supporters accept private contributions, and will decline to accept them himself. My guess is that the Republican candidate may well take that approach too.

But I have said consistently what I say now: that I myself would like to see the Presidential campaign conducted in such a way that neither major party need be subject to any improper influence at all, and that neither party need rely upon the contributions of a few wealthy contributors to finance their campaigns.

It seems to me that in one way or another two things must be provided: First, the campaign must be financed without any improper pressure; and my feeling about that is that both the candidates who are considered big enough and responsible enough to run for President would not be seeking large private contributions if they could have money available to them to finance their campaigns that could be used and accounted for completely beyond any taint or influence whatever.

So that, from my point of view, we have managed to find a way, honorably and honestly, to finance campaigns that do not have these large contributions coming in. Thus, I would hope that we can go forward to accomplish as much as we can along the line which the Senator has advocated on the other score, to see to it that we cut off, insofar as possible, these private contributions.

The Senator will find it will be very

difficult, indeed, to keep private contributors from doing certain things in order to help the candidate of their choice. Those who own large newspapers, for example, could give tremendous support to candidates in their editorials, and there is nothing we can do about that in Congress because of the first amendment to the Constitution regarding freedom of speech and freedom of the press. I doubt very much that we could keep people from doing any one of a number of other things in order to help the candidate of their choice. But we can prevent a great deal of evil by providing for collective contributions, and that sort of thing, and that is what we seek to do.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLINGS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am glad that the interest of the Senator from Louisiana has been aroused. I have been concerned about this subject for a long time, and I shall be happy to join him in an effort to achieve election reform. However, the first step would be to erase the mistake we have made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely propose to ask some questions of the Senator, in order to clarify in my own mind the situation which prevails and to point up the principal objectives of the argument of the Senator from Tennessee.

Has there been any change in any of the Federal laws dealing with the solicitation or acceptance of funds from the taxpayers if they so indicate, to conduct presidential campaigns, as is contained in the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana so that in all probability each of the political parties in this country would be given $30 million?

Mr. GORE. No safeguards were contained in the bill. There are none in the law now. All the money, so far as the law is concerned, could be spent in one State or could be turned over to the treasurer of one political party. The law does not identify or define "party," except that the nominee of that party must have received 5 million votes in the previous presidential election. What the treasurer of the party does with the money, or how many treasurers there may be, or how the organization may qualify, is left uncertain and indefinite except for the requirement that the nominee must have received 5 million votes. That freezes everyone with the exception of the nominees of the two major parties. But it is still indefinite as to who the treasurer is.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I take the Senator's reply to mean that if the treasurer of each of the parties, according to expectations, is given $30 million to begin with, there would be, in addition, no inhibitions about the right to solicit or accept moneys as they have been solicited and accepted in the past.

Mr. GORE. The law provides that they shall be or can be reimbursed for moneys spent or incurred—whatever they may mean—but it carries no provision whatsoever that would inhibit in any way the solicitation of or the receipt of money from private sources for expenditures, or the commingling of funds from private sources.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the premise for the sponsorship of the measure offered by the Senator from Louisiana, and passed by the Senate by some sort of legerdemain operation, is that we must eliminate the corruption under past practices and that, therefore, it is necessary to provide for the taking of moneys from the taxpayer, if the taxpayer so wills?

Mr. GORE. As I understand the able Senator from Louisiana, he was convinced—and he still seems to be of the same opinion—that the providing of public funds for presidential campaigns would somehow eliminate private contributions.

However, the Senator from Ohio knows that the President's club still thrives, and we know that the Republicans are going to be charging $500 a plate and the Democrats $250 a plate for a dinner. Of course, the poor man will not give $250 or $500 for one dinner.

Mr. LAUSCHE Since the enactment of this $30 million contribution that is to go into the pockets of each of the two political parties, has there been any indication anywhere that with a $30 million nest egg there will be a cessation or has been a cessation of the soliciting of contribtuions?

Mr. GORE. I know of none at all. Their appetite seems to be insatiable.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The newspapers report a central meeting being held in Washington to prepare for the army of banquets and programs and the collection of money throughout the Nation.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is true that the premise for the bill of the Senator from Louisiana is that we must eliminate corruption in elections, my question is, If we give $30 million to the Democratic Party in Washington and $30 million to the Republican Party, as their initial nest eggs, and we then say to them, "Go out and collect as much more money as you can," and if it is true that money corrupts, is it not fair to infer that the corruption will be even greater because there definitely will be $30 million more for each party to play with?

Mr. GORE. In answer to the question, I will say that the corruption associated with money in politics can come from its volume and its amount as well as from its source and its use. The more money each candidate or each political party has, the more the potential that candidate or that party has for corruption. There used to be a time when a candidate for the U.S. Senate who expended an unconscionable amount would be denied a seat in this body; but lately I have not heard that question raised.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bars are down. "Get as much money as you can. We will give you $30 million to begin with, and from that point go out and collect as much as you can from $1,000-a-plate clubs, $500-a-plate clubs, $2,500-a-plate clubs."

Mr. GORE. The sky is the limit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. $1,000 is not the limit. I predict that when we give these political parties a nest egg of $30 million and allow them, without limitation, to go out and solicit other contributions, we will create the most vicious instrumentality for buying votes, dominating the precinct committeemen, the county ward leaders, and State chairmen that we have ever seen.

Mr. GORE. That is what we have now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the basis of population, Ohio will get 5 percent of the $30 million, if the whole amount is collected. That would be $1.5 million, in addition to the other contributions.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's comment causes me to suggest that in most of our presidential campaigns, an intense contest has raged in a few pivotal States. Other States are taken more or less for granted. Ohio has always been one of the pivotal States. So the Senator might well be prepared for an influx of twice that amount in his State in the national campaign. There is no provision in the law to prevent having the entire amount spent in Ohio—perhaps for the defeat of the senior Senator from Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; and I have some apprehensions in that direction.

Mr. GORE. I am glad I have aroused some apprehension in some Member of this body of the danger of giving $30 million of public money to political bosses in Washington. That is a danger against which there should be safeguards. Not only should the expenditure of public money be safeguarded, but expenditures from private sources to campaign contributions as well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think I heard the Senator from Louisiana state that the candidates for President will exercise their powers in restraining solicitations and the acceptance of contributions to conduct campaigns. Has the Senator seen any evidence of that kind since the establishment of the $30 million "bank"?

Mr. GORE. No; I have not.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to my good friend from Tennessee that I quite frankly am trying to make up my mind on how to vote on the Senator's amendment. Last year, with considerable reluctance, I voted for the Long amendment. I am not at all sure that I was right. I would like, if I may, to ask the Senator some questions in order to bring out his thinking on what is really a vexing problem.

My first question is, Does not the Senator, who has wide and deep experience in the field of campaign financing, believe that comprehensive legislation in this area is long overdue?

Mr. GORE. I do, indeed. I have earnestly sought it. As chairman of an elections subcommittee, I spent a whole fall conducting an investigation. The Senate provided that subcommittee with $250,000. I corralled an expert staff, contracted for IBM equipment, slapped subpenas on officials and candidates. I think the first subpenas I issued were

upon the officials of a big Democratic dinner in the State of Pennsylvania, which the Senator, as a candidate, attended.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. I was then conducting my first campaign for the Senate, in 1956. I remember very well the zeal with which the Senator from Tennessee pursued his efforts to check up on campaign contributions that year, and the very great and deep trouble he gave me in securing records, which I thought at that time was quite justified.

Mr. GORE. It was not my purpose to interrupt the campaign of anyone, but I was charged with the responsibility of investigating the records of that dinner. Pennsylvania is a State of great influence——

Mr. CLARK. Not as much as it was formerly.

Mr. GORE. From my standpoint, I wanted to exercise the power of subpena first on the Democratic Party—my own party; and the officials of the State of Pennsylvania cooperated fully. I was grateful that they did. But we cataloged $30 million, who gave it, who received it, and what was done with it. This report, which a few persons still have—I have a file copy—is still today the largest committee report that the U.S. Congress has ever had submitted to it. I am not saying it would be of great value now.

But I have been, since 1956 at least, seeking zealously to bring about election reform, to curb abuses, to eliminate dangerous corruption. I assert that a widespread, thoroughgoing election reform is vitally and urgently needed.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad the Senator agrees with me on that.

Would the Senator not agree that when we are dealing with as complex a subject and, indeed, as controversial a subject as election reform, it is not the wisest thing in the world to write a bill on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. GORE. I agree thoroughly. I confess to the Senator, as I did earlier today, when he was not in the Chamber, that I voted to report this bill from committee, not because I thought it ought to become law, but to stimulate discussion and consideration.

Mr. CLARK. That has happened.

Mr. GORE. That has happened. If we can repeal the law now, before it goes into effect, it will have stimulated great interest. The chairman of the Committee on Finance has already pledged to have a public hearing and go thoroughly into the question.

But it seems to me, if I may attempt to persuade the Senator, that the bill we passed in such haste is so fallacious in its approach and so piecemeal in providing the "goodies," so to speak, without the necessary restraints that might not let them taste so good, would prove to be a hindrance to establishing proper election reform. It seems to me we need to repeal it and then provide a carrot-and-stick approach to needed election reform. Unless we tie reform and the provision of public funds together, we are not going to get reform, just as we must place in the same measure tax reform and tax reduction.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator about the need for tax reform and tax reduction and that we have to tie them together. It seems to me that we make tax reductions, but no tax reforms.

The Senator from Louisiana has offered a number of amendments to the present election subsidy provision which went into the "Christmas tree" bill of last year. I have not had an opportunity to study them. In the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee, do they make satisfactory and perhaps adequate changes in the wide open law which we now have?

Mr. GORE. I would not use the word "satisfactory" or "adequate." I would say that if the amendments the Senator has proposed—the opportunity I have had to study them has been very limited; I have not actually seen the texts of the amendments, though I have seen a press statement which described the purport of the amendments—put into effect what they purport to do as described in the press statement, they would serve as improvements; but by no means would they bring about satisfactory amendment. For one thing, the proposals that I have seen thus far have in no way touched the problem of sharing in the funds by independent parties, or candidates of independent parties—third, fourth, or fifth. For all practical purposes, the existing law prohibits this.

I think that is a basic error. It seems to me that the able Senator, who has been so eloquent and so effective in his advocacy of civil rights, would agree with me that the right to seek public office, the right to seek political preferment, is a civil right as basic as the right to vote; and the right to seek that public office with equal opportunity with his fellow candidates is equally basic.

Mr. CLARK. Regardless of his own financial situation.

Mr. GORE. Regardless. One man, one vote, one office, one officeholder, but freedom of American citizens to compete for that office on as nearly equal terms as is practical and possible.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator has made a valid point; but I ask him if he agrees with me that this very troublesome question should be carefully studied in committee, after comprehensive public hearings. Do I have his assurance that if I vote for his amendment, he will join with me in seeking to develop such a bill or bills, and in promptly pressing for public hearings?

Mr. GORE. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. CLARK. One of the difficulties which confronts me is that, by reason of the parliamentary situation, I have to either vote or not vote for the Senator's amendment, and then I have no chance to look at the bill as the Senator from Louisiana might develop it by amendments, which might make it more satisfactory. So I have to cross the river before I am quite ready to do so.

Mr. GORE. As I understand it, the able junior Senator from Louisiana, who is fully capable of speaking for himself, has not introduced his amendment as an amendment to the pending bill, but as a separate bill to amend existing law. So his amendment, as such, is not before the Senate. What is before the Senate is my proposal to repeal the present law because I think it is a hindrance to real election law reform.

I point out one thing further to the Senator: The tax forms for next year's returns will before long be going to the Public Printer. So if we are to act on this matter, it should be now, to save unnecessary cluttering of the tax forms, which we have sought to simplify over a period of years.

Mr. CLARK. I ask the Senator this: It has seemed to me, as a Member of the Senate and a possible candidate for reelection, that there is very little excuse for giving all this Government money to the candidates for President, and thereby prohibiting them, by one of the amendments of the Senator from Louisiana, from soliciting funds from private individuals if they accept the contributions from the Government, and doing nothing with regard to congressional candidates.

I have great difficulty in understanding why we should thus attempt to protect presidential candidates from the unsavory influence of lobbyists, but leave candidates for the Senate and for the House of Representatives wide open to those claims of lobbyists with which the Senator from Tennessee and I are very familiar, which I have no doubt the Senator from Tennessee has always resisted, and which I have done my best to resist, too, although sometimes it gets to be pretty difficult.

Mr. GORE. My resistance, I must confess, weakens a little in an election year.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator would not agree, though, quite seriously, that if we are going to do something for presidential elections, we ought to do it for congressional elections at the same time.

Mr. GORE. This problem cannot be dealt with effectively piecemeal. We must deal with the problem with respect to all Federal elections. The Senator knows it will be very difficult, when he is a candidate next year for reelection—as I hope he will be, and I am confident he will be reelected——

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that the Senator not be too sure about that proposition.

Mr. GORE. Suffice it to say that I have my hopes and my confidence.

But suppose he is a candidate for reelection, and the candidate for President of the Democratic Party comes to the State of Pennsylvania. How are we to separate the two campaigns? Will the Senator abscond? Will he flee the presence of the President and the boundaries of the State?

Mr. CLARK. That is a possibility, in view of present policies, but I doubt if I would go that far.

Mr. GORE. What I am trying to illustrate is that you cannot deal with this problem practically by providing public funds campaigns for one Federal office alone. The Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Tennessee will be seeking reelection on the Democratic ticket. How do you separate all of this, and say

that the campaign of the candidate for President, as the Senator now proposes, shall not receive any private political contributions?

Mr. CLARK. It might not be possible.

Mr. GORE. Suppose that the Democratic Party of Pennsylvania buys time on a television network for the campaign of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. He has a half hour of prime time on a given night.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would be a great program.

Mr. GORE. As someone has remarked in an aside, it would be a great program. The Senator from Pennsylvania might think it would have a greater appeal if the candidate for President of the Democratic Party came to Pennsylvania on that night and used part of that time. It has been paid for by private campaign contributions. The amendment which the Senator from Louisiana has proposed would prohibit any private contribution to the campaign for President. Perhaps that is meritorious; but the point I am trying to make is, how do you divide the campaign for Senator from the campaign for President?

What we have under the present law is a commingling of public and private funds. This must be dealt with on a comprehensive basis.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, if the President were to go into a particular congressional district—we have 27 in Pennsylvania—and advocate the reelection of a Democratic candidate, there you would have the complexity of the situation increased to that extent; would you not?

Mr. GORE. Indeed.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend from Tennessee this question: If we agree, first, that comprehensive election reform is needed——

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. And, second, that careful consideration, after extensive public hearings in committee, is highly desirable, and that we should not attempt to construct this important sort of legislation on the floor, then would the Senator agree with me that there are three important areas where election reform is required, and they are within the jurisdiction of three separate committees?

I point out to the Senator that last year the Johnson administration sent down an election reform bill and asked me to introduce it, which I did, offering also some amendments of my own. That bill was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which did not see fit to hold as much as 1 day of hearings on it.

Then we have the problem presented by the Senator from Louisiana, dealing with the general subject of tax credits, and the Senator from Louisiana, in what I thought was a very skillful way, in a sense got away from the tax credit situation and into this dollar checkoff deal, which certainly, to a very substantial extent, would provide the necessary money, though perhaps in a somewhat clumsy fashion. I repeat, I voted for it.

So, there is a matter which comes within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee on which the Senator from Tennessee serves with such ability. Then, we have the third and very vexing area of how to handle television and radio time. That is a matter that is, I think, of most importance, because of the enormous cost to all candidates of prime television and radio time and, if I may say so, this is occasioned by the somewhat excessive charges which the networks make for many political candidates.

This sort of reform ought to go to the Committee on Commerce on which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] serves with such distinction.

What I have in mind doing, if the amendment were to be agreed to, is to introduce three bills, one of which, dealing with television and radio time, would go to the Commerce Committee.

The second would deal with tax credits and possibly the same idea that the Senator from Louisiana brought to the floor and had enacted into law. That would go to the Finance Committee.

The third bill would be a rewriting of the Fair Campaign Practices Act. There would be a good many more sticks and not so many carrots. That bill would go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Hopefully, out of those three areas, we would come up with a comprehensive bill, but we should do it quickly, because this would apply to 1968.

In the course of doing this, I hope that those three committees would coordinate their efforts, which is hard to do sometimes in the Senate. Any comprehensive reform must deal with Representatives and Senators as well as with the President.

I wonder what the Senator thinks of that approach.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I would like to deal with the last thing first.

From a practical standpoint, I believe that most Senators and Representatives would agree that there is more difficulty to raising campaign funds for candidates for the House and Senate than there is in raising funds for the presidential nominees of the two parties.

Mr. CLARK. Except where there are avid lobbyists who rely on the vote of a Congressman in a particular area and are all too willing to make substantial campaign contributions.

They might be labor unions. They might be individuals looking for favors. They might be businesses in the State or in the congressional district. That is where I think so much of the viciousness of our own method of financing campaigns arises. What the Senator says is true.

Mr. GORE. The remarks of the Senator call for some comment.

A vote in the U.S. Senate is of such great effect and influence that any person who is willing to sell his soul can have handsome financing for his campaigns.

Mr. CLARK. We hope that none of our colleagues would do that, and we hope that we would not. However, the temptation is present.

Mr. GORE. It is a danger to our democratic process. As the population increases and as the means of communication become more costly, the temptations and the dangers will grow in proportion.

Mr. CLARK. There is a very real conflict of interest present; is there not?

Mr. GORE. There is no question about that. The question of jurisdiction ought not to be difficult. We have precedent for it. Matters arise frequently which have overlapping jurisdiction.

I serve on the Committee on Finance and on the Committee on Foreign Relations. When a tax treaty is presented, its ratification can be reported only by the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, invariably there is a working relationship between the two committees, and when the matter is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Foreign Relations forwards the measure to the Committee on Finance for its recommendations.

So there are ways in which we can act. If we repeal this provision and take away this carrot of adequate presidential campaign financing, we may get a little more leadership from the White House in the matter of election reforms. We may be able to arouse enough interest in the executive branch, in Congress, and among the public, as a result of all of this discussion, to bring about the necessary teamwork, coordination, study, and effort to provide real election reform.

I say to the Senator in all sincerity—and I warn him that I am trying to persuade him—the existence of the present law is an obstacle and a stumbling block to real election reform.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has been a vigorous and ardent promoter of reforms in elections in an effort to eliminate all the evils that we as public officials know about and that the general public believes are in existence. I commend him for it.

However, I desire to point out that these reforms will not be achieved when the awkward situation exists in which we would be piling an additional $30 million into a presidential election campaign for each of the two major parties.

Mr. GORE. I agree.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We all agree that there should be reforms. The Senator from Louisiana agrees that there should be reforms. However, before he attempts the reforms, he has seen fit to have a bill passed that would aggravate the situation and preclude the development of an intensive fight to achieve the reforms.

Mr. GORE. I agree.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We all talk about the corruption that exists. It seems to be a unanimous opinion that the tickets for the $100 a plate dinners are not sold to individuals as a general rule. They are sold to lobbyists who buy 20, 30, 40, or 50 tickets.

Mr. GORE. Sold by both parties.

Mr. LAUSCHE. By both parties. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I am pleased to state that the only dinner that I have ever had given for me was a $2.50 a plate dinner in my little ward out on St. Clair Avenue, in Cleveland. That is the only

type dinner I have ever had given for me.

Mr. GORE. I have not been favored with any kind of dinner of a testimonial nature yet. I have had my appetite satisfied many times.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That dinner was given by the people who knew me in the community in which I was born and reared. They had proposed giving a $100 a plate dinner for me, and I turned them down.

The $30 million contribution to each of the presidential candidates from the two major parties constitutes the creation of an instrumentality in politics that will produce the dirtiest and meanest type of corruption ever seen in American politics.

I have been in campaigns in which word reached me: "They are ganging up against you in ward X. The only way you can stop them is to send money into the ward." I suppose the Senator from Tennessee has been through that experience.

When $30 million is available centrally, talks will then go on between the Democratic National Committee and the Ohio State Committee. It will be said: "You can begin soliciting funds back home, but we will not use them in the presidential campaign." Or the national committee will say: "We will send you extra money because there is an extra problem."

Gold is the source of evil practically everywhere. The proposal that is now the law would make more gold available and cause more evil.

If $300,000 is sent to three wards where precinct committeemen and ward leaders want money, we know what the result will be.

Mr. President, this is the most scandalous provision that has ever been included in the laws of the Nation. The tragedy is that the legislation was passed under circumstances that are unbelievable.

Do I correctly understand that when the Senator from Tennessee voted to report the proposal to the Senate, he did so with the understanding that it would open a discussion of the subject that would continue throughout the Nation, and that he did not expect the amendment to be agreed to?

Mr. GORE. That was my own supposition, rather than an understanding. I had no understanding with anyone to that extent.

From the beginning, I should say in all fairness, the junior Senator from Louisiana must have been very sincere in proposing the legislation. It was only my supposition that the matter was of sufficient importance that it might be a public service to report the measure and to promote some discussion, but I did not expect that the proposal would be seriously considered for adoption. I declared at the time, in committee, that I would not support the proposal on the floor of the Senate.

Frequently an appeal is made—I have yielded to it a number of times—"Well, Senator So-and-So has made a proposal. He is entitled to have it reported and to have a debate on the floor"; or "The administration is entitled to have its bill reported to the Senate and have it discussed and considered." This is a frequent plea. I yielded to that plea, believing that the public might be well served. I confess that I may have erred.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill to which the amendment was attached was originally a tax repeal bill, was it not?

Mr. GORE. It was originally a bill that dealt with the taxation of foreign investors. It was a good bill, to begin with.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was it known as the "Christmas tree plum" bill?

Mr. GORE. Ultimately, after a number of amendments benefiting special interests had been added, it became known as the "Christmas tree" bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask which was the biggest plum on the Christmas tree? Was it not the $30 million gift to each of the political parties?

Mr. GORE. I suppose the election subsidy was the biggest plum.

Mr. President, when the committee met a few days ago to consider the pending bill, I was confident that there were sufficient votes in committee to adopt an amendment that I advanced to repeal the Presidential Campaign Election Fund Act. Not only did I believe that there were sufficient votes in committee to adopt the amendment to repeal the law, but also the acting chairman, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], publicly stated at the conclusion of the committee action that in his view there were sufficient votes in committee for the adoption of my amendment.

I withheld my amendment because of the absence of the distinguished chairman of the committee and author of the provision that is now in the law, which my amendment sought to repeal. I believed that this was proper courtesy and regard for him. I offered the amendment yesterday on the floor of the Senate. We who advocate the amendment were prepared to vote yesterday, but I requested—and the Democratic leadership acceded to the request—that the vote go over until today, when the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana was expected to be in the Chamber. He is here today; he has made an eloquent speech; he has defended his enactment by introducing a bill to amend it, containing several pages. Now we are ready to vote.

I do not wish to submit a unanimous-consent request. I am not in the leader's chair. But I respectfully suggest to the acting majority leader that it is 5 minutes after 3. We coud vote at 5:35. This would allow 2 hours for Senators to complete their mail.

Would the Senator from Louisiana be agreeable to fixing a time to vote?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not intend to make that request at this time. I may do so later. If the Senator from Tennessee wishes to conclude his speech, I am prepared to discuss the subject.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I certainly shall not undertake to usurp the leadership. This is not my responsibility. I am ready to vote.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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. LONG of Louisiana. 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. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for nearly 200 years the people of this Nation have been trying to perfect a system of government under which man could govern himself better than he could be governed by others.

Generally, our progress has pursued the theory that the more hands into which the goddess Liberty is entrusted, the safer she will be. We have steadily expanded the electorate to include more voters and we have worked to see that voters were better qualified to judge the candidates and the issues.

We have improved our technique for registration of voters, for counting votes, and for prosecuting vote stealing until we take for granted that every election will provide us with an honest decision of the voters.

The great failure of our democratic process remains in the manner in which campaigns are financed.

First, let us look at some of the problems of financing a campaign:

Permit me to refer to the problem of running for the U.S. Senate, because it is an area in which I have had firsthand experience, having been elected against both strong and weak opponents on a number of occasions, and having assisted in financing the campaigns of many of my colleagues.

Louisiana is a State of about 3,700,000 people, about one-fiftieth of the Nation's population. It has been my experience that a hotly contested race for the U.S. Senate costs somewhere between $200,000 and $400,000. My most expensive campaign was nearer the low figure to which I have referred, but costs have been going up, and friends who have faced the prospect of a difficult race in the State have provided estimates which tended toward the higher figure.

It is generally felt among professional politicians that candidates should not be required to finance their campaigns out of their own pockets for a number of reasons. First, most of them cannot afford it. The job of Senator or Congressman pays only $30,000. Second, it is not necessary. There are plenty of people around who will contribute to candidates whom they wish to see continued in office.

The reason that people contribute to politicians are so varied that thousands of pages could be written on the subject without being repetitious. You might sum it up, however, by saying that the average man in business is willing to contribute toward keeping a good man in office.

Most campaign contributions are made because a candidate either supported things that the contributor favored or opposed things that the contributor did not favor.

Most campaign money comes from businessmen. Labor contributions have been greatly exaggerated. It would be my guess that about 95 percent of campaign funds at the congressional level are derived from businessmen. At least 80 percent of this comes from men who could sign a net worth statement exceeding a quarter of a million dollars. Businessmen contribute because the Federal Corrupt Practices Act prohibits businesses from contributing. Funneling contributions through their officers is a simple and safe way for business to accomplish what it cannot do directly.

A few examples can help illustrate the kind of things that cause businessmen to contribute:

A great number of businessmen contribute to legislators who have voted for laws to reduce the power of labor unions, to regulate unions, to outlaw the union shop.

Many businessmen contribute to legislators who have voted to exempt their businesses from the minimum wage.

Businessmen contribute to legislators who have fought against taxes that would have been burdensome to their businesses, whether the tax increase was proposed as a so-called reform, a loophole closer, or just an effort to balance the Federal budget.

Power company officials contribute to legislators who vote against public power and against expanding the Rural Electric Administration cooperatives. REA officers are also able to raise some money, although not nearly as much for those legislators who vote the other way around, although the real power of the REA cooperatives is to be found in the strong grassroots support they can generate against their enemies.

Bankers, insurance company executives, big money lenders generally contribute to legislators who vote for policies that lead to high interest rates.

Many large companies benefit from research and development contracts which carry a guaranteed profit; a so-called fixed fee of about 7 percent of the amount of the contract. Executives of such companies contribute to those who help them get the contracts or who make the money available. In recent years, quite a battle has developed over the desire of Government research contractors to obtain and keep lush private monopoly patent rights on those things discovered with billions of dollars of Government research money. The possibility of windfall profits in this area defies imagination. Research contractors contribute to legislators who vote to permit them to have private patent rights on Government research expenditures.

Drug companies are often able to sell brand-name drug products at anywhere from twice to 50 times the price of identical nonbranded products for welfare and medicare patients if the companies can prevail upon Government to permit their drugs to be prescribed and dispensed by their private brand names rather than by the official or generic name of the product. Executives of drug companies will contribute to legislators who vote to permit or bring about such a result.

Many industries are regulated. This includes the railroads, the truckers, the airlines, the power companies, the pipelines, to name but a few. Executives of regulated companies contribute to legislators who vote to go easy on the regulation, and ask no more questions than necessary about their rates.

Companies facing threat of ruinous competition from foreign sources have executives who contribute to those who help protect them from such competition by means of tariffs and quotas.

Many industries are subsidized. This includes the merchant marine, the shipbuilders, the sugar producers, the copper producers, and a host of others. Executives in such industries contribute to those who help keep them in business.

This list is merely illustrative; it could be elaborated upon and enlarged to include many more. The fact of the matter is that a legislator can, and in many cases should, vote with some of these business groups. Many times they will be right, although not always. Such businessmen can be prevailed upon in varying degrees to contribute to his campaign. Merely by assiduously tending to the problems of business interests located in one's own State, a legislator can generally assure himself of enough financial support to campaign effectively for reelection.

The unfortunate part of the problem is that in certain cases, such as problems involving the level of interest rates and monopoly situations, the money is all on one side. People who would be benefited by low interest rates or by lower prices as a result of more competition do not have an active and vocal interest in the matter, nor do they have the wealth or the understanding of the problem, that would cause them to contribute money to a legislator who fights for their side of the case. Should some such people want to do something about the matter, their individual financial contributions would be so small that it might cost more to collect them than they furnish in revenue.

Fortunately, in many cases, the special interest of one group is offset, at least in part, by the special interest of another group. Many groups in one geographic area have opposition from somewhere else equally as well financed.

Many times legislators will bend over backward to vote for the general public interest of the few, but on balance it would still be best if legislators did not have to concern themselves with the problem of raising large amounts of money for campaigns. They should be completely free to vote their honest convictions. A great number of things wrong about government can be traced to the problems of financing campaigns of legislators.

Against that background, consider the problem of financing a campaign for President of the United States.

The cost may vary from $14 million to $50 million. No one really has any accurate idea of the cost because so much money is spent by committees and by individuals who do not report it. Only a handful of families have sufficient wealth to wage a campaign for President, and even they deem it unwise to pay more than a tiny portion of campaign expenses from their own bank accounts.

Because of the high cost of campaigning and the inability of most candidates to pay the cost themselves, every corporation, every vested interest, every monopoly, every businessman in America, particularly the large and wealthy ones, have a virtual standing invitation to contribute large sums of money and in return to receive assurances of one sort or another will receive a sympathetic ear.

Here is where the big corporations, acting through their executives, have the opportunity to gain assurance that interest rates will not be very low, that monopolies will not be upset radically, that appointees to regulatory agencies will be acceptable to those whom they are supposed to regulate, that the wealthy will continue to enjoy tax loopholes.

If he does not weaken and give some assurances along these lines, a presidential candidate is simply unable to raise enough money to make himself heard by 190 million Americans. And no matter how fine a candidate he is or how good his platform may be, he does not stand a chance of getting elected unless he is fully and frequently exposed to the public through television, radio, newspaper advertising, billboards, handbills, and every other means of advertising that the fertile brains on Madison Avenue can devise. It is sad, but true, that the good man and program will not win out, the public will not recognize their merit unless they are adequately, almost excessively, promoted and publicized.

Under the circumstances, it is utterly amazing that the public makes out as well as it does.

Even so, the Government pays out many billions of dollars in unnecessarily high interest charges; it permits private monopoly patents on over $12 billion of Government research money annually; it permits billions of dollars of Government money to remain on deposit in banks without collecting interest; it permits overcharging by many concerns selling services to Government; it tolerates all sorts of tax favoritism; it fails to move to protect public health from a number of obvious hazards; it permits monopolies to victimize the public in a number of inexcusable ways. It provides for too much tariff protection to some industries and too little to others.

Many of these evils are built-in defects of American Government resulting from the way that we finance our presidential campaigns.

This is the reason that I have fought for legislation to finance the presidential campaigns in such a manner that the expense of the campaign would not separate an American President from his conscience or inhibit him from freely advocating and fighting for the national interest as he saw it.

My suggestion is that both major party candidates should be assured adequate funds to cover the cost of their campaigns without having to make the commitments so common to large fundraisings. The money would be available as a result of permitting every taxpayer to mark on his tax return that he wanted one dollar of his tax money to go into a presidential election campaign fund.

The Congress agreed with the suggestion, and it is now law. For 1968 both major parties would have available $30 million of untainted funds to work with.

Those who would perpetuate the old system with all of the corruptions, special privileges, and favoritism that it entailed have worked diligently to find fault with the honest method of financing the campaigns which I advocate. Were they to spend as much time finding answers as they spend finding conceivable shortcomings of the plan, they could solve all the problems which they invent. Let me discuss some of these problems and answer them.

In the first place, some criticize that there is no prohibition of large private contributions.

One problem in this case is that you cannot prohibit a citizen from campaigning for the candidate of his choice. His constitutional right of free speech clearly permits him to go around the country speaking, shouting, carrying signs advocating the candidate he supports. He can put a sticker on his car and hire a sound truck.

Perhaps we can prohibit a man from buying radio and television time, but we could hardly prevent him from buying an ad in a newspaper, putting circulars on his neighbors' doorsteps, handing out free pencils and candy advocating his candidate.

But we can provide enough money to the candidate to free him from any necessity of making any commitment which he deems to be contrary to his conscience or against the national interest.

PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS

One criticism of last year's law is that while it provides a goodly sum of money for the Democratic and Republican Parties to use in presidential campaigns, it does nothing to curb the amounts the parties can get from private sources and thus the fund is just a whale of a supplement to whatever else they can beg, borrow, or steal. My purpose in introducing the proposal originally was to give the parties an adequate source of untainted funds so that they would not find it necessary to solicit anything near the amount they formerly sought in contributions. But it can be said that as long as they may use any outside funds for their presidential campaigns, the parties and their candidates will be subjected to influence. Now that we have assurance of adequate financing for presidential campaigns, it is possible, for the first time, to limit the use of private contributions for this purpose.

Therefore, the next amendment in my bill would prohibit any payment from the campaign fund to a major party with respect to a presidential campaign if any contribution, direct or indirect, has been or would be accepted or spent for that campaign by the party, its candidates, or any organization controlled by the party or its candidates.

The Long Act will make approximately $30 million available to each of the two major parties to defray their expenses in connection with the 1968 presidential election. That is more than either party has ever reported as expenditures in any prior campaign. With this tremendous sum available, and in order to make the Long Act even more of a force for the elimination of improper influence in Government, it seems wise to have the major parties choose between private contributions and fund payments for their presidential campaigns. Funds these parties raise by contributions will have to be used solely for other campaigns including congressional and gubernatorial or for expenses unrelated to presidential campaigns.

Minor parties present a different problem. First, they are paid under a different formula which looks solely at the number of votes cast for that party's candidate. Major parties, on the other hand, are paid on the basis of total votes cast for all major party candidates without regard to how many were cast for any particular major party candidate. Second, the $5 million floor before payment can be made is for a minor party, relatively speaking, a much heavier burden than it is for a major party. Third, under the act as it now applies, a party must receive at least 5 million votes for its candidate in order to be classified even as a "minor party." If a party's candidate does not receive 5 million votes, it does not qualify for any payment from the fund.

Because of these differences, my new bill does not prohibit contributions, for presidential campaigns to minor parties, as determined by the preceding election. However, the aggregate amount of payments from the fund plus private contributions which a minor party may devote to a campaign for President is limited by my new bill to the lesser of the actual amount of expenditures incurred by it, or the amount to which a major party is entitled from the fund. Under the amendment, if a minor party, which has previously received substantial private contributions becomes eligible for reimbursement under the act, it can restore the contributions it received to its donors in order to realize the full $1 per vote payment. If it chooses to retain the private contributions for paying the costs of its presidential campaign, then its payments under the plan are reduced. Of course, the minor party can continue to receive contributions for nonpresidential campaigns. This amendment assures that the minor party can receive sufficient private contributions, which, when added to the payment it receives under the plan, covers the full cost of its presidential campaign, but it may not make a profit because of payments under the act. And the party which does not reach the 5-million-vote level to qualify for payment from the fund can continue to receive contributions from private sources free of any limitation not already in the law.

Under the amendments it will not be possible for a major party to incur an expense which cannot be paid either from private contributions or from amounts received from the fund. If an expense is not for the presidential campaign, contributions may freely be used. If it is for the presidential campaign, and the party has elected to have its campaign expenses paid from the fund, contributions may not be used.

There are some items which are incurred with respect to campaigns for more than one office which may not be reimbursed from the fund. For example, expenses of poll watchers, and salaries, or other expenses related to persons assigned to pass out campaign literature at polling places, or to drive voters to and from the polls tend to benefit the entire slate. For this reason they are not primarily related to the presidential campaign and thus are not proper expenses to be paid out of the tax checkoff fund. To allow them to be paid from this fund would, in effect, embark the Federal Government on a program of contributing to the cost of campaigns for most any office which occurs concurrently with the presidential campaign.

For the same reasons expenses related to a joint appearance of a presidential candidate and a candidate for another public office will not be reimbursed from the fund if a principal purpose of the joint appearance is to further the campaign of the other candidate.

Mr. President, I will propose certain amendments which I believe study and consideration may very well prove to be justified as improvements to the provision that we presently have on the statute books.

I would hope that we may conduct hearings on this matter and study these and other suggestions and improve upon the act in doing so.

I think that such action would make the bill an even better bill than that which we have today. But, suffice it to say, the bill we have today is workable. It will work, and it will relieve the presidential candidates of the necessity of seeking private contributions in order to carry on a campaign.

TAX CHECKOFF

The first of these amendments eliminates the $1 tax checkoff. Instead of having taxpayers evidence their desire to have part of their tax money used to finance presidential election campaigns, this amendment would provide a permanent appropriation to finance the presidential election campaign funds. Amounts payable to the political parties would remain tied to the same basic $1 per vote formula as in last year's law.

Some people have suggested that the Long Act is not constitutional, because it authorizes taxpayers to designate how their tax money is to be spent. People who argue this do not understand how this act works. It is true that the $1 tax checkoff builds up the presidential fund. However, under the act, not one penny of this fund can actually be spent for presidential campaign expenses until it has specifically been appropriated by Congress. My reason for taking out this tax checkoff provision is not to concede its unconstitutionality. There is no constitutional issue involved. My reasons are quite different.

First an appropriation from the general revenue of the Treasury gives even more citizens of this country an opportunity to share in the costs of selecting the President. There are thousands of persons who are not income-tax payers and therefore have no opportunity to make the tax checkoff. But because of

such other Federal revenue raisers as excise taxes, dollars from these same people find their way into the general revenue of the Treasury from which the campaign fund payments would come under my amendment. So that a candidate will feel beholden for his financial support to no one individually, but to all the people as a whole, the campaign fund can be made to represent the resources of all American citizens, not just income-tax payers.

A one-time appropriation from the general revenue of the U.S. Treasury assures, additionally, the automatic operation of the fund payments without dependence on the whims of the times and without danger of influence by a party in power.

There are numerous precedents in the law for this kind of appropriation; such as for the payment of interest on the public debt, for refunding money erroneously received by the Federal Government, for the expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, and for the payment of interest to certain Indians.

If the parties are provided with sufficient funds to put on a proper campaign for President, I do not particularly care whether the funds come from a tax check-off or from a guaranteed appropriation. Those are procedural alternatives and both are equally suited to do the job. If Senators feel more comfortable with the more usual appropriation device, I have no objection to working it out that way instead of through the tax check-off.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING GUIDELINES

A third amendment I propose fixes broad guidelines over the uses for which most of the money from the fund can be put. Under this new rule 75 percent of the payments from the fund can be used only for such purposes as travel and transportation of the candidates and their campaign personnel, radio and television production and time, newspaper and periodical advertising, reasonable allowances for salaries of campaign personnel and for overhead expenses of maintaining campaign headquarters, telephone, telegraph, postage, printing, and distribution of campaign literature, and polls and data processing.

According to the reports filed in the past by political committees, the bulk of their spending has been in the above seven broad categories. They are the kinds of expenses which can best be verified and accounted for. And they give every indication of continuing to be the items that will demand the greatest spending by parties and candidates in the future. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that the largest share by far of the fund payments to a party should be directed to these items. By thus channeling the money in certain specified kinds of expense, the argument that the fund money can be wasted by political parties on all manner of frivolous and even evil activity is effectively blunted.

The other 25 percent of the fund payments to a party can be used for the same purposes for which the 75 percent must be used or it can be used for other types of expense not included within the aforementioned seven categories. There are sure to be expenses which do not fit neatly into any of the categories chosen, no matter how many categories are listed. Therefore, there should be some of the fund payments which the parties can use for miscellaneous or not otherwise categorized purposes.

However, all of the fund payments, the 75 percent portion and the 25 percent portion must be used for proper, legal expenses of a presidential campaign. The final arbiter of what is such a proper, legal expense of a presidential campaign is the Comptroller General of the United States, aided and assisted by the Advisory Board, composed of two Democrats and two Republicans and three others. And none of the fund payments can be used for such typical election day expenses as paying poll watchers, transporting voters to the polls, or furnishing food and drink on election day. These fund payments, I reiterate, are for the purpose of paying legitimate presidential campaign costs, not for providing any self-gain for the candidate, the party faithful or the voters.

AUDITS AND REPAYMENTS BY PARTIES

The next amendment directs the Comptroller General to conduct after the presidential campaign a thorough examination and audit of the expenses incurred by each political party in carrying on the presidential campaign and to require either a repayment from the party or a reduction in future payments to the party if any of the fund moneys are found to have been used by the party for other than presidential campaign expenses. If the Comptroller General should find that the party knew that it was using money from the fund other than for an expense of the presidential campaign, there would be exacted upon the party a penalty of an additional 25 percent of the amount misused.

As part of his general duties and function, the Comptroller General probably already has authority to conduct the postelection audit, but it will not hurt to vest this authority specifically under this act. And there should be provisions in the law in the event it is discovered that payments from the fund have been mishandled.

Under the amendment, the repayment —plus the penalty, if it should apply— may be effected either by using contributed funds for this purpose or by reducing future payments due to the party involved with respect to the current election or the next election.

VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND POLITICAL COMMITTEES

Another amendment in my bill clarifies two other points that have been raised about the Long Act. The amendment assures payment for the campaign costs of a vice-presidential candidate as well as a presidential candidate and defines the treasury and treasurer of a political party as being the treasury and treasurer of the national committee of the party. I believe that last year's act and legislative history fully provide for payment of expenses connected with vice presidential candidates. I think that "political party" as used in the Long Act encompasses "political committee" as used elsewhere in the law. But for those purists who desire to see such matters spelled out in the act, I have included the appropriate clarifications.

DISCLOSURE

The sixth amendment calls for the Comptroller General to file a full and detailed report to Congress after each presidential election, of the payments from the fund made to each party, the expenses of the parties for which the payments were made, and the repayments, if any, which the parties were required to make to the fund. I stated in the Senate last year that the Comptroller General's findings and actions would be a matter of public record, but again it may be preferable to assure such a result by requiring it in the statute.

PENALTIES

The seventh amendment provides a specific criminal penalty for individuals for the misuse of funds received under the act. This criminal penalty is in addition to the civil penalty I previously described for the party. As I said when the Long Act was being debated last fall, I am convinced that the present Federal fraud statutes adequately provide for any violations of this act. But to soothe those who want to see a penalty specified in the act itself, I have included a provision to impose a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, for any willful or knowing misuse of funds received under the Long Act, including the use of such funds for personal purposes or for any other purposes not specifically related to the carrying on of a presidential campaign. The penalty is identical to the penalty now provided under Section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code for fraud against the Government.

LIMITATION OF $3 MILLION

The eighth amendment to the Long Act, which I guess makes it the "Longer" act, spells out that payments under this act are not to be considered contribution in applying that limitation in another part of the Federal law which restricts contributions and expenditures by "political committees" to $3 million. I stated categorically last year that the $3 million limitation would not apply with respect to payments under the act. Those who question this cannot have examined the law very closely. Present law refers to contributions to political committees. The new act, on the other hand, actually has nothing to do with contributions. The term "contribute" means to give or supply in common with others; to share in a joint effort. The financing of presidential elections with Federal tax revenues is not a voluntary, joint effort to give funds. Rather it is an appropriation of funds to which the parties have a statutory right.

Moreover, it is not part of a joint effort. As a result, it is not a contribution, and therefore, does not come under the limitation of present law. Finally, it involves a payment to political "parties," not payments to political "committees." As a result, it should be clear the present $3 million limitation does not apply.

PRIMARY ELECTIONS

Neither the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act nor the amendments I propose today extend Federal financing to primary candidates. A sound case can be made for doing this. So long as presidential aspirants must get out and seek their own financial support for their primary battles, the hint of improper influence being exerted on this high office remains. However, it is far less of a threat when there are several aspirants vying with one another in different parts of the country for the privilege of representing their party in the general election.

To further the cause of clean elections for the Presidency, I believe it would be well in the future to extend Federal financial support to primary campaigns. However, at this point it would be better to gain experience with the operation of this new method of financing the general election before we take up the peculiar problems associated with primary campaigns.

MINOR PARTIES

It has been suggested by some that the bill Congress approved last year did not give proper recognition to the financial needs of minor parties. I disagree. First, it has been many, many years since there was a new political movement strong enough and enduring enough to threaten either of the major parties. One such party was the Bull Moose movement in 1912. The Populist movement in the 1920's was another. Both of these parties ran good races, but neither of them endured.

A new party can get substantial help under the present act if it has a consistent appeal to the electorate. Aside from the financial help such a party may receive from the fund, it is not subjected to the restrictions my amendments would impose on private contributions. To the contrary, the restriction on the major parties' use of contributions may well serve to open up new avenues of financial support for third-party candidates. If a minor party demonstrates the staying power and political appeal needed to make strong campaigns two elections in a row, it will find the financial climate under the act and my amendments well suited to its continued development.

Of this much I am certain: The new law does more than anything yet done in this century to reduce the disproportionate and improper influence of big private money contributors which leads to corruption of government. It is the longest stride we have made toward realizing the American dream of a truly democratic land where the influence of a poor humble man or an elected official is as great as that of a millionaire.

After 180 years, it is time that we at last remove from Government the power of big money to control and corrupt it. This will be one of our best steps in that direction.

For that reason, I think I shall offer a final amendment to change the name of last year's law to "The Honest Election Law."

The roughly $60 million cost every fourth year averages out to an annual cost of about $15 million each year to place the highest office in the land above and beyond the control and influence of big money.

To the average citizen the difference could well save him one thousand times that much money on an annual basis. For example, a difference of one point in the level of interest rates on a public and private debt of $1 trillion, 600 billion would be an annual saving to borrowers of $16 billion and an annual saving to the Federal Government of over $3 billion in interest on the national debt.

The areas in which savings to Government can be made are all matters of opinion and dispute, but equally as important is the satisfaction of knowing that decisions of Government in picking the right man for the jobs in Government, selecting the best qualified contractor to produce an important weapon on which our future security will depend and the inspection or rejection of that performance was not dictated by the contribution of large amounts of money to the President's campaign.

Now, what is proposed here does not affect the election of the Congress.

Yet the proposal which we suggest this year will give us valuable experience for the future in suggesting how we might better finance the congressional elections.

The ways in which improper influence has been brought to bear are somewhat difficult to describe in Washington because of the sophistication of the persons involved. Wrong decisions which have cost this Government billions of dollars could be set forth, but most of them are subject to dispute and argument.

I am very familiar with some of the things that happen at the State level and why they happen. In participating in campaigns for the Governor's office, I have seen sincere, scrupulously honest men start out refusing to promise anything the least bit improper and end up promising things that made me feel sick, all because the candidate was broke and could no longer perform as the master of his own conscience if he hoped to win.

Candidates for Governor have time and again promised highway contractors, or materialmen the appointment of the highway commissioner or at least the right to veto anyone being considered for the job. Oil producers, or a particular oil producer, have been promised the appointment of the conservation commissioner who would set their production allowables.

Older and wiser heads have advised newcomers to the business of politics that, if they were going to make some deals, they should make the deals early. The logic of such procedure was that the sort of commitments a man would feel compelled to make early in a race would not be nearly so bad as those he would find himself making later in the campaign when he was desperate for money to continue his campaign and the people he was negotiating with knew that he was desperate.

At the end of a campaign, I have seen fine young men left with more than a hundred thousand dollars of debts, without a job, no financial resources, and no immediate prospect of paying off.

As a boy, my mother told me of the time that my father came to her and asked her to sign a waiver of the wife's right of homestead exemption, so that he could pledge our home against mounting campaign expenses. On that occasion, she told him that she had spent her whole life working for a home for her children, and that, if the Governor's job did not mean enough to his supporters to carry the expense, it did not mean that much to her.

After a man has put everything he could beg and borrow into a campaign with a good chance to win, can anyone be surprised that he would begin to promise jobs, promise appointments, make commitments that he preferred not to make rather than see his signboards come down and cancel out his broadcasts to the public prior to the election?

An illustration of this was Senator HUMPHREY'S experience in the 1960 West Virginia primary. Let me quote from Theodore White's "Making of a President, 1960":

> Strangled for lack of money (Humphrey's expenditures in West Virginia were to total only $25,000—nothing, in the scale of American politics), knowing himself in debt, aware of the nature, depth and resources of this final Kennedy drive, as the final week end approached Humphrey became a figure of pathos. He needed advertising, he needed workers, above all he needed TV to show himself across the state.
>
> I remember the final Saturday morning, shortly after it was revealed that Kennedy's TV expenditures alone across the state had mounted to $34,000. Humphrey had had but four hours' sleep that morning and was up at seven, prepared to barnstorm north from Charleston in his bus on a rainy morning; at that point one of his assistants informed him that the TV stations that had booked him for a Sunday night half hour were threatening to cancel unless they were paid that day, cash in advance, for the time.
>
> It was one of the few times I have seen the temper of that genial man snap.
>
> "Pay it!" snarled Humphrey. "Pay it! I don't care how, don't come to me with that kind of story." Then, realizing that his crestfallen aide was, like himself, destitute, Hubert pulled out his checkbook at the breakfast table and said, "All right, I'll pay for it myself," and scribbled a personal check of his own.
>
> Mrs. Humphrey watched him do so, with dark, sad eyes, and one had the feeling that the check was money from the family grocery fund—or the money earmarked to pay for the wedding of their daughter who was to be married the week following the primary.
>
> My memory tells me that the sum of that check was $750—not a particularly large sum for a statewide hookup of half an hour. But such a grocery-money check buys time only—it does not buy the production, the preparation, the care a major television manipulation of the public requires.

Now I know that some pontifical politico will tell us that he never begged for 5 cents and that his campaign cost him practically nothing—only a fraction of what others must pay.

My reaction is that any person who is the darling of the newspaper publishers has much of his campaign covered in favorable news and editorial support they can afford. If his record has the overwhelming approval of the wealthy business people, if he has a consistent record of favoring penny-pinching economy when the needs of the sick and the poor were involved, a consistent record of vot-

ing to protect management from the demands of labor, of protecting monopolies from the public rather than the other way around, he will find that the campaign expenses seem to take care of themselves. Radio and television broadcasts may be paid by unseen and seemingly unknown beneficiaries. The man may well find himself with a substantial campaign surplus and no place to spend it.

Candidates who have done much to help the poor, the needy, the ignorant, the suffering masses of humanity, while at the same time they have fought against letting the regulated monopolies escape regulation, and in favor of the principle that taxation should respect the ability to pay, are candidates who understand the difficulty of raising money to take the fight to the people.

Candidates like this are needed in government. It would be well that both parties should offer us a choice of such men, rather than a choice of the other kind as sometimes happens.

Insofar as this act would result in long-term economies in government it is the one approach that the favored few would want the least. Of all expenditures by government, this is the one which the robber barons will oppose the most. The cost of financing a presidential campaign is one expense that they welcome. Investments in this area can often be viewed as monetary bread cast upon the water to be returned 1,000-fold.

This is where a few thousand people have historically bought for themselves the opportunity to represent their Nation abroad, the right to be consulted about governmental policies and the right to be consulted about proposed appointments to the President's Cabinet, as well as virtually all other important appointments. They will have bought for themselves the expectation that any change of governmental policy adversely affecting them would be measured at the highest level in government against the money that they contribute to one campaign and would expect to contribute to another.

With the Honest Election Act in operation, no longer would government have to operate so inefficiently and ineffectively. Because candidates need worry no longer where their campaign funds were to come from, they could run on their principles and convictions and if elected see that these principles and convictions were acted upon in the best interests of all the people without paying wasteful and dangerous heed to the interests of the well-heeled few.

This, then, is the direction toward clean, honest government. At a cost of less than 25 cents per taxpayer per year, we can lift the American Presidency above the debasing necessity of the major parties and their candidates making commitments and appointments that should never be made.

Admittedly, improvements can be made, but the approach should be to amend for the better, not to junk what we have accomplished after 60 years of futile efforts in this direction.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I will vote against the motion to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, not because I think that act is perfect or even near perfect, but because I am convinced that a positive program in the area of campaign finance must be developed. The Campaign Fund Act of 1966, passed in the waning moments of the 89th Congress, is not a totally satisfactory answer to the problem. But simply to repeal that act is no answer at all. It is no secret that year after year, for one reason or another, campaign financing proposals have failed to see the light of day. Now, finally, we have a law on the books. It is a law which needs extensive revision and amendment. And it is precisely with such revisions and amendments that we should concern ourselves—not with a repealer that would put us back where we started and necessitate our running the same old obstacle course all over again.

The skyrocketing cost of political campaigns—figures from 1960 and 1964 reveal an increase of over 65 percent in national committee expenditures over a mere 4-year period—presents us with several interrelated problems. It threatens to make politics a rich man's vocation and to prevent all but the privileged few from seeking office. It makes the large contributor a key figure in our political structure. And it creates a tie of dependence between candidate and contributor that is disquieting at best.

It is no solution at all simply to limit the amounts contributors may give or candidates may receive. Present law represents primarily this negative approach, and every indication is that it has been totally ineffectual. The ceilings are unrealistically low, enforcement is impossible, and loopholes are manifold. If the ceilings were effective, they would cause an undesirable curtailing of campaigns, at a time when we want our candidates to have maximum public exposure and to undertake full discussions of electoral issues. In their present ineffective state, the ceilings simply encourage evasion and penalize the conscientious. And they do not solve our basic problem: to lessen and equalize the burdens of campaign financing, to reduce our candidates' financial dependence.

A more promising remedy, but still only a partial solution, is to improve reporting procedures. "Sunlight," Brandeis noted, "is the best disinfectant." Senator GORE has for many years advocated measures which would make reports of contributions and expenditures simpler and more revealing and would guarantee that they are required of all candidates and are given due publicity. This was also a major thrust of the administration's proposed Election Reform Act of 1966. An effective reporting and publicity system, as Herbert Alexander, of the Citizens' Research Foundation, has argued, "will create financial accountability, increase public confidence in the electoral process and curb excesses and abuses by increasing political risk for those who would undertake sharp practices." Campaign contributions would not be treated as themselves questionable; indeed, they represent a legitimate form of political participation. But their questionable aspects would be diminished through exposure to light of day.

The third and most controversial type of remedy is one to which advocates of "reform" have given too little attention, but it is a type of action which, more and more, the dilemma seems to warrant. If we are to have full and effective campaigns, the money must come from somewhere. Government could stimulate the private contribution of funds, could encourage contributions from particular sectors, could provide for reduced advertising and broadcasting costs, or could itself provide indirect assistance. The great merit of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, whatever its demerits, is that it represents a new departure in this regard. It reflects a recognition that mere limitation or regulation or surveillance of expenditures is not enough. What is needed is a source of funds that equalizes and reduces the burdens of campaigning without creating questionable ties of dependence. The administration bill of last year was rather short on proposals of this variety, though it did contain provisions for the sale of low-priced campaign souvenirs and for tax deductions for contributions of up to $100.

Other suggestions also deserve consideration. President Kennedy, in 1962, proposed legislation which would have granted franking privileges to candidates during the campaign period. The President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation has suggested that the Government might support campaign publicity similar to the information pamphlets used in some Western States. Other proposals, which I will mention in more detail in a moment, would make television and radio time available free or at reduced rates.

The Campaign Fund Act of 1966 thus represents only one among many proposed solutions. Its shortcomings are not to be minimized. In its present form, it probably presents unjustifiable obstacles to the entry of minor parties into the presidential campaign arena. Its tax check-off features need careful study. Detailed administrative guidelines, to prevent abuses and windfalls, are necessary. And its provision of a campaign subsidy must be supplemented by strict accounting and reporting requirements. I am pleased that Senator LONG has announced his intention to meet some of these problems through amendments to the Campaign Fund Act, and I will be interested in learning the details of his proposals.

In addition, the act leaves two major problems uncovered—problems which require further congressional attention and action. The first has to do with nonpresidential campaigns. The Campaign Fund Act applies to presidential campaigns only, and would channel public funds only to committees concerned with the nationwide effort. As Senator METCALF noted on the Senate floor yesterday,

we should give serious attention to the impact that this act, in isolation, might have on the power structure of our national parties and on the vitality and influence of local parties units. And certainly few Members of Congress—or few Governors, State legislators, or mayors—would suggest that the problems of campaign finance focus only on the national level. Many of the proposals I have mentioned for revised reporting procedures, for the stimulation of private contributions, or for indirect governmental assistance could be applied to primaries as well as general elections, to State and local as well as presidential campaigns, to minor as well as major parties. These are points in their favor. The Campaign Fund Act is incomplete in its coverage and one-sided in its effects. Supplementary programs are required.

Second, I would turn to a problem which I regard of overriding and increasing importance, but a problem which both the Campaign Fund Act and the President's bill of last year failed to confront. I refer to the ever-increasing role of television and radio in political campaigns. Federal Communications Commission reports indicate that expenditures for political broadcasting in the 1964 general elections were 73 percent higher than they were in 1960, and the 1960 figures were 45 percent higher than those for 1956. This means that in an 8-year period, expenditures for political broadcasting have multiplied two and one-half times. The figure for 1956 is $9,818,000; for 1964, $24,603,989. If we include expenditures for primaries, the latter figure jumps to $34,610,714, of which some $23.8 million went to television stations and networks. As former Senator Neuberger once noted, Abraham Lincoln ran for President in 1860 on a budget of $100,000; today, 1 hour of network television time costs $130,000.

Television is an essential campaign medium; it is fast becoming the major item in campaign budgets. If government is to ease campaign cost burdens, it must start here. Several proposals have been made. Adlai Stevenson testified before the Commerce Committee in 1961:

> I would urge the Congress to say to the political parties and the television industry: "We reclaim for a few hours every 4 years the public airwaves. We owe it to our system of government to give the voters—now numbering more than 100 million and beyond the physical reach of any candidate—a chance to hear the issues discussed and make their choice with knowledge of the facts."

Vice President HUMPHREY and Senator GORE have likewise favored requiring TV stations to give free time to candidates. Other Senators have at various times advocated plans whereby the government would reimburse stations for commercial time thus utilized, perhaps at controlled rates.

It seems to me that none of the proposals for direct or indirect assistance to candidates, at whatever level, even approach the relevance and the promise of a program of television coverage. I hope that we shall skirt this problem no longer. I hope that, with the cooperation of the broadcasting industry, the airwaves can increasingly be utilized to promote a public awareness of candidates and issues—without the imposition of paralyzing financial burdens.

I think Congress should investigate the possibility of legislation which would require broadcast stations to set aside a certain amount of time to be used by candidates for President, for Congress, and for perhaps some State offices. This time would be made available at no cost or at greatly reduced cost. Perhaps the cost could be paid by some form of Federal subsidy. An equal amount of time would be made available to nominees of the two major parties, with fair amounts of time reserved for other duly nominated candidates. A candidate could divide up the time as he wished within the limits of sound program scheduling.

Two limits might be imposed by such legislation. One would require that candidates using provisions of this law to acquire air time would not be permitted to buy additional time during the same campaign. The other would be to prohibit use of spot or very short commercials, which, because of their brevity, add little or nothing to discussions of issues.

The aim of this proposal would be to insure that all nominees, regardless of their financial backing, had equal access to the air waves which belong to the public. It would also help stop a dangerous trend toward campaigning in terms of slogans rather than in terms of programs and issues.

I realize my proposal would require a great deal of study and probably revision. I offer it principally as additional fuel to fire further the discussion of the entire question of campaign financing ignited by the Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that an article dealing with this subject by Jack Gould, television and radio critic for the New York Times, printed in the January 1967 edition of Current, be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. It is therefore my conclusion, Mr. President, that the Campaign Fund Act of 1966 is very much in need of revision and amendment. We must get on with the business of developing a comprehensive and equitable solution to the problems which campaign costs pose for good government and the democratic process. But simply to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act is no solution at all. That act is a start, albeit a rather unsatisfactory one, and I am concerned that we make the most of this small beginning.

EXHIBIT 1

[Reprinted in Current magazine, January 1967, from the New York Times, Oct. 24, 1966]

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK—SHOULD TAXES PAY FOR CAMPAIGN COSTS?

(By Jack Gould)

The use of Federal income taxes to finance Presidential campaigns is a numbing prospect for the television viewer. Apparently it is not enough that the taxpayer should have to look at the wretched political spot announcements that make a farce of civilized governmental processes; now he is being invited to pay for them.

Senate passage [on Oct. 22] of the campaign financing amendment to the tax bill, under which the taxpayer could voluntarily assign $1 of his tax payment to a Presidential campaign kitty, potentially represents a whopping windfall for the TV industry.

The dominant item of campaign expense is the purchase of time on the home screen.

If enough taxpayers agree to become participating sponsors, the Democrats and Republicans might have $70 million to divide in 1968, according to Washington dispatches. What is still far from clear, however, is whether such a sum would be a floor or ceiling on campaign expenditures. The likelihood of the two major parties agreeing that the extent of their TV exposure before the viewers should be the same runs counter to all experience.

The $70 million may just put added economic steam under the TV political pot, not cool it off.

Sen. Russell B. Long, Democrat of Louisiana, in introducing the campaign-financing amendment to the tax bill, said it would help curb improper influences by large campaign contributors. But that argument puts the cart before the horse.

Why are campaign costs so high? And why is so much unfairness built into the present use of television?

Instead of trying to use public funds to cover the costs of present abuses, attention should be directed to the cause of those abuses. One of the basic causes is the political manipulation of television for partisan advantage. This opportunity is built into the communications law and has been skillfully exploited by those familiar with the nuances of the preposterous application of the equal-air-time provision.

The networks and individual broadcasting stations have offered hours of free time without charge to political candidates. But the campaign strategists have often turned such tenders down and knowingly driven up campaign expenditures. In the last Presidential race, for example, established TV news programs sought appearances by President Johnson and Sen. Barry Goldwater. Virtually all the overtures were rejected by the White House, allegedly because the Democratic party saw no point in giving free exposure to the Republican aspirant. Unless both candidates agreed to appear, the networks were open to violation of the principle of equal time. In effect, therefore, if one candidate feels he is better known than his rival he can exert a veto power over his opponent's free appearances and force him to buy time. This strategic attitude also accounts for the invariable nonsense over challenges and counter challenges on the subject of TV debates, which do not involve any campaign costs. One candidate, usually the one enjoying the publicity advantage of being an incumbent, sees no purpose in putting a rival on an equal stature in the public eye.

IS OUR "EQUAL TIME" LAW UNFAIR?

Much of the large costs of politics on television is by design and lies in the weakness of the Communications Act, which exempts paid political broadcasts from the criterion of equal time. Upon selling hours of time to one candidate, all a broadcaster must do is agree to make similar time available to other contenders. But if the other contenders cannot come up with the money, they are for practical purposes kept off the air. The social importance of this situation is the universal belief by all politicians that television is now essential to elections.

The disadvantages of the procedure, moreover, were abundantly evident in the recent gubernatorial race in New York. Governor Rockefeller started a series of spot announcements long before he and his opponents were

nominated. After the nominations, the Governor's opponents could not match his economic resources, and were snowed under by his spot announcements.

Moreover, Governor Rockefeller's spots were thoroughly typical of the emotional oversimplification of government inherent in trying to convert politics to the level of washing-machine detergents. "The nonsense about fish being delighted by the Governor's efforts to halt water pollution, and about the Governor paving enough roads to extend to Hawaii and back are symptomatic of how spot announcements have reduced serious issues to handy slogans designed to stress the element of a candidate's personality.

Senator Long's hastily conceived measure, which applies only to Presidential campaigns may ultimately serve a useful purpose if it results in a larger re-examination of politics on television.

Thought might well be given, for instance, to the question of whether a medium that exists through free use of the air waves belonging to the public should not be expected to donate a certain percentage of hours to the task of choosing a President. A generous amount of such time might not actually exceed what the networks already have been prepared to offer if they had not been hobbled by restrictive legislation.

IS THE BRITISH SYSTEM FAIRER?

The British system of handling politics in broadcasting may warrant scrutiny. A limitation on the number of TV hours under the control of the parties carries an automatic safeguard against one party out-scoring the other and allows for proportional representation of minority parties, something the Long amendment does not.

For many years Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, repeatedly, if futilely, has urged a thorough re-examination of the problems of TV in politics [see also *Current*, November 1965, page 33]. In particular he has appealed for studies to be started well in advance of the deadline pressures of an imminent Presidential campaign. His words deserve heeding now because raising more money to finance the soaring costs of political advertising on TV is not the answer.

THE LATIN AMERICAN SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I address myself now to the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee has reported Senate Joint Resolution 60 purporting to meet the President's request for some declaration by Congress on the question of policy to be pursued at the summit conference to be attended by the President in Latin America.

I have today urged the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the other cosponsors of the originally submitted Senate Joint Resolution 53—which has been passed by the House of Representatives on March 23—to move on the Senate floor to substitute the House language for the version approved yesterday by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when, as, and if the matter is brought to the floor for consideration.

I can assure the Senate that it will have this opportunity in these crucial days before the President leaves to attend the Latin American summit conference, if we are going to act on any resolution at all.

I believe that a resolution—the right kind of resolution—is critically important. The President's summit meeting represents an opportunity really to utilize the second 5 years of the Alliance for Progress. The groundwork has been laid in the Latin American republics for a development breakthrough which could make South and Central America and the Caribbean the first area of largely underdeveloped nations crossing the threshold to development. Indeed, there is some thought that Mexico may already be over that threshold. It is vital that the Senate vote in a deliberate way whether it intends to support the President in the Punta del Este negotiations. The other Presidents understand very well Senate debate and Senate support. Therefore, because they know that anything the President does will ultimately have to pass muster in Congress, action on the resolution could be vital to a successful summit meeting.

The Common Market has the capability for being the touchstone to this dramatic breakthrough for Latin America's economic development, so critically important to hemispheric security, prosperity, and peace. I am confident that it will have very strong backing from the business community, from labor, and from parliamentarians. The opportunity which is historic and timely should not be missed because the Senate does not have all the options before it; and it is therefore my purpose to see that the Senate, if it is going to consider any resolution, has all the options before it.

Opponents of the resolution originally requested by the administration—which has in substance been granted by the other body—object to being confronted with a far-reaching commitment to give the President another "blank check." But the resolution as passed by the House cannot really add or detract from the President's powers to commit this country, subject to constitutional procedures and, I might add, subject to the terms of the Act for International Development. The President, indeed, can operate without our prior consent. But the resolution is very important because it can influence the President in the extent to which he will commit the United States at the summit, and it can also assure the "presence" of Congress at the conference table. It can also encourage Latin American Presidents to the line of policy supported by our President—to wit, a Latin American Common Market—and backed by Congress.

Let us understand that it is widely known that the President consulted with the leaders in Congress about this matter before taking action in it, before going to Punta del Este, and that is the background for the watered-down resolution which has now come from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, we can hardly complain that we, in Congress, are not consulted about the President's policy before he makes a major decision, when, if he does consult us, we refuse to meaningfully join him in that about which he has consulted us in advance of making a major commitment which seemed to have such widespread approval and support.

In short, I believe it would be a grave reverse for the policy of the United States to adopt the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe it would be most deplorable if the whole effort is abandoned and the President is left up in the air with a fair resolution from the House and no resolution from the Senate.

Therefore, if the matter is brought up—I hope it will be, because I deeply believe that the votes exist in the Senate to give the President a meaningful declaration on this score—I shall do my utmost to urge the other sponsors, of whom the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is the leader, to propose the House resolution as a substitute. But I assure the Senate that in any case it will have the option to vote upon that proposition.

In closing, I emphasize the fact that after 5 years of the Alliance for Progress, a chance for a major breakthrough is presented. The President's hand will be enormously strengthened if he goes to Punta del Este with a congressional resolution of support. It is very much in the interest of our Nation that he should have that support. There is extensive business, labor, and parliamentary support for this proposition. I believe that we will miss a historic opportunity if we do this with less than a full heart and with less than all the support which Congress can muster to give the President before he goes there.

Mr. MORSE. I have listened with great interest to what the Senator from New York has said. He is one of the cosponsors of the resolution, which I introduced, and I fully understand his position. However, I wish to make this brief comment today, not for the purpose of becoming involved in discussion of the merits of the problem that he has raised.

A resolution was reported yesterday by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is true that I did not cast a vote in connection with the matter, because of a procedural viewpoint that I held, and other members of the committee hold that view. But those who voted yesterday did not hold that view.

It was my judgment—and it is still my judgment—that we were in the stage of consultation with the President and should not have considered ourselves as being in the stage of legislative action. I believed that more consultation should be held, and that is why I did not vote on the resolution.

I believe we should wait until the majority leader returns from Montana, so we may consult with him, with the leaders of the committee, and with the White House, without proceeding to open debate on the matter by means of the suggestion that the Senator from New York has made. It may be that the problem can be worked out in some other way. It may be that the President might prefer to have no resolution at all. He does not require a resolution. He has the executive authority and power to go to Punta del Este, work out whatever negotiations he would like to subsequently recommend to Congress, submit them, and then let Congress work its will.

All I wish to say, because the Senator has mentioned my name in connection with his remarks, is that the Senator

is entitled to know what my present position is. My present position is that we should await the return of the majority leader, for consultation with the majority leader and the minority leader and the members of the committee and with the President. We should maintain this matter on a consultation basis for the time being.

Mr. JAVITS. The reason for making my statement today is threefold:

First, I wish to point out that the watered-down resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations will represent a regression of our efforts rather than to forward them, and I am against the resolution.

Second, I wish to assure the Senate that if we are going to consider any resolution, it will be my duty—I hope under the leadership of the Senator from Oregon—to see that the Senate considers a resolution that is meaningful, at least the one passed by the other body.

Third, I wish to assure those who are listening to this discussion very carefully that what has been done does not represent the view of the Senate in unanimity. Many of us—I believe I can say this fairly—understand what is at stake in terms of the history of the economic development of Latin America from now on. We realize the importance of the Latin American common market. We realize that there is a great body of sentiment in the United States which wishes to back up the effort of those countries to the south of us, which will have very grave difficulty with vested interests in their own countries, in trying to get any such thing done. The leaders of this movement in those countries, such as President Frei of Chile and others, would be entitled to all the encouragement we could give.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the point of view of the Senator from New York, but I repeat what I have said There will be further conversations about this matter prior to the proposal to take up any action, if any action is taken on the floor of the Senate.

I appreciate the Senator's comments and his support as a cosponsor of the resolution. I shall certainly keep him advised of any information that I receive either from the White House or the majority leader or minority leader.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield, if it is all right with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself very much with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon and, I assume, the distinguished Senator from New York. I have just arrived in the Chamber and I did not hear what the Senator had to say. However, for myself I wish to state that I think it was most unfortunate that the Committee on Foreign Relations voted as it did.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. I hope the opportunity will present itself for those of us who believe it was a mistake to at least bring up the resolution of the House of Representatives, and the language of the resolution of the House of Representatives.

This is an area of the world where we have been talking about good neighborliness, help, and assistance for years; they are natural trade partners. It seems to me that the amount of money we are talking about is approximately 30 percent over the amount in the original Alliance for Progress, which required them to take certain steps, as we all agreed, before they receive any help. Third, it would be most unfortunate to have to send the President to the conference at Punta del Este on April 12, after having, in effect, suffered a defeat in the Senate. Actually, the President did not have to send the resolution here, but having sent it over for our advice and consent, we should not consent and advise him that he is all wrong.

Mr. President, in any event I believe that we should continue to encourage Central America and South America to elevate and lift themselves, and we do want to cooperate. In the long run it is beneficial to them and eminently beneficial to us.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the position that I have stated before the Senate. In terms of trade, Latin America, I believe, is the third largest customer of the United States, and this has an enormous meaning to us in terms of security and peace. I believe that an enormous issue is at stake. I support what the Senator divined: That the Senate should have the opportunity at least to vote on the resolution of the House of Representatives, if anything is brought up.

Mr. SMATHERS. I commend the Senator and join with him, as I have likewise assured the Senator from Oregon that I would help him.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Robert C. Belloni, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon, which was reported earlier today.

Mr. President, I have cleared the consideration of the nomination with the acting majority leader. It has the united support on both sides of the aisle, as far as the Committee on the Judiciary is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Belloni, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon, which had been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE LATIN AMERICAN SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I can well understand that my colleagues would be misled as to the real significance of the Latin American resolution controversy. The New York Times seemed to misinterpret what it is all about. It said in an article this morning that the President had been rebuffed; that the policy had been rebuffed. But the fact is that policy is not involved.

What is involved is the procedure by which the Senate is expected to give commitments prior to the knowledge of what it is committing itself to. So far as I could determine most members of the Committee on Foreign Relations did not vote to oppose in principle either our policy in Latin America or the Alliance for Progress at all. They did seem to me to oppose the continued erosion of the function of the Senate as a party to the legislative process. That erosion has been taking place by the growing administration practice of sending up broad resolutions, in general language, which create commitments of future action by the Senate.

In this case, if the original resolution submitted by the administration had been adopted, it is quite clear that when the agreements, whatever they may be, are brought back from Punte del Este, we will be told, "You are committed. You authorized the President to do this, and so do not waste your time in extensive hearings." We are confronted with this procedure time after time. It happens time and again in the foreign aid bill.

I do not wish to take too much time. However, a good example of a commitment we were required to honor involved the NATO interstructure problem. There was, I believe, $77 million in last year's program. We wanted to cut it out, but the administration said "No, you are committed." We were not technically committed. But we were morally committed, because the executive made these agreements in the past.

What would have happened in the case of this Latin American resolution is that if we had taken it as drafted, probably later this year, there would be submitted a program—nobody knows today what it would be—and we would be told, "You passed that resolution; you authorized the President to do this; you did not dot every 'i' and you did not cross every 't,' but you created this impression and you should not hesitate now to do what you promised."

Personally I have always supported the foreign aid programs, although I have had grave reservations, particularly because of this kind of tactic. But it is not the policy, or the policy of aid to Latin America that has been rejected by the committee. It is the policy of trying to tie the hands of the Senate in advance of the development of the program itself.

If Senators do not care about their constitutional duties and are willing to be a rubberstamp for the executive, they should take everything that the executive submits. Perhaps the Senate should be abolished. We do not cost very much money compared to the total cost of the war, and we might as well be abolished if we are going to take without question everything the Executive sends here.

It is the function of the Senate to exercise its judgment. This resolution was designed to circumvent that exercise. We have had several other resolutions in different fields doing the same thing. My interest is to try to raise a barrier to the continuation of a practice that undermines the little influence the Senate has in the development of policies and the making of decisions. That is all there is to it.

I can well understand that after one has read Mr. Frankel's article in the New York Times he might have a misapprehension as to what this is about.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes so that I might reply?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was trying to get on with my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would 1 minute be sufficient?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Louisiana did not put a restriction on the Senator from Arkansas. Any Senator could make things miserable around here if he were unable to get a chance to answer arguments. I asked for 2 minutes. That is a minimal courtesy, and I hope that it will be extended to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope the Senator will limit his remarks to 1 minute. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are told that we misconstrue what was stated in the New York Times. I understand the concern of the Senator from Arkansas about the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, but we are legislators here and we can read. I am not talking about the report in the New York Times. I am talking about what the committee did.

The Committee on Foreign Relations gave the President no support, as did the other body. The other body gave him support in the basic concept of going down and trying to negotiate a Latin American common market, which is indispensable in order to get them off of dead center.

The other body did not commit itself to give an appropriation or an authorization but they said: Morally we will support you if you go down there. The Presidents of other countries are unlikely to do it if they think that the Congress is going to turn on the President of the United States.

Mr. President, if the Congress wishes to be constructive it has to be a party to our system of government. It cannot stand off remotely, unlike other systems of government. We have to cooperate when cooperation is in the best interest of our Nation.

It is not a blank check. There is no such thing that can be given him. It is an essential element to get the job done. I think we have a paramount, constitutional duty, the duty to stand up and be the third independent body, to get done what is essential to the security, well-being, and future of our Nation. That is what is at stake here.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I rise in support of the proposal, offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee, to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

Since I believe firmly that public subsidy of political campaigns is urgently needed, my inclination would be to support any well-conceived step in that direction, no matter how small. In my judgment, however, title III of Public Law 89–869 is not only misconceived, but is in fact a step in the wrong direction. We will be better off, I think, to repeal it and start over again.

The 1961 Presidential Commission on Campaign costs, under the chairmanship of the distinguished political scientist, Alexander Heard, made a number of suggestions as to how we might meet the problems created by rising campaign costs. I believe those recommendations should guide us as we consider the matter.

But first the Long Act must be repealed. It places funds where they are relatively less needed and, more important, it does so by giving massive amounts of funds in a dangerous and unrestricted way to the national leadership of the two major political parties.

The Long Act has the potential of changing our whole political system. Our national political parties have always been coalitions of State parties, which in turn are coalitions of local parties. Our ideal and our working rule have been that political decisions and policies will be made from the bottom up, not from the top down.

Unrestricted public financing of national political campaigns is a revolutionary overturn of principles which have served our Republic for 175 years. The national parties would be divorced to a large extent from local control, and given immense power to reward or punish local candidates. By this power to decide where to concentrate, and where to refrain from, presidential campaign efforts, the national chairman would wield enormous leverage over the prospects and policies and, indeed, over the very process of selection of local candidates all over the country. The national leadership of the two parties could thereby dominate State and local elections all over the country.

Control of local parties by the national committee, moreover, would lead, perhaps irrevocably, to national parties rigidly organized along lines of class and ideology. If the history of the past century has any lesson for us, it is that governments based on such political divisions cannot preserve either freedom or stability for their people.

Now the Senator from Louisiana has proposed to amend the law so that each party will have to choose whether it will have its presidential campaign expenditures paid out of public funds or by private contributions. He did so, presumably, to meet the objection of the Senator from Tennessee and others that the law as enacted last year would allow the commingling of public and private funds, and could have the unfortunate result of just adding public funds to an already acquired private treasury. Senator LONG's new proposal, however, in many ways creates more difficulties. The assumption is that the parties will choose public funding. But forcing them to reject all private contributions will only insulate them even further from control by their membership around the country than did last year's law. The result will be an even greater departure from the goal of broadening the base of our political parties than was implicit in last year's law.

The law is also deficient in that it fails to reach most of the areas in which reform is badly needed. As I have indicated, it fails to insure financial help to those candidates who need it most. It does not come to grips with the present unrealistic limitations on the amount of contributions. Nor does it seek to end the proliferation of campaign committees which are organized to circumvent these limitations. It does not deal with the underlying question of how to make campaigns less costly by lowering the price of some of the services, such as television, which candidates must purchase. And, as Senator GORE has pointed out, the law gives away the carrot without brandishing the stick when it provides its subsidy without enacting any other reforms. With the subsidy in the law, the leverage to accomplish further reform is greatly diminished. This is unfortunate.

The doubly unfortunate fact is that it would have been just as easy for Congress to begin with a step in the right direction. It would have been just as easy in those hectic days last October to enact a tax credit for small contributions—$10 or $20 or even $50—by individual taxpayers to the candidate or party of their choice. Even without accompanying reforms insuring greater disclosure and more effective limitations on contributions, such an enactment would have been an important step toward broadening the base of and encouraging greater individual participation in our politics, and toward relieving candidates of the need to rely on the kind of large contributions which can obligate or appear to obligate them undesirably when they achieve office. Instead, however, we began with a step which injected the Government directly into the political process in massive amounts at the national level, and ignored the State and local levels. As I have indicated, I think the implications of that action are so serious that we should undo it before we proceed fur-

ther, so serious that it would be unwise to leave its fate to the uncertain course of hearings. Hearings which are complete and exhaustive should be held, but they should be held after the slate is wiped clean. There would then be an impetus to do something and a stimulus to both the National Committees and their leaders to support change and reform. I believe it would be better to have no law at all than to have this one, although new law in this field is desperately needed.

Mr. President, I therefore urge the Senate to adopt the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee. Let us provide public encouragement of campaign finances, but let us do it on a clean slate instead of as an overlay on an ill-conceived design.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I find the statement of the able Senator extremely interesting. He has made a point and has emphasized a point which has not been adequately developed heretofore in the debate; that is, that this law which we seek to repeal would bring about a concentration of power in our political party structure in Washington not heretofore known and which, as he said, would be a revolutionary change.

In view of the Senator's wide experience as a national political party leader and participant, what power would he regard as being available to the party chairman or treasurer who possessed this large amount of money?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I might say to the Senator from Tennessee that the national party would take over the State parties. Talking about 1960, a campaign in which I had a personal association, some $6½ or $7 million was spent all across the United States by the Democratic Party on its presidential campaign.

If $30 million were available, the national chairman of either party could easily decide to place a large amount of money into the campaign of any one Senator, for example, provided only that the money be used for presidential campaign purposes. Take a small State like New Hampshire. If the national chairman decided that he was going to send $1 million into New Hampshire for an individual candidate to use, albeit for presidential campaign purposes, that would completely undermine the local organization. The national committee is going to control that candidate. It will be the national political party who will absolutely control the situation. No other candidate would have a chance.

It would be a dangerous situation that was never anticipated or foreseen. Nothing like it has ever existed before. I think it would be extremely dangerous in this country, where we really depend upon and believe in local authority with respect to the individual candidate and the local party, to have such a large amount of money concentrated in the hands of one or two individuals.

Again, I state, it would be the national chairman who would have the power to make the decision as to who would be the local candidate.

He could decide to give $250,000 to promote the campaign of a certain individual for sheriff, so long as that individual used the money in the presidential campaign. How is anyone else going to campaign against him? Or, he could say to someone who is going to run for the Senate, "We will give you $1 million to campaign for the presidential candidate." How is anybody else in that State going to be able to campaign against an individual who has $1 million behind him? This is going to be the destruction of local political parties.

We have differences of opinion as between our local parties across the United States. There are differences between and among the South and the North. If this law stays on the books, we are going to have national control of the actions and policies of local political parties. Nobody who is getting contributions of $5,000 or $10,000 will be able to campaign against anyone to whom the national chairman says, "I have $1 million for you to run the presidential campaign in your State if you deliver the delegates." It would be deeply dangerous and be open to great corruption.

Mr. GORE. From this point of view, would this possibly create vicious contests as to who would be the treasurer of the national party because the prize in the pot is an estimated $30 million to begin with?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think it would. It would remove the local party from power. Take the national chairman of the party out of power just before a convention. He will go to various States across the country. If this money is in his hands, he can say to particular people in New York or California or another State, "I will get you $1 million." He will be able to dictate the nomination of local candidates, and exercise great leverage over selection of the national ticket.

Mr. GORE. If it is a pivotal State, it might be $3 million.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Or $5 or $10 million.

Mr. GORE. Suppose a Senator has not been "cooperative," according to the interpretation of the existing party treasurer. Is it possible that, under the law that is now the law of the land, the treasurer of that party, to whom this law would make available an estimated $30 million for campaign expenses, could use that fund so as to bring about the defeat of a Senator or the reelection of a Senator?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is, of course, extremely possible. Again, taking the example the Senator is talking about, say a Senator is running in a campaign. The national chairman decides he is not the one to run the presidential campaign in that particular State. They decide on someone else. They give him $1 million to run the campaign and establish the operation for the national party. He is going to influence that election. He is going to be the one to hire the people. He is going to make the decisions about television. He can get on television and talk about the marvels of the party. He is going to be the one who decides about John Jones or whoever it might be. He will be able to advance his own candidacy, if he is a candidate, and the Senator who was left out by the national chairman will be in serious trouble.

I would go back again to our own personal experience in 1960. We sent an individual to each one of the States across the country. These individuals did not have the money themselves, but if we had had $30 million, we would not have to pay any attention to the State organizations. We could have just sent somebody in and given them $500,000 to spend, or in an important State, a couple of million dollars. They would set up their own local organization. They would not have to pay any attention to the State Democratic or Republican organizations. Each would be controlled from the national party.

Mr. GORE. From Washington.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. From Washington.

Mr. GORE. And with public money.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the proposal which he is discussing says that the first disbursement of funds would be in September of the election year?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand that. But it also talks about the expenditures that have been incurred prior to that time. Let us say the national chairman goes up to the——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Wait——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me just give an example of what I think is the problem.

Say the national chairman goes to a particular State, the State of California or the State of New York, for example, and says, "If you follow my directions, or if you support my candidate, or if you cooperate a little bit more actively than you have in the past, I can see to it that you will get $5 million on September 2," or, "You are going to get $2 million on September 2, you are going to get another $1 million on October 1, then another $1 million on October 15."

Whether the money is expended prior to September 1, or after September 1, I do not think is relevant.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us explore that for a moment. The Senator is assuming that a party chairman or party treasurer might wish to support one member of his party for the nomination of his party.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is one example.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is assuming that.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is one possibility.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The State party conventions are held prior to the nominating convention. After the nominating convention is held, it is traditional—and I believe the Senator knows this to be the case—that the nominee of that party then has the power to say

who any party officer is going to be, and if he is not satisfied with that party treasurer, he will get himself another one, if he is the nominee of the convention. As a result a party treasurer in office before that time would know he could not commit how funds would be spent after he was out of office and everyone else would know that.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana, I do not think there is going to be any problem; if that chairman or that treasurer has $30 million to spend, I do not think anybody else can compete with him. I was close to the national chairman in 1960; and if he had controlled $30 million, there would have been no competition across the country. There would have been no contest.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the party officer of whom the Senator is speaking does not know whether he is going to be the party officer after the convention, when the nominee has been nominated. He is not in a position to commit to somebody a million dollars, or any figure, for that matter, not knowing whether he is going to be the party treasurer after the nominating convention.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. He is not going to be certain of that; but he is going to have the kind of conversations I have described, in which he can say to the person in charge of a political party in one of the States, "You support us at the national convention, and you will have $2 million."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But afterwards if he is not the party officer his promise of the money is no good and that will be known.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The chairman will say, "I have the other 5 or 6 or 10 or 12 States lined up."

I think both of us have been through political campaigns enough to know that that is how a campaign can proceed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Promises may be made but they do not have much effect if everyone doesn't expect his man to get the nomination. In addition, to get this money, he has to go to the advisory council of the Comptroller General, some of the most outstanding Republicans and some of the most outstanding Democrats. They also must be in a position to certify to the satisfaction of the Comptroller General of the United States that this is money that has been spent in a presidential campaign.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If he made payments in a general election, based upon efforts made at or before the nominating convention was held, he might have to go to the penitentiary for a fraudulent claim, if he did what the Senator said.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not think so, at all. Because you could easily legitimately spend $30 million. You could easily spend $5 million or $10 million in the State of California. You could easily spend $5 million in the State of Louisiana. Say you decide you are going to spend $5 million in Louisiana. You say, "I am going to make $5 million available to you after September 1, because you are going to support my candidate at the national convention. I am the national treasurer, and my candidate has a good chance of winning. You are going to get $5 million if you show up wherever the convention is held and support my candidate, because I think we should spend $5 million in Louisiana."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If you make a payment based on what someone did in helping to get the nomination, you are violating the law, which you have no right to do, and you in reality would be stealing Federal funds when you do it. This money is to be spent only for legitimate presidential campaign expenditures of a man once nominated.

We have laws on the statute books about that right now, to take care of someone who makes a fraudulent claim with respect to Federal money. People wind up in the penitentiary for a lot less. In addition, if the Senator has a specific problem for which he has a remedy, I will be happy to join him in working out an amendment when this is before the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What I am pointing out is, if you decide you are going to spend $5 million through individual A in a particular State for a presidential campaign, he can spend that money, and is going to spend that money for television, for advertising, for personal appearances; he is going to give it to workers throughout the State to work in the political campaign, for what will be perfectly legitimate expenditures, and when he comes back to the Comptroller General and explains how he spent the million dollars or the $5 million, it is all going to be explained properly.

My point is that you can say to the fellow, before that happens, "The money is going to be handled through you. We think you need $5 million in the State of Louisiana," or "We think you will need $10 million in New York this year."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This law requires that the money must be actual, out-of-pocket expenditures in the presidential campaign itself. Under the laws right now there is nothing to say how you spend your money in support of a candidate for President of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are doing what the law already requires, making these people strictly accountable to the Comptroller General for all the money they spend, and when they come in to be reimbursed, they must be able to show the money has actually been spent in a presidential campaign, and it cannot be spent in the primary.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand that. What I am suggesting is that between September and October, you can increase the expenditures in a particular State over what they might be under ordinary circumstances. Both of us know you can spend astronomical sums in political campaigns, if you want to. You can easily spend $10 million in the State of Louisiana for a presidential candidate, because you can hire everybody in Louisiana for 1 day.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If a candidate were so foolish as to spend $10 million in the State of Louisiana, he would probably be defeated because this would mean he would have less to spend elsewhere. His opponent could not be expected to be so foolish and he would spend the money where it would do him the most good in the campaign. This would be as foolish as if he were to steal the money.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. But there has been no suggestion of stealing it. No restriction has been placed on how the money is to be spent, except that it is to be spent in a presidential campaign.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For a campaign for the Presidency, not directly or indirectly for services in a primary.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. So, under the example we gave, suppose we have an individual, or a Senator, running for the U.S. Senate, who is not the most popular individual with the administration, and you decide you are not going to spend the money in that particular State through him, you are not going to spend it through the regular State organization, you are going to set up your own organization. So, let us not take $10 million for Louisiana, then; say we take $1 million for the State of Louisiana, or $5 million for the State of New York, or $5 million for the State of California. You decide you are going to set up your own organization, hire your own people, and all the television, all the advertising is to be done, not through the local organization, but through your own representative in that State. I think it opens the door to all kinds of——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course you don't use opponents but when you try to pay that man off for services in a primary, you have to pass the inspection of a board composed of four good men—here are their names, right now—you have to get by these men: On the Democratic side, you have to get by Jim Farley, and you have got to get by Arthur Krim with that activity, and on the Republican side, you have got to get by——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Good news so far.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Fred Scribner, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, and you have to get by David Moss, plus the three impartial men. You have got to convince them, that you are really spending funds for a presidential campaign and not making payment for services rendered in a primary. That might not be easy.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am not suggesting that what the money is being spent on would be illegitimate. You can spend any amount of money in a State, and who could decide, Jim Farley or Arthur Krim, or anybody else, that you have spent too much money in a State, or hired too many poll watchers on election day? I think it is going to be difficult to say how many poll watchers you should have in Philadelphia compared to Los Angeles, or how many you should have in New York City, or what you should do in the State of Louisiana. I think it is going to be very difficult, if I may say so, for any outside group, no matter how distinguished it is or how great its influence, to find out whether your expenditures are justified, whether you gave a man $25 on election day, or $50

to do registration work, whether you are paying that individual too much, and whether has was actually out working or sitting at home. I think you are going to get into all kinds of complications.

I think we would get into all kinds of complications.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as I outlined in my speech, it would seem to me that we should not pay for poll watching or any similar services rendered on election day. I have introduced a bill with amendments that I would like to make in the Presidential Campaign Fund Act to provide that we are not going to pay anything for poll watching or for transportation of voters to the polling place or for any other similar services that the Senator could dream up.

We have provided appropriate safeguards to see that the money is spent in the way in which it should be spent and not spent otherwise.

I just got through making an argument to the effect that where most of the improper influence creeps in government is not by somebody bribing somebody, but from the tremendous pressure on a man running for office to find money for his campaign.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with that statement.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The people who put the money up want some kind of an understanding that the man will not act contrary to their interests.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with that statement.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is the problem of providing the means with which to finance that campaign from sources that are above reproach, like Caesar's wife.

We must provide every way that we can to be sure that the money is spent in pursuance of appropriate guidelines established by both the Democratic and Republican Parties. The Democrats should know of every mischief that the Republicans are up to, and the Republicans should know of every mischief that the Democrats are up to.

Each party can watch the other and see how the money is being spent. They can then have a chance to present their case to the people of the country.

It seems to me that if this is done in that fashion, we would have much better practices. People are obligated because of positions that they have to take because of the need for campaign funds.

The Senator knows as well as I do that it is one thing for a man to receive money and say: "I am going to do this." It is another thing to make a campaign contribution and have the candidate say: "Here is what I am going to do." The people say: "That is great. That is what we would like to see you do." The one example is strictly on the up and up and the other is not.

There may not be much practical difference between them in some cases.

My suggestion is that we provide an honest way to provide for this and then put in every safeguard that the Senate can provide for doing this.

The Senator is a former Attorney General. He can certainly suggest some things.

I have amendments that I have prepared, having heard discussions such as the speech that the Senator from New York is making and the speech that the Senator from Tennessee is making.

The best single suggestion of the group was that we ought to outlaw all private contributions.

There are other suggestions, some of which are clarifying. There are nine suggestions in all which this Senator would think are appropriate.

If the Senator could suggest other ways in which money could be spent corruptly, I hope he will inform us of them so we can eliminate them too.

We should provide for honest financing of the election and provide penalties and safeguards in the bill to guarantee the sanctity and honesty of the election. We should strike out completely any possibility that the President might be compelled to make a commitment that he did not want to make, in order to finance his campaign.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand. I am strongly in favor of that.

I think the Senator has described the actual problem. I do not think that an individual running for the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives or President should be running all over the United States or all over his own State or congressional district holding out his hand for $100, $500, or $1,000, or whatever amount might be involved and be indebted to people in some way because he needs the money to run his campaign.

But I say to the Senator from Louisiana that I think his way is the wrong way to go about it. I think this would aggravate many of the problems that the Senator is trying to deal with. It would create more problems than it would eliminate.

Returning again to the example of a national campaign, who is going to make the decision as to where the money will be spent in a presidential campaign? Would it be the national chairman?

There would have to be a priority even if one is not going to reward anybody.

Sometimes it is possible to punish a State or a political candidate of whom you disapprove.

The campaign manager must make the decision as to where to concentrate the money and effort.

If he decides that he does not like a particular State or a particular candidate for the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives, he can decide not to spend the money in Mississippi or Missouri or New Hampshire or New York or wherever it might be. He might spend $5 million with somebody else or in some other State or may create a new and entirely different organization than the organization that has been established and is existing in a State.

That is within the power of the national committee under this bill.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, say a national administration, which generally controls the apparatus of the national committee, decided that a candidate for the Senate was not in sufficient accord over a period with the policies, programs, and plans of said administration, then, with the administration working in conjunction with the national committee, a rival organization could be set up in a State with assurances given. Then, in effect, a candidate could be set up against an incumbent, who had not supported the administration.

Is that a possibility under this proposed legislation?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Absolutely. And it would not have to be at all corrupt. It could just be said: "This is the way we are going to run our presidential campaign in this State."

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think I know enough about campaigns to know that it would not have to be corrupt.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator could say in his State of Missouri that he needs $1 million to run a presidential campaign for 1964, or for whatever year it might be. Somebody would decide that that money is going to be spent through "A," who happens to be a political opponent of the U.S. Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if I understand the observations of the Senator, over a period it would be possible for a national administration to gain control of both Houses through the expenditure of this $30 million.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. It certainly could have complete control of all of the political officeholders of that political party.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, does the Senator not understand that this money is now spent in campaigns and that the expenditure of the funds is now controlled by the party? The difference under the act we passed last year is the review by the Comptroller General and the opening of the records to the public.

This money must be spent for the presidential election.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The money cannot be spent directly or indirectly for another candidate such as that to which the Senator refers.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. Let me cite an example. Assume that there was an individual who was going to run against the senior Senator from Missouri. That individual could be given $1 million, and he could then go on television and talk about the national candidate. He would talk about the President and the Vice President. He would then spend $100,000 or $200,000 to hire people. He is going to put someone in every county in the State. They are going to be personally responsible to him.

Does the Senator not think that is going to be a very powerful organization within 3 months, an organization that could very effectively deal with the incumbent Senator?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator assuming that would be a candidate for the U.S. Senate against the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. He could be a candidate for the Senate, but

he would be working hard for the national ticket. Every time he would appear on television he would talk about the national ticket. Every time he would hire somebody, he would put his hand on the man's shoulder and say "I want to talk to you about the national ticket." He puts his hand on the fellow's shoulder and talks to him. I think it would be nice.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Based upon the illustration, I am not so sure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is really talking about spending the money on a senatorial campaign even though disguised as a presidential expenditure?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No, he would be spending the money on a presidential campaign. I think, with Jim Farley and the other distinguished members of the group, they would be running all over 50 States trying to find out when a candidate gave somebody $50, what the man did with it, whether he showed up on August 15, September 15, or September 16. They would have to call witnesses to find out whether any of the people actually showed up at the polling place, whether a person who spent $3.50 for gas for his car actually used it. I have been all through that. No one can check on that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope that none of the Kennedy money was spent that way. I hope you spent your money for the presidential campaign. At least you would have to under the law now in effect.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We are very careful.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Just as the Senator from New York was careful with his money, I would expect any candidate for President to be careful that the money was spent for the presidential campaign and not spent for someone else's campaign. If he were not careful he might lose because the opposing candidate might spend his money more effectively.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We were extremely careful, but I know that a great deal of money was wasted; I know that a great deal of money disappeared.

I believe the laws should be much stronger than they are. Also, we are talking, as I said, about $2 million or $3 million at that time. Now we are talking about $30 million. The power that would be given to one or two individuals in both political parties seems inconceivable.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator have much doubt that as the situation is now, political parties are spending upward of $30 million?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I can tell you what we spent in 1960. In 1964, as I understand, they spent about $10 million apiece. They did not spend $30 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Republican Party that year directly accounted for $14 million, and many Democrats thought the Republican Party spent three times that amount. It is believed that the additional amounts for the most part were spent by committees. Frankly, my impression has been that $30 million is a realistic figure of what it presently costs to wage a good campaign.

Louisiana has never been one of the real battlegrounds. The Senator did not use much of that money in Louisiana, because I carried the State for the Senator at that time.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Personally, I would rather see the laws tightened up and the Corrupt Practices Act tightened. I would be in favor of the Senator holding hearings as to how the law should be tightened. I should like to see the law provide for a tax credit or a deduction, with an individual having the choice of contributing to an individual candidate, rather than the law as it is at present, or as encompassed by the law that was passed last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under this measure, there would be an accounting for all the money that was spent. An accounting would not be made without this law, would it?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Regulations could be written into the legislation which would require an exact accounting. I would be in favor of that. But I would not be in favor of this bill merely because it contains that provision. If this legislation remains on the books as it is, it will destroy the local political parties in the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not believe it would injure the local parties. The Senator has referred to the fact that a candidate could concentrate his money in one particular State.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator understands that with this advisory board checking on both parties, if one party is concentrating its money in one State, the other party is in a position to know that.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So that if they want to concentrate their money at the same point, they have the power to do so, for their candidate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. But in a national campaign, you always make priorities, and you decide how you are going to spend your money. The Democratic Party traditionally concentrates on perhaps a dozen or so States. That decision will have to be made, and that is a natural thing that will occur. But with this amount of money, you are in a position to punish States and punish individuals as well as reward them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why does the Senator think that a candidate for President is going to spend more loosely or improperly money for which he must account under this law than money for which he need not account at present? Does he not want to spend money in a way which will help him win?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. First, as I have said, we are talking about a tremendous amount of money, much more than has ever been available before. We are talking about the figure of $30 million, and nothing like that has ever been conceived before. After hustling around for $3 million or $4 million, we are now talking about giving each chairman or treasurer $30 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I have indicated, I do not believe the amounts spent are large relative to what is actually spent now; merely large relative to the reported expenditures.

The Senator from Tennessee did some investigating in this field when campaign expenditures were less than they are now, and he found that about $30 million had been spent by the two parties.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does the legislation now in effect, that sponsored by the Senator from Louisiana, prohibit private expenditures?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not at this point, but my amendment would.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is why I say the legislation is so full of holes.

The Senator from Louisiana has said that he will offer an amendment. It seems to me that the best way to deal with the matter is to get rid of the law and start again.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Theodore Roosevelt began to work in this direction in 1907. It took from 1907 to 1966 to get something done in this field. Does it not seem more appropriate that now that we have a start, and now that we have something that will work, to proceed to study the matter and to amend and improve it in every way we can rather than throw it out and start all over? The President seems to be of that opinion. That is what he said when he signed the bill into law. The Secretary of the Treasury seems to believe that. The American Federation of Labor seems to believe that. As a matter of fact, the professor of government who, I believe, heads the foundation the Senator's family financed, seems to be of the opinion that you should take what you have and improve on it, rather than junk it and start over again. He believes that this makes for good government, something that we have been thinking about and trying to work out for 60 years.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe that if you have created a monster that is worse than what existed before, you should destroy the monster. I believe that we have created a monster.

When the Senator from Louisiana talks about some of the individuals who support this legislation, he is saying that they like having $30 million. I do not blame them for that. But I do not believe it is in the interest of the country, in the interest of either political party, or in the long-term interest of honest politics in the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to see the campaign for President sponsored so that a candidate for President, be he rich or poor, need not be beholden to any financial interest; that he need not make any commitment other than in accordance with the dictates of his conscience; and that if elected President, he need have no obligation for the financing of the campaign, and need not feel that there is any pressure on him to respond which has anything to do with the cost of financing the campaign.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with what the Senator has said, and I

would support any legislation that would meet those requirements.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator on his statement and I thank him for his support.

Although I do not wish to engage the Senator in a lengthy colloquy about the constitutionality of the law, I would like to elicit from him his feeling as to the propriety, wisdom, and fairness—if not the legality—of virtually freezing the mobility of our political system, denying any benefits of this vast public fund to any candidate for President other than the Democratic and Republican candidates, whether it be the candidate of the independent party, the liberal party, the conservative party, or any other party. I am sure the Senator gets the point. It seems to me that the right to seek public office with equality of opportunity is as basic to a democratic system as is the right to vote.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. I thought that the Senator from Tennessee, in his statement, made a strong point when he used as an example the Bull Moose Party, and where they would be cut off from any help or assistance because they were not of the two major parties. I believe that would be a mistake and I believe that the Senator handled the matter eloquently.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. In connection with the line of inquiry addressed to the Senator from New York by the Senator from Tennessee I wonder whether the Republican Party could have been born a century ago if we had established such a system, looking to the existing parties of that day. I think it is highly questionable. While I strongly believe in a two-party system, it is presumptuous, if not arrogant, that they will always serve the best interests of the public.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator. It is an extremely strong point.

Mr. CHURCH. In listening to this debate I wish to commend the Senator from New York for the emphasis which he placed on the danger of further exaggerating executive power. It seems to me that the Federal system depends on retaining the vitality in the grass roots. The independence of Congress is in jeopardy if we place at the disposal of the executive a national committee in each party which is subject to the executive control, in so raising public funds from which we temper, direct, effect, and assert the political process. It seems to me that such a proposal could only have that effect.

We have not begun to examine this matter. Can we appreciate or understand all the ramifications of this law? It was adopted hastily. We must not leave it on the books and trust that further hearings will take care of the problem.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator. There are so many uncertainties about this legislation. Take its provisions regarding the significance of the September 1 date, for example. While no payment can be made before September 1, it does appear that reimbursement can occur for expenditures which were incurred before September 1 of that year. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana was going to clarify that by amendment, but I think it would be better to get rid of this law and start again, and wipe the slate clean.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to query the acting majority leader concerning the program for the remainder of the day and tomorrow. I understand there will be no vote today.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not intend that there be a vote today. I plan to recess or adjourn until tomorrow, as soon as Senators finish their speeches.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be an adjournment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And we will come in tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is understood that we shall adjourn today and come in at 12 o'clock tomorrow, that will be notice to Senators with respect to the business for the remainder of the day.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Could we have an understanding as to when the Senate will vote tomorrow?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suppose we will vote on the matter tomorrow. I do not propose to suggest a unanimous-consent request at this time, or agree to one, but I think that we will vote on the matter tomorrow.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I was told by the staff we would vote today. Would it be in order to say that we will have a unanimous-consent agreement for later in the afternoon?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, because one acts as acting majority leader does not foreclose him from acting as a Senator in this body. I do not propose to foreclose the rights that I have merely because I hold the position of manager of the bill or chairman of the committee. I would insist that as a Member of this body I enjoy the rights of others. I have found the futility of trying to make any Senator vote on something before he is ready.

As far as I am concerned, I made my first speech on this matter this year. A number of Senators were not present and I would prefer that they read my speech. It is par for the course for the Senator from Louisiana to want to vote on something. I have a speech in the RECORD that I would like to have Senators read before voting, and I would say that we will vote tomorrow.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was not urging it. I asked the staff three times this afternoon when we were going to vote, and was assured each time that we would vote a little later today; thus, I wonder whether a unanimous consent would be in order for tomorrow. If the Senator from Louisiana does not feel it is, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will make it easy for him——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would anticipate that we will vote tomorrow but I do not feel like asking for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say that if there were a unanimous-consent request to be propounded, I am directed to object. I do not do this on my own account but notice has come to me from my side of the aisle.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Over a long period of time, I have learned that single Members determine that we not vote, so that it is rather futile to try to vote at any particular moment.

Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from New York, I did want to ask him a question or two before he yielded the floor.

Did I correctly understand the Senator to propose, as an answer to the problem of financing presidential campaigns, that there should be a tax credit for taxpayers in order to help them make contributions?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think that idea should be explored, of having a tax credit or a tax deduction for individuals for particular candidates, plus, as I said, strong and stringent reporting obligations.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well now, would not all of that be subject to all the same problems of loose spending, poor spending, or unwise spending which the Senator has suggested could be the case with respect to presidential campaigns?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The great difference is, Senator, that it would not go through the national committee. It would go from the individual to a particular candidate and he could use it for a statewide office. The individual could use it for a local office, or for the office of U.S. Senator, or for a Representative, or for national office. It would be controlled by him. It would not be controlled by the national party.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Even so, it could——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is a very important distinction. I am talking here, Senator, about the tremendous amount of power which would be given a national party by the legislation which is on the books at the present time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Even so, it could be loosely spent, as the Senator has indicated, and it would seem to me that much of it would go through the national party. Money could be concentrated in certain areas. That could happen.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That would be up to the individual, as to which party or candidate he was going to support. It would be up to the individual to make that decision. Also, I would put on more restrictions that are not now contained in present legislation. I would want much tighter reporting.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is still up to the particular individual to spend this money as loosely as the Senator suggested, is it not? He could spend it loosely, or unwisely.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think that is quite true.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator suggested that funds would be denied to a third party. I would ask the Senator if third parties would not have available to them the same sources of private financing which have always been available to them.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes; but there is quite a difference here. Perhaps I am not getting my point across. There is a great difference between giving someone $30 million, and telling someone to go out and try to raise money. I would say to the Senator from Louisiana that $30 million is a tremendous amount of money, and giving the two major political parties $30 million each is quite a Christmas gift.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No one is giving anyone $30 million. One must come here and show that he has spent x number of dollars, whether it be $100 or $200. It must be shown how the expenses were incurred, and that the money is owed on bills, and then he must ask the Comptroller General to certify a check to the bills he has accumulated in presidential campaigns. There is a great deal of difference between that kind of money, and giving someone $30 million.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not think there is. Tell someone to go out and raise $30 million, and then tell someone that he will be given $30 million, there is quite a difference there. If I tell the Senator he is going to get $30 million for a campaign, I am sure that the Senator is going to spend that $30 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But it must be spent in a presidential campaign.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. All right, but let me assure the Senator from Louisiana that there is quite a difference here. If someone is going to give us $30 million to spend in Louisiana, say, in his individual State, I believe that the Senator from Louisiana could find a way to spend that $30 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would that not be unwise if I were a candidate for President and I authorized the Senator to spend the whole of that campaign money in the State of Louisiana? Might I not lose the other 49 States?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The argument is that no one is going to have any trouble spending $30 million, if it is given to them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is familiar with that same problem in supporting a candidate for President. I have supported candidates for President, of course. Suppose I said to one of them, "We will raise this money for you, and you go out and make a speech or a television broadcast and we will try to find the money to pay for it." It would seem to me that the only real difference between the two is that in one instance the money is being made available by the public at large, and in the other instance it is being made available by a relatively small number of people. We put up relatively few large contributions. It seems to me that the more we finance campaigns through small contributions, say, $1 each, the less likely we are to be subject to improper influence.

But, let me explore this point for a moment: If we proceed now to require that there be no private contributions, would not a third party, which has always had that available to it, in order to finance its campaign, be at a great advantage?

There would be no private contributions allowed to the Republican or Democratic parties, but if a third party wants to emerge, say, would it not have every opportunity—perhaps, even more—to go out and raise all the private funds that people felt like contributing to help that third party to emerge and become a major force in politics.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. There is no question about that, but there is quite a difference. Again I come back over the same ground, I am afraid, and say that there is quite a difference between saying, "You are going to get $30 million," and having to go out and hustle $5,000.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New York, to ask him a couple of questions about the very excellent presentation he has made in opposition to the special program which is now the existing law.

Yesterday, I introduced a bill that I would like to have go to the Finance Committee for hearings, which I think will clear up some of the objections which the Senator from New York has raised.

My proposal would be that we keep the same checkoff which the Senator from Louisiana has provided in the bill, and mark in a box on the income tax form that we want to make a political contribution. However, instead of setting it aside for the two major parties, as is in the existing law, the Treasury Department would send the taxpayer a voucher which he could contribute either to a presidential candidate through an official presidential committee, or to a congressional or senatorial candidate. That would mean that there would not be any contributions, perhaps, before the convention.

If we go back in history to the situation when Taft was nominated and someone wanted to support Roosevelt on a third party, they would say, "Well, I am not going to turn my voucher over to the Republican Party. I am going to turn it over to the third party." It also would provide for funds to be made available in the year in which the third party was created, instead of 4 years after a third party had been established, when it was essential that it request campaign expenditures.

We have provision for a voluntary contribution now. Each individual has an incentive to take a tax credit of $1 to contribute to the campaign. There is provision now so that, if an individual in the next campaign did not like the two candidates, and if ex-Governor Wallace was to be a candidate, he could contribute to his campaign, or if the party was fragmented further, the taxpayer could make his contribution to the candidate for another party.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. And he could contribute to a local candidate for Congress.

Mr. METCALF. For a Member of the House or the Senate. This gives the check-off that the Senator from Louisiana wants. It gives each taxpayer an opportunity to voluntarily contribute. It does not give the power to the central committee, which power the Senator has emphasized, and permit it to spend the money as it spends it now.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would like to examine it more carefully. I think it would be a significant improvement over what we have now.

I assume that the Senator would vote to repeal what we have on the books?

Mr. METCALF. I would hope we would have an assurance that, no matter what happens to the amendment, the Senator from Louisiana will call for early and prompt hearings to consider the other proposals. I understand how difficult it is to consider a proposal, such as we are talking about now, on the floor of the Senate, but I believe if we presented something like this we would allay some of the fears which the Senator from New York has rightly suggested and at the same time reach the rank and file and encourage them to contribute to campaigns and participate in political campaigns.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think there is some merit to it, and it should be considered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent editorial in a local newspaper stated:

> The Administration has acted with commendable dispatch in asking Congress to restore both the 7 percent tax credit for equipment investment and the rapid depreciation provision on building construction.

I wish to add my support to that statement. I believe that the Congress will be following the course of wisdom in voting the restoration of the 7-percent investment tax credit for business firms and in taking this action now. I believe that such action represents sound economic reasoning in relation to the present state of our Nation's economy.

It is logical to liberalize the Federal Government's fiscal policy most directly affecting business investment when at any time positive and continuing evidence exists of a slowdown in the Nation's business momentum.

There are certainly indications, in quantity, of so-called soft spots in our present national economic state.

Automobile production for calendar year 1967 is over 26 percent off the 1966 pace. Residential construction has been off substantially in the period of the past several months, and plant and equipment spending is scarcely higher than last year. Worrisome increases in inventories have been widely noted. In fact, it has been reported that manufacturers' inventories are at the highest level in relation to sales since 1960–61.

Expansion in consumer credit on the installment plan during February was the smallest in 5 years.

Particularly notable, Department of Commerce records indicate that coincident with the withdrawal of the investment tax credit last fall, harmful effects on production became evident.

As a manifestation of the general malaise, which is not believed to be seasonal

in nature, we see recurrent reports such as that in yesterday's April 3 Washington (D.C.) Post. In an article in the business and finance section, entitled "Investment View," Harold B. Dorsey said:

There is practically no support in the latest business statistics to justify a complacent attitude about the business outlook for the next several months or for optimism about the revival of an upward trend in the second half of the year. The February figures were quite poor indeed.

A general sluggishness in manufacturing has indeed been reflected throughout the economy, and when such sluggishness is not overcome in a timely manner, the inevitable results are a drop in employment and a slowdown in investment activities.

Without the stimulus of a strong flow of investment, sustained growth of our Nation's economy is not possible. Yet this growth is the taproot of our Nation's prosperity. It is the keystone of our business and financial well-being.

To insure this vital growth, we must have the means to continue development of our resources, for it is this development which has made our Nation rich.

Yet, how can we continue the development of our resources if we do not encourage initiative in making effective use of the technological gains of our country?

Such development requires initiative—business initiative. It requires investment confidence at all levels from the sales clerk, who thriftily places her limited savings for investment, to the big industrialist and the banker.

And anyone who has been following current stock market reports is aware that investment confidence has suffered a slump in the past months.

To the extent that a recent policy of fiscal tightness has contributed to that wavering, stimulation should now be judiciously applied by restoration of the 7-percent business tax credit and approval of an advanced depreciation provision on building construction.

This investment tax credit and rapid depreciation provision on building construction are needed both by light industries purchasing new equipment and expanding facilities and by heavy industries which manufacture the machinery needed by smaller firms and which program newer technological functions.

I know the value of new equipment to our industries in West Virginia. I have seen the benefits in safer working conditions, better performance, and sustained productiveness.

I favor an immediate repeal of the suspension of the investment tax credit and the rapid depreciation provision on building construction for these reasons. Moreover, I believe these actions have an added practical merit from a standpoint of benefiting the Federal Treasury over the long haul.

Accelerated business activities result in increased tax receipts to the Federal Government—both from corporate and individual income taxes and from excise, estate, and gift taxes. The profits generated by improvement of the Nation's business posture will provide returns in increased tax receipts to more than compensate for any revenue losses to the Federal Treasury.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article from which I read the first paragraph.

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

INVESTMENT VIEW: FEBRUARY STATISTICS CLOUD OUTLOOK

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

NEW YORK, March 25.—There is practically no support in the latest business statistics to justify a complacent attitude about the business outlook for the next several months or for optimism about the revival of an upward trend in the second half of the year. The February figures were quite poor indeed.

The total of all types of retail sales last month not only declined from January but they were also lower than they were last summer and fall. The February figure is only one per cent higher than a year earlier. After allowing for higher prices, the units of goods moving into consumption at the retail line were actually lower than a year ago.

New orders received by the manufacturers of durable goods last month continued the generally downward trend that has persisted since last September. The February figure was 6 per cent below a year earlier and the decline was even larger on a unit volume basis.

The Federal Reserve Index of Industrial Production last month at 155.9 was down 2.1 points from the preceding month and down three points from last October's high.

Hours-worked-per-week in factories last month, at 40.3 hours, recorded the sharpest month-to-month decline since 1960. This figure has also been in a generally downward trend since last fall and the February figure was 3 per cent below a year earlier.

Factory payrolls last month recorded the first month-to-month decline in quite a long while. The personal income figures for February illustrate the shift in the product mix of the economy which is likely to continue—a larger proportionate dependence on government and a perceptible slowing down of income generated by the private sectors.

The sensitive index of industrial raw material prices has been in a downward trend for several months, suggesting a slowing down in the demand for raw materials (as well as an increase in supply) which, in turn, suggests that fabricators have an ample supply of inventories and are not particularly optimistic about the demand for their finished goods several months hence.

The curling over of the long and large upward trend in business expenditures has already been referred to in this space but deserves repetition because this item is one of the most important purchasing power creators in the whole economy.

Housing starts receded in February, following three months of recovery from the extremely low level of last October. However, we are not inclined to place much emphasis on the latest figure because the month-by-month figures are often subject to temporary aberrations.

The inventory-sales ratio of durable goods manufacturers continues to rise.

Labor cost per unit of output continues to rise sharply according to the latest available figures.

Most of the February statistics were so poor that there is room for suspecting that the weather might have been partially responsible, although the evidence strongly suggests that adverse trends have been initiated. There is certainly enough substance in these business statistics to justify the concern about the economy's outlook which is now being expressed more frequently by nongovernment economists. They cannot help but observe the close similarity between the evidence now available and that which has characterized the curling-over phase of the historical major business cycles.

Little wonder then, that there is skepticism about the ability of the Washington authorities to devise fiscal and monetary policies that are powerful enough to offset the sequences of the classic economic forces without causing a huge government deficit and without aggravating the already serious international payments situation.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

What is the will of the Senate?

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

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

BRADFORD P. TAYLOR CITED FOR MERITORIOUS SERVICE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a citation for meritorious service by the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, to a distinguished native of the State of Kentucky, Bradford P. Taylor.

Bradford P. Taylor was born in Casey County, Ky., in 1903, a county adjacent to my native county of Pulaski. It has been my privilege to know his family for many years—a distinguished family—which has always served the people of their community and State well.

The award speaks for itself, of the faithful service, ability, achievement during 38 years in the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Taylor's career is one of service to our country and honors our Government.

I know that the citizens of Kentucky, as well as his colleagues, are proud of his work.

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

CITATION

Citation for meritorious service, Bradford P. Taylor, upon retirement after completing more than thirty-eight years of outstanding Government service, all in the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Taylor began his Federal career in July 1926, and advanced steadily to positions of increasing responsibility. As a Planning, Project and District Engineer in the Atlantic Area, he displayed superior management and engineering ability in planning, directing, and executing large and difficult mapping projects in the eastern United States. During the critical World War II years, his superior efforts were largely responsible for the exceptional manner in which the Topographic Division carried out special high-priority mapping projects for the Air Force. Especially noteworthy was his excellent advice and assistance in the advance planning, coordination, and management of many of the details involved in the expansion of the Topographic Division over the last twenty years. His expert analysis of the effects of

new equipment and procedures in mapmaking led to minimum interruption of operations during the transition period. As a Planning Engineer for the Washington Staff from January 1958 until retirement on March 31, 1965, Mr. Taylor was responsible for developing long- and short-range mapping programs for the Division. As a result of his extraordinary technical and planning ability and his superior execution of these duties, lasting benefits have accrued to the topographic mapping program of the Geological Survey. In recognition of his many valuable contributions as an engineer and administrator to the field of topographic mapping, Mr. Taylor is presented the Meritorious Service Award of the Department of the Interior.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE LATIN AMERICAN SUMMIT CONFERENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 149

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate Joint Resolution 60, reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, concerned with the meeting of the chiefs of state of members of the Organization of American States to be held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, April 12 to 14, 1967.

The substitute resolution which I offer is substantially the same as one I proposed, but which was not accepted by the committee. I then did not vote for the committee resolution which has been reported, because I did not believe it to be an adequate expression of congressional support of the Conference, or of the policy of the United States toward Latin America and the Alliance for Progress, as developed under three administrations with the support of Congress.

More clearly than the resolution introduced by Senators MORSE, HICKENLOOPER, JAVITS, and MANSFIELD—which has been termed the administration proposal—the amendment I offer by way of a substitute provides that additional funds authorized and appropriated by Congress are to be dependent upon "self-help," "determination of need," "effective use," and made available "through constitutional processes," thus meeting one of the objections made to the original proposal.

The chief point of my resolution, as distinguished from the committee resolution, is that my resolution expresses and pledges the support of Congress for this Conference, and specifically for the chief objectives for which the meeting at Punta del Este is being convened; namely, the organization of a Latin American common market, and the establishment of multinational projects such as transport, communications, electrical energy, and river development, without which it is doubtful that a common market can be established successfully, or that the area can make effective progress.

The committee resolution ignores these two objectives. The coming meeting has been preceded by much preparatory work in which the Government of the United States has participated. The objectives of the meeting and the agreements to be considered have received, for nearly 10 years now, the support of Congress and, I believe, of the country.

I believe that Congress should be more specific in its support of the Conference, in its statement of a policy which has been developed over nearly 10 years, in its support of the President, and of the Conference itself.

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

Mr. COOPER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the Senator have any objection if I ask unanimous consent to join with the Senator from Kentucky as an author of that resolution?

Mr. COOPER. I would be happy if the Senator would.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a joint author of that resolution.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I completely concur in the statement the Senator has made. As I stated earlier today, I viewed with much dismay and amazement the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations in reporting the resolution which they did report, and I very much support the resolution which has now been offered as a substitute by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and several other Senators whose names he has listed.

It seems to me that it is proper and right that we have before us for consideration such a resolution, because I cannot help but believe that there is a feeling or opinion, at least of a majority of the Members of this body, that they wish to support that resolution in the form that the Senator from Kentucky has introduced it, which, as I understand it, is very much the same form as that in which the House passed it.

I happen to be one of those who was privileged to attend the meeting of the Organization of American States in Buenos Aires just a few weeks ago, and I was privileged, along with others, to meet and talk with the representatives of all the Latin American countries. They looked forward with much interest and enthusiasm to the prospect of working to bring about economic integration among their countries. If there is any area in the world where trade barriers are not needed, it is in those areas, and particularly in the Central American area, where they already have a common market, but they will, of course, in time, become part of the larger common market.

It seems to me that we could not follow the view which was expressed yesterday by a majority of those present at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, and still adhere to the principles as laid down in the Alliance for Progress. I was one of those who supported the Alliance for Progress, and I think most Senators believed in it. It seems to me that the resolution offered by the Senator from Kentucky is entirely consistent with the precepts and principles of the Alliance for Progress, and other expressions of cooperation, good neighborliness, and willingness to help them throw off the shackles of an economy which has held those people back for centuries. I can see nothing in the world more inconsistent than for us to stand behind the resolution of the Committee on Foreign Relations as it was reported yesterday.

As I said earlier today, I think it is an unfortunate slap at the President of the United States, who, as we all know, is prepared to go down to Punta del Este, Uruguay, on April 12, and appear along with all the other chiefs of state of Central and South America, in a common objective: to try to improve not only their economic basis, which in turn, of course, will improve their educational basis and political stability and everything else, but at the same time, because they are able to develop their economies, they, in turn, will become better neighbors of ours, not only because we will be provided with better markets, but because we will have much more in common with them.

So I am delighted that since yesterday, when the action was taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations, there has been this groundswell of opposition rising up, to let the Latin American nations know that the U.S. Senate does not stand on that side, but still believes in the Alliance for Progress, still believes that we want to be good neighbors in every respect of the word, and still believes that this Congress is willing to appropriate certain moneys to be helpful to them, when they have demonstrated that they can be, want to be, and will be helpful to themselves.

So, all in all, I am very pleased with what the Senator from Kentucky has done. I hope that we can have his amendment before us for consideration in the very near future.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Florida joins with me in my proposal.

No Member of the Senate has been more interested throughout the years in the solidarity of our country with Latin American countries than has the Senator from Florida. He has always supported the development of such great programs as the Alliance for Progress.

I am a new member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the discussion of the resolution which took place last week, I was much impressed at first with the argument that was made to the effect that if Congress were to pass the joint resolution proposed by the administration, Congress would be committing itself in advance to programs and projects which it did not have the prior opportunity to study in detail.

I think all of the countries that will be in attendance at the Conference must know that whatever appropriations and authorizations are made must be made through our constitutional processes. They must know that they will be dependent upon the availability of resources and the views of Congress at the time such authorizations are requested. We could not make available more than we could appropriately find the resources.

The first matter which concerned me was that, after almost 10 years spent in the development of a policy toward Latin America, it seems to me that the resolution which was reported by the commit-

tee was a retreat from the progress that has been made and from that policy.

The amendment which I offered, and which I hope will bring about discussion and perhaps agreements from the leaders upon an effective resolution, does take note of the fact that whatever authorizations and appropriations are made in support of new programs and objectives that they must be made in accordance with constitutional processes.

Since the committee resolution fails to specifically support and approve the very objective for which the conference is being convened, I thought it necessary to submit an amendment which, at the least, would express the support of Congress as to these objectives—objectives which the member states now have agreed, after more than a year of discussion, are necessary if the Organization of American States, is to proceed toward an alliance of economic progress, social advancement, and security of our hemisphere.

It has been said that because we are engaged in war in Vietnam we cannot consider any substantial allotment of our resources to the Alliance for Progress. That is an argument that could be made against any worthy program today. However, I call to mind that perhaps we are at war in Vietnam because in past years we have been so preoccupied with the immediate crises of the day that we did not take note for 10 or 12 years of our growing involvement in Vietnam.

I would not wish to see us make that same mistake now because of our preoccupation with Vietnam. It is important that we not fail to take note of the possibilities of future crises in our own hemisphere.

I earnestly ask the leadership of the Senate and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations—and I regret that I did not have the opportunity to notify them that I would be here—to see if we cannot do something substantial to assure our neighbors in Latin America that we still pursue the goal and objectives which we have stated so vigorously and so ardently throughout all these years.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I ask either of the cosponsors of the amendment if this measure in any way disagrees basically with the resolution that came from the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. There is the change that the resolution which I have offered—and which I offered in the committee—does express clearly that any authorizations or appropriations which are to be made in the future will, of course, be made through the constitutional processes and be dependent on the joint efforts of members of the Organization of American States.

Mr. HARTKE. Is there an implication in the resolution that aid would be forthcoming from Congress?

Mr. COOPER. That was one of the questions raised, and it is a fair and honest question.

I gave my view in committee that the joint resolution which was offered on behalf of the administration would in my view make a commitment. I would say that the amendment which I have offered would also make a commitment, but under more express limitations.

Those limitations relate to: adequate "self-help" on the part of these countries; a "demonstrated need," "effective use" of our assistance; and, of course, there is always the implicit limitation of our own ability to furnish funds.

Mr. HARTKE. In other words, this would be a blank check to the President in advance of his going to the meeting?

Mr. COOPER. No; that is too simple a term. It is not a blank check.

Mr. HARTKE. It is a commitment for something, according to what the Senator said. What is it for?

Mr. COOPER. The Senate has been making commitments for 10 years.

Mr. SMATHERS. For longer than that. We began in 1947, in Rio de Janeiro and in Costa Rica. President Kennedy went to Latin America shortly after that. He then went to Punta del Este, and from that Conference the Alliance for Progress was developed. We have had other meetings, too.

This is a commitment for cooperation. We are actually, at this point, legislatively committed to something like $500 million. That amount is already on the books. What we now propose is that if the countries of Latin America will comply with certain requests which we think are sensible both for them and for ourselves, and which we hope they will agree upon, we will endeavor to see if we cannot provide them with additional assistance.

As the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has said, at that point we will have time to determine whether Congress will make further appropriations. They will be based, first, on our own financial position; second, on what the countries of Latin America have done for themselves; and third, on what we believe we should do in the future.

Mr. HARTKE. Did Congress pass resolutions before the President went to Punta del Este and before we entered upon the Alliance for Progress?

Mr. SMATHERS. No. That is what is peculiar about the present joint resolution. I do not believe the President read the resolution. We have always complained that we were ignored; that we did not have a chance to advise and consent. So the President sent a joint resolution to Congress. He said, in effect, "If you will pass that joint resolution, that will let you be a part of the proceedings." Instead of agreeing to his proposal, we popped him on the nose—at least, the Committee on Foreign Relations did.

Mr. HARTKE. Why not withdraw all the resolutions?

Mr. SMATHERS. For the simple reason that word would go out over Latin America immediately that the Senate, because of the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is opposed to the President's proposal. I do not believe that, any more than does the Senator from Kentucky. That is why I believe the Senator has submitted his amendment in the nature of a substitute. He wants to let the countries of Latin America know that there is a body of opinion in the Senate that does not agree with the nine Senators who voted to report the joint resolution from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HARTKE. Do I correctly understand that the joint resolution makes a commitment to the common market arrangement?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Surely.

Mr. HARTKE. Does it take into consideration the effect upon us of our arrangement to help the Common Market of Europe?

Mr. COOPER. I understand that argument, too. But Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act for the purpose of entering into an arrangement with the common market. Although we have not been able to do so yet, we are still working toward that end. It is anticipated that it will take 10 years even to begin to operate with any effectiveness under that arrangement with the common market. It might take 20 years. Many problems are involved in the development of a common market, and in the establishment of multinational projects, which are not mentioned in the joint resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It may take from 10 to 20 years before such an arrangement can be developed, if at all.

This proposal affirms the support of Congress for a Latin American common market. It would be an effective step toward the economic integration and progress of Latin America.

These are debatable points. But it is my judgment that Congress as a whole and the country as a whole support these objectives. I admit that many Members of Congress do not.

Mr. HARTKE. I am in favor of the general objective of trying to relieve the trade barriers, but I do not believe that we should go ahead and subscribe blandly and blankly to a proposition which says a market will be established and we will be frozen out. Where is any indication written into the resolution that the United States will not be outside the common market or will even have any opportunity for participation?

Mr. COOPER. Every detail cannot be arranged before the proceedings start. The history of the preparations for this meeting indicates that the representatives of the states have agreed among themselves that the establishment of a common market in Latin America is necessary for economic integration and economic progress.

This resolution, as I understand it, would support the President in his efforts at Punta del Este to assist them to reach agreements which would move toward the establishment of a common market. They cannot establish it there. They will try to reach agreements moving toward that goal and we support them in that objective.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand what the Senator is saying. I do not see this in the resolution.

This is exactly what happened with respect to the establishment of a common market in Europe. It happened with respect to the Kennedy round, which is a colossal flop. We did not re-

ceive these commitments in advance. We relied upon the same generalized statements, and now we are faced with the possibility of whether we are going to extend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 or whether we are going to say, "We gave you 5 years, and nothing was done except to lock us out of a big market."

Mr. COOPER. My position is that we should favor extension of the Trade Agreements Act. I do not take the view that because we have not succeeded at a certain point, that we will not succeed for all time.

Also, I do not believe that you can hold back the determinations and arrangements of other peoples in the world to try to improve the conditions in their countries. With respect to Europe, we are still hopeful that with our great economic capacity and theirs that we can reach some agreement.

I am in favor of the establishment of a common market in Latin America, and many others in this country are also in favor of it.

Mr. HARTKE. I did not say that I was opposed to it. I want to know what this resolution is going to do before we start voting on it.

Mr. COOPER. It will give support to the President, at Punta del Este, for whatever he can do there to assist these countries in reaching some agreements with a view to the establishment of a common market. I would say that it is a preparatory step.

Mr. HARTKE. The President does not need a resolution to do this.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, he does not.

Mr. SMATHERS. The President does not need a resolution, and that is what some of the argument pertains to. He could have done it without a resolution. Many Senators have stated on the floor that the Senate is ignored, that its advise-and-consent powers are not used. So the President desired to make the Senate a participant. And nine Members decided that they are going to give him a solar plexus punch, and they did. I believe that in many ways it was unrelated to what actually is going to happen at Punta del Este.

I was in Buenos Aires when we had 2 weeks of argument as to whether or not they wanted to have economic integration among the countries of Latin America. Some of them do not really believe that they want it. But it is our view, and the view of almost everybody else, that if we can have lower tariff barriers, no matter where they are, we then upgrade the economy of those countries; and when we do that, when those people have more money, they can buy more from us. It is the same theory on which we went into GATT. GATT is a colossal failure, as the Senator has said.

Mr. HARTKE. I did not say that GATT is a colossal failure. I said the Kennedy round is a colossal failure.

Mr. SMATHERS. It might be a great success tomorrow, if they could agree.

Mr. HARTKE. If they could agree.

Mr. SMATHERS. They still have another 6 weeks or 2 months to go.

In any event, it is a belief that the whole world is better off if we cooperate and if we lower trade barriers and try for trade. To use an old cliche, we have trade, not aid. And we are working toward that end.

All this resolution does is to express, as has been expressed over the past 15 years, on not one but five different occasions that I can state at this time—and I believe there are others—that we wish to cooperate with our Latin neighbors, who are some of our biggest trade partners.

I am certain that the Senator realizes that Mexico is our second greatest trade partner in the world. We have a favorable trade balance with Mexico. We make a billion and a half dollars. Venezuela is next, and then Brazil and Argentina. In that area are the 20 top countries with which we do business. This is not aid money. This is not our own money coming back. We are trading with them. We want them to get stronger and better, and we hope they will work with us, and we want to work with them. That is what this is about.

We did not want the President to have to go to Punta del Este with a black sheep behind him which walked out of the Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 9 to 0.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator means he would rather have the President carry a little black bag.

Mr. SMATHERS. We want him to go there with the support of the Senate, which I think does support him.

Mr. HARTKE. I am in favor of reciprocal reductions of trade barriers. But I think it is high time that we recognized that the United States cannot continue to involve itself in this split personality on trade, and that is to say that we will provide all the relief on one side but never have any relief coming back.

In this situation there is nothing to provide for the U.S. participation in the Common Market. We are locked out of the Common Market in Europe. There has been no reciprocity over there.

What I am saying, honestly and sincerely, is that I hope that we will go ahead and redefine our policy, so that we will have expanding markets and expanding reciprocity and better trade. But I do not wish to export American jobs to South America at the expense of our people here.

Mr. SMATHERS. Nobody else does.

This is a belief that they will economically improve, that in time it will benefit the people of the United States. Nobody is attempting to hurt the United States—neither the Senator from Kentucky nor any of the other sponsors.

We believe that our most natural trade partners are the people to the south of us. The European Common Market is pretty well locked up. Their natural trade is toward Africa, but ours is in this hemisphere. This is why we wish to continue to let them know that we are cooperating with them. We took the lead in urging them to go ahead with respect to the Common Market. It has worked beautifully in the Central American countries. They have integrated their business among each other by 150 percent in the last 2 years. We believe that all over South America this will be the final result.

Mr. HARTKE. Nothing in this resolution indicates any reciprocity whatsoever. Nothing in this resolution indicates that there will be anything except a reliance upon gifts from the United States, no investment of private capital. It is not even discussed in the resolution. Whatever amount is forced upon them or given to them in South America, if they are given $1 billion or $2 billion, it will not be enough to make a dent in their troubles.

(At this point, Mr. SPONG assumed the Chair.)

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator want us to do nothing?

Mr. HARTKE. No; quite to the contrary. I believe the President should do as all presidents should do, and as presidents of other countries do. There is not another country that is going to have a prior commitment from its legislative body backing up its president.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is not correct in that statement. Many of these presidents have to get approval from their legislatures as to what they can do.

Mr. HARTKE. What they can do in the final analysis.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. But no prior commitment as to what they are going to give or release.

Mr. SMATHERS. We have not said what we are going to give.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Kentucky said there was implied a commitment.

Mr. SMATHERS. If they will do what we think they should do, we are going to help.

The Senator did not object to our helping Greece and Turkey, the help we gave under the Marshall plan, or the help we have given all over the world, where we have saved the world from communism.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator does not read my voting record clearly.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not believe the Senator objects to that. I am sure he is not going to object where we get a quid pro quo from them.

Mr. HARTKE. Where is the quid pro quo? That is what I am asking.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is implied in all of this.

Mr. HARTKE. I cannot find it.

Mr. SMATHERS. They are going to make certain improvements themselves. That is in there. In any event, the Senator knows what we are talking about and what the result will be.

Mr. HARTKE. If I knew the result, I would not have these apprehensions. I believe it is fine for the President to go there, find out what we can do, and then come back and report to the Congress.

The Senator from Florida said that it has worked four times successfully, so why change the rules in the middle of the ball game? It worked four times, so why not a fifth time? I hope the Senate will give urgent and deliberate consideration to this matter.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is going to be against this, then?

Mr. HARTKE. I did not say anything about that. I want an explanation.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator will get an explanation in due course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 5, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 4, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Robert C. Belloni, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Teacher Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Teacher Corps.

The Teacher Corps provides a new and effective tool for schools with the most difficult educational tasks—schools in city slums and areas of rural poverty. It encourages dedicated and gifted men and women to join the staffs of these schools. It encourages colleges and universities to design training programs tailored to the needs of those who teach poor children.

On request from local school systems, experienced teachers and teacher-interns—college graduates with little or no teaching experience—go, in President Johnson's words, "to the places in their country that need them most." They supplement, not replace, regular teachers in poverty schools.

The Teacher Corps provides both immediate and long-range benefits. Already it has provided our schools with more than 1,200 young men and women with the training, the talent, and the motivation to teach disadvantaged children. Next year we hope to provide three times this number.

But the benefits of the program extend beyond the initial period of an individual's service in the Teacher Corps. Colleges and universities design both preservice in-service Teacher Corps training programs.

This training benefits members of the corps and the schools involved, but almost as important, they encourage all colleges and universities to reexamine their regular teacher-preparation programs with an eye to providing the kind of training needed for successfully teaching disadvantaged children.

The Teacher Corps encourages men and women to continue to serve in poverty schools for many years. The program provides a new career opportunity: teaching the disadvantaged. The organization is beneficial to many who as individuals might find the task overwhelming.

Because members of the Teacher Corps work in the local school systems, they bolster the efforts of regular teachers. The skills of these teachers are sharpened and their morale is strengthened to continue to serve in poverty schools.

This stable and dedicated educational leadership enables the schools of city slums and rural poverty to develop a climate for learning—a climate that will help poverty youngsters become productive adults.

Proposal To Convert Post Office Department Into a Nonprofit Government Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General Larry O'Brien spoke out on Monday with a bold thought-provoking proposal to remove the Post Office Department from the President's Cabinet and convert it into a nonprofit Government corporation. His candor in approaching the issue of effectiveness and efficiency in the postal service is as refreshing as his suggestions are stimulating.

It is not often that a public official proposes the entire reorganization of his department much less the abolition of his own job. Yet, this is precisely what the Postmaster General did in his forceful, imaginative and far-reaching statement before the Magazine Publishers Association and the American Society of Magazine Editors.

Many arguments can be and have been advanced as reasons to rethink the operation and structure of the Post Office Department but none have summed up the situation more succinctly than the following comments of Mr. O'Brien's:

> Recently, I was asked a basic question about the organization of the Postal Service by the preceptive Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative Tom Steed of Oklahoma.
>
> Chairman Steed asked, "General . . . would this be a fair summary: that at the present time as the manager of the Post Office Department, you have no control over your work load, you have no control over the rates of revenue that you are able to bring in, you have no control over the pay rates of the employees that you employ, you have very little control over the conditions of the service of these employees, you have virtually no control, by the nature of it, of the physical facilities that you are forced to use, and you have only a limited control at best over the transportation facilities that you are compelled to use . . . ?" And then he added, this is ". . . a staggering amount of 'No control' in terms of the duties you have to perform."
>
> I agreed with Chairman Steed. My area of "no control" is almost unlimited. This is a situation that has grown up over such a long period of time and has such a strong tradition, that the only effective action I foresee is sweeping it away entirely.

I know I join a good many of my colleagues in welcoming Mr. O'Brien's forthright appraisal of the relationship between the executive branch and the Congress when he said:

> The partnership is meaningful, the relationships are excellent.

This observation is one of the key reasons for the success of the American form of government, and one of the reasons that Mr. O'Brien is able to speak to Congress frankly and openly. We welcome this frankness and we welcome creative proposals.

While it still remains for the Postmaster General to present his proposal in detail, I do think it is opportune to commend him and congratulate him for taking the first step and for applying to age-old problems the genius of American inventiveness. There are those of us, of course, who will be concerned that in any new organization the public service concept be maintained and enhanced and that justice be done both employees and management, but we will eagerly await further development of the pioneering new course that Mr. O'Brien has charted for the Post Office Department.

Results of Questionnaire From Third Congressional District of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of a questionnaire recently sent to residents of the Third Congressional District of Florida, which includes the city of Jacksonville and Duval County. Over 18,000 citizens responded to this poll.

The net results of the questionnaire follow:

[Results in percent]

1. Should the United States expand trade with Communist countries in nonstrategic goods?

Yes	34
No	66

2. Should Federal income taxes be increased over Federal needs to provide for tax sharing with States?

Yes	7
No	93

3. Should social security benefits, and taxes to provide for same, be increased?

Yes	38
No	62

4. In Vietnam should we abandon our gradual pressure course and pursue a prompt victory course?

Yes	85
No	15

5. Should your Congressman vote to continue the poverty program under present circumstances?

Yes	12
No	88

North Dakota Views on Vietnam, Candidates and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a tabulation of views expressed by citizens of North Dakota's Second Congressional District in response to a questionnaire I distributed recently.

Tabulated below are the combined views of the more than 8,000 residents of North Dakota's Second District who returned my questionnaire. It was mailed to all post office patrons and presumably represents a good cross-section.

It shows west district people overwhelmingly favor stepping up U.S. military efforts in Vietnam; that they favor Nixon over Romney as the 1968 Republican presidential nominee, and ROBERT KENNEDY over Johnson for the Democratic nomination; that they are 5 to 1 against the proposed 6 percent Federal surtax on incomes.

On questions 2 and 10, responses are broken down by number, rather than percentage, because of the multiple choices. On questions 9 and 10, relating to agriculture, farmers and nonfarmers are tabulated separately. Both farmers and nonfarmers responded in about the same proportion they represent in actual population figures, but quite a few nonfarmers passed over the farm questions.

I am deeply grateful to the thousands of people who took the time to fill out the questionnaire and, in many instances, volunteered additional comments. I recognize the difficulties involved in answering complex questions with a flat "yes" or "no" but this method was used to reach a maximum number of people and expedite tabulations. The information gained will be most helpful to me in representing the district in Washington. Here are the results:

1. The United States seems to have three courses of future action in Viet Nam. Please check the one which most closely reflects your choice of alternatives: (a) Step up the bombing of military targets in North Viet Nam, including, if necessary, a naval blockade, 75%; (b) Continue U.S. land, sea, and air operations pretty much along present lines, 9%; (c) Withdraw American military forces completely, 16%.

2. Who would you like to see the Republican Party nominate as its Presidential Candidate in 1968? Nixon, 2,759; Romney, 2,278; Reagan, 898; Percy, 460.

For Democratic Party Nominee in 1968? Johnson, 1,827; Kennedy, 2,028.

3. President Johnson has proposed a 6 percent surtax on personal and corporate income taxes beginning July 1. Do you favor this? Yes, 17%; no 83%.

4. President Johnson has asked Congress to provide $1.9 billion for the war on poverty during the next fiscal year. Do you think this is (a) Too much, 80%; (b) About right, 16%; (c) Too little, 4%.

5. There is considerable support for a tax-sharing plan under which a portion of the individual income taxes collected by the Federal government (perhaps 3 to 5 per cent) would be returned to the states to replace, in part, present federal grants.

Would you favor this? Yes 79%; no 21%.

6. Would you favor a federal income tax credit to offset, in part, costs incurred by parents in sending children to college? Yes, 64%; no 36%.

7. Would you favor a reduction in federal non-defense spending as a means of reducing the size of the budget deficit? Yes, 84%; no 16%.

8. President Johnson has called for increases in both Social Security benefit payments and Social Security taxes. Do you favor this? Yes, 31%; no, 69%.

9. How would you rate the kind of job Orville Freeman is doing as Secretary of Agriculture? Farmers: Good, 7%; fair, 27%; poor, 66%. Non-farmers: Good, 9%; fair, 37%; poor, 54%.

10. On the question of Federal farm programs, would you favor:

(a) Abolishing all price supports and controls? Farmers: yes, 1,085; no, 1,871. Non-farmers: yes, 1,531; no, 1,246.

(b) Higher price supports with controls as needed? Farmers: yes, 2,234; no, 368. Non-farmers: yes, 1,256; no, 697.

(c) Continuing present programs about as they are? Farmers: yes, 650; no, 1,013. Non-farmers: yes, 566; no, 978.

11. Would you favor tighter import controls on foreign meats, dairy products, sugar and other competitive farm commodities? Yes, 87%; no, 13%.

12. Do you favor the seating of Adam Clayton Powell? Yes, 7%; no, 93%.

For General Excellence in Local Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last month an alert, courageous, informative, and entertaining weekly newspaper received a well-deserved honor when the Johnstown, Pa., Observer was named winner of the Golden Quill Award for general excellence in local coverage.

The presentation took place at the seventh annual Golden Quill Awards dinner in Pittsburgh—an event sponsored by the Pittsburgh chapter of Sigma Delta Chi and the Pittsburgh Press Club. Cosponsors include officials of such firms as the United States Steel Corp., Mellon National Bank, Gulf Oil Corp., National Steel Corp., the Koppers Co., and other leading business firms.

The Johnstown Observer was one of only three among more than 400 entries—including newspapers and radio and television stations in 16 western Pennsylvania counties—to be cited for excellence. Johnstown and the entire area are proud of this tribute to editor and publisher, Larry D. Martin, and his staff.

Features that appealed to the judges were a series of Mr. Martin's editorials as well as columns by Jim Malloy, Jr., associate editor, and Betty Marky. With writers of this caliber, the Observer has to be one of the favorites in any competition, and the prize will not be the last for this growing publication.

Forthright and fearless newspapers are a vital component of community progress and a necessary safeguard to the integrity of public officials. The Observer is to be congratulated for the new recognition it has received.

Fino Introduces 1967 Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a package of legislative proposals relating to housing and urban development.

My four bills are as follows:

First. To provide for a bank for urban rehabilitation and development within the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which bank would: First, insure loans—above existing ceilings—of up to $50 million for FHA multifamily housing projects—rehabilitation, as well as other FHA 221 programs—and insure loans for mass transit programs for which grants could be made under the Mass Transportation Act; second, make direct loans of up to $10 million for rehabilitation of housing in urban areas of extreme socioeconomic tension; and, third, guarantee municipal bond issues issued to finance such projects regarding which loans could be made or insured under the bank's other programs. Public agencies and corporations, as well as private persons, would be eligible for bank loans and insurance. I introduced this bill in the 89th Congress as H.R. 17997.

Second. To amend the National Housing Act to provide for more careful administration by FHA of its multifamily housing programs by first, prohibiting FHA from extending or modifying mortgages in default unless income from the insured project is held in trust; second, requiring contractors furnishing materials or services to multifamily housing projects to certify the cost before FHA can insure; and third, prohibit FHA from insuring multifamily projects unless there is a binding agreement that the Comptroller General may have access

to the books. Senators ERVIN and MCCLELLAN have introduced this bill in the 90th Congress as S. 1249.

Third. To amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide tax incentives for the rehabilitation of rental housing for low-income families by allowing a 5-year depreciation writeoff of the cost of rehabilitating housing, with a 20-percent bonus in the first year. Senator JAVITS has introduced this bill in the 90th Congress as S. 1199, and Congressman BUTTON has introduced it as H.R. 7328.

Fourth. To amend the Internal Revenue Code to deny capital gains tax treatment to unimproved real estate, to limit the deduction for real estate taxes paid on unimproved land, and to eliminate the deductions for real estate taxes and depreciation on multifamily housing which is not maintained in a safe and sanitary condition. I introduced this bill in the 89th Congress as H.R. 14995.

During the last few years, I have been privileged to be among the leaders of the fight against the administration's bureaucratic, wasteful, and socially scheming rent subsidy and demonstration cities programs. I regret that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has, in the words of Barron's financial weekly, used the Nation's urban crisis as an excuse to get the social planning "camel into the tent"—that is, enact housing legislation designed to achieve social upheaval.

As this administration knows full well, the cities need Federal help, but not Federal control. This administration uses Federal aid as a stalking horse for Federal control which the Federal Government intends to exert on behalf of special interest groups. Frankly, I disagree with this whole philosophy. I think that private enterprise offers the real hope for rebuilding our cities. If the Federal Government will content itself with helping private enterprise to do the job, we will be spared Federal control and bureaucratic waste. The achievements of corporations like U.S. Gypsum, and Smith, Kline & French, ought to convince the White House to give business the tax and mortgage insurance encouragement necessary to do the job and foreswear the sociopolitical ambitions of the Washington housing bureaucracy.

With these thoughts in mind, I am today introducing four bills which I think can help to solve the crisis of the cities. First, I am reintroducing my 1966 bill to establish a bank for urban rehabilitation and development within the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. The bank would insure loans for rehabilitation and other multifamily project housing activities undertaken by private persons and public agencies up to $50 million, going beyond the limit of some existing Federal programs. The bank could also insure local mass transit project loans up to $50 million providing the projects meet existing requirements for a mass transit program grant. Additionally, the bank would be empowered to make, rather than merely insure, loans for housing rehabilitation in areas of socioeconomic crisis. Lastly, the bank would be empowered to guarantee municipal bond issues for purposes for which it could make or insure loans. I believe that the bank for urban rehabilitation and development could be just what business needs to get going in the field of housing rehabilitation. I think my proposed bank would provide a great alternative to the power-hungry demonstration cities program and unnecessarily cumbersome homeownership plans.

Second, I am introducing a bill which Senators ERVIN and MCCLELLAN have authored to impose new and stricter standards on FHA's sloppy administration of multifamily housing projects. The administrative incompetence of FHA is so noticeable that Reader's Digest entitled a recent exposé "The Stench at FHA." As a Housing Subcommittee member, I know that Reader's Digest is correct. If we impose tougher standards on FHA, perhaps some of the money they spend will go to provide housing and not bank accounts for windfallers.

My third bill has already been introduced by Senator JAVITS and Representative BUTTON. Simply put, it would encourage housing rehabilitation by setting up a new tax incentive scheme whereby builders could write off rehabilitation costs over a 5-year period, besides getting a 20-percent bonus deduction in the first year. While I am completely in favor of the general idea of tax help for rehabilitation efforts, I recognize that there are several approaches which can be followed.

My fourth bill is similar to one I introduced last year, based on suggestions in several labor and architectural journals that our present tax treatment of land transactions encourages both land speculation and long-term idling of valuable land, which affects land prices and thus housing prices. Besides denying capital gains tax treatment to unimproved real estate, my bill would also strike at the profits of slumlords by denying Federal income tax deductions for real estate taxes and depreciation on multifamily housing which is not maintained in a safe and sanitary condition. My proposal would make it uneconomic for slumlords to operate their slum properties. A dearth of profits will be a far greater blow to slumism than all the demonstration cities programs the administration can conjure up.

I hope that the late April Housing Subcommittee hearings will give me a chance to discuss these proposals with expert and governmental witnesses.

Bennett Introduces Bill To Get at Federal Home Loan Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 7822, to strike a blow against fraud in the Federal home loan and mortgage insurance programs, specifically to get at the so-called "equity skinner" and it carries a penalty of a $10,000 fine and 5 years' imprisonment.

Because of lax real estate laws and slow foreclosure proceedings in many States, unscrupulous persons are assuming the mortgage on property, insured under the veterans and Federal home loan program, with the deliberate intent of making few, if any, payments on the mortgage, and cashing in on rentals or other profits that may be accrued before foreclosure.

Generally, an equity skinner is one who takes advantage of a homeowner's desperation to sell his property. In desperation the homeowner is willing to sacrifice his own investment to dispose of the property. The equity skinner offers little or nothing down and usually represents that the house is just what his family or relatives need.

Often the skinner offers to prepare the deed of transfer, but in most cases will not record the transaction. The skinner may then rent the property at a cheap rental in order to get occupancy immediately. Although he collects rent, he does not make the mortgage payments.

This can be done for approximately 6 months in my own State because foreclosure proceedings take about that long to complete. Thus, the skinner who has purchased the property for $100 down and rented it for $90 a month has made a net profit of $440 for the period.

Equity skinners generally do not operate in States where foreclosures may be completed promptly under the State's foreclosure statute and where there is no State statutory period of redemption.

In Florida's Third Congressional District, which I represent, there have been many cases of a flourishing trade by these parasites.

Tragically, servicemen are prime targets of the skinner because of the need to sell their homes in a hurry when they are transferred.

The Florida State's attorney's office in Jacksonville has spent considerable time and effort in attempting to stop this practice, but due to inadequate laws the task has become nearly impossible.

Efforts by the Federal Government to successfully prosecute equity skinners have to date been limited to only a few cases, and convictions in those cases have been for violations of Federal mail fraud statutes.

I believe the bill I have introduced will permit the Federal Government to successfully prosecute the person who engages in equity skinning, and I am hopeful that it can be enacted without undue delay.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 7822

A bill to eliminate fraud from the Federal home loan and mortgage insurance programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 61 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

§ 3506. Fraudulent purchase of guaranteed or insured real property.

"Any person who purchases any real property which is security for a loan which is

guaranteed or insured under chapter 37 of this title with the intention of—

"(1) not making payments on such loan as they are due, or

"(2) selling or otherwise conveying such property (while it is security for such loan) to another person with knowledge that such other person cannot or intends not to make payments on such loan as they are due, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 61 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"3506. Fraudulent purchase of guaranteed or insured real property."

SEC. 2. Title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"FRAUDULENT PURCHASE OF PROPERTY COVERED BY INSURED MORTGAGE

"SEC. 524. Any person who purchases any real property upon which there is located a one-, two-, three-, or four-family residence covered by a mortgage insured under any of the provisions of this Act, with the intention of—

"(1) not making payments under such mortgage as they are due, or

"(2) selling or otherwise conveying such property (while it is covered by such mortgage) to another person with knowledge that such other person cannot or intends not to make payments under such mortgage as they are due,

shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

Tax Relief for Homeowners and Tenants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have, today, introduced H.R. 7945, "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for certain local residential real property taxes."

The bill will provide tax relief for homeowners and tenants through a Federal tax credit based on local property taxes or rentals paid. The legislation implements a proposal made last month by the distinguished county executive of Nassau County, N.Y., the Honorable Eugene H. Nickerson. I included an explanation of the Nickerson plan for tax relief in my statement calling for an overhaul of our tax laws. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 20, 1967, page H3022.

Thus it will be observed that under the bill a Federal tax credit is allowed in cases of hardship; that is, whenever local property taxes exceed 5 percent of a taxpayer's household income. In the case of tenants, property taxes are deemed equal to 25 percent of the amount of rent paid.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 7945

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for certain local residential real property taxes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 40 as section 41 and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"Sec. 40. Local residential real property taxes.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—If an individual chooses to have the benefits of this section for the taxable year, there shall be allowed to such individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount equal to 75 percent of such individual's base overage for such taxable year.

"(b) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) BASE OVERAGE.—The term 'base overage' means an amount equal to 80 percent of the overage for the taxable year.

"(2) OVERAGE.—In the case of any taxpayer for the taxable year, the term 'overage' means the amount by which his local residential real property taxes exceed 5 percent of his household income.

"(3) LOCAL RESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY TAXES.—

"(A) The term 'local residential real property taxes' means taxes imposed by a political subdivision of a State or by the District of Columbia which are paid or accrued by the taxpayer during the taxable year with respect to real property which he is using as his principal residence.

"(B) In the case of a taxpayer who rents real property and uses such property as his principal residence, an amount equal to 25 percent of the rent which he pays or accrues during the taxable year for the use of such property shall be treated as local residential real property taxes.

For purposes of subparagraph (B), (i) where some or all of the utilities are furnished without separate charge, the amount taken into account as rent shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be properly reduced for that portion of the rent which is properly attributable to the utilities so furnished, and (ii) the rent so adjusted which is taken into account for any taxable year shall not exceed $2,400.

"(4) HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer for the taxable year, the term 'household income' means—

"(A) the taxable income of the taxpayer and his spouse, plus

"(B) an amount equal to all interest, annuities, pensions, remunerations, emoluments, and other fixed or periodical gains, profits, and income of the taxpayer or his spouse which are excludable from gross income, plus

"(C) the aggregate amount contributed or paid during the taxable year for the maintenance of the household by members of the household other than the taxpayer and his spouse.

"(5) LIMIT ON CREDIT.—The credit allowed by this section for the taxable year shall not exceed—

"(A) $300, plus

"(B) in the case of a taxpayer whose tax is determined under section 1 without regard to the standard deduction, the amount by which his liability for tax under this chapter is greater than it would be but for section 275(a)(6) (denying a deduction for local residential real property taxes in the case of an individual who chooses to take the benefits of this section).

"(6) ONLY ONE SPOUSE MAY TAKE CREDIT.—In the case of a husband and wife filing separate returns, only one may take the credit allowed by this section.

"(7) SECTION NOT TO PRODUCE REFUND.—The credit allowed by this section for the taxable year shall not exceed the tax imposed by this chapter for such year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under section 33, section 35, section 37, and section 38."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last line and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 40. Local residential real property taxes.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

(c) Section 275(a) of such Code (relating to certain taxes not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) Local residential real property taxes (within the meaning of section 40(b)(3)(A)), if the individual chooses to take the benefits of section 40 for the taxable year."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

The increasing burden of local taxes is eased through this credit approach and a form of tax sharing is authorized between the Federal Government and local governments.

The "Nickerson plan," which this legislation seeks to implement and translate into law, has a limited precedent in the State of Wisconsin which has a similar State tax credit for senior citizens. It is hoped that other States will adopt legislation to provide tax credits for the remaining 25 percent of the overage or tax hardship declared under the bill.

It is estimated that more than 15 million families in the United States now face local property taxes which are disproportionate to their incomes. An additional 14 million tenants may also benefit under the proposed legislation.

Notwithstanding the number of families who may come within the definition of hardship, established by this bill, the estimated cost of the proposed Federal tax credit is estimated at approximately $1 billion. Pending proposals for tax sharing with States have been estimated at nearly $3 billion. Significantly, the bill implementing the Nickerson plan brings relief to the segment of the population which needs it most and where all of the resulting tax credit will flow back into the economy.

During the past 6 years and particularly during the past 6 months we have heard much about the "Heller plan" and other tax-sharing plans which call for a return of Federal revenue to the States. We have not heard enough about tax relief for the individual until the Nickerson plan.

The "Nickerson plan" is constructive and a new approach to the concept of tax sharing, bringing Federal assistance directly to the individual homeowner and indirectly to local governments. The "plan" which this legislation seeks to implement merits the consideration of the Congress in any discussion of tax-sharing procedures.

The burden of local taxes has increased in direct proportion to the increasing demand for services at the local level. State and local spending has been rising at an annual rate of about 9 percent—a post-World War II increase of about 300 percent. Federal spending during this same period has risen at an average rate of about 6 percent a year—in line with the increase in our gross national product.

State and local governments today account for more than 52 percent of all government spending for domestic-civilian purposes. Our national debt has risen approximately 15 percent since 1954 while our State and local debts have increased 137 percent during the same period—from $39 to more than $92 billion.

The fiscal plight of local governments requires immediate review and relief. The sources of revenue at the local level are limited—limited to the most regressive of all taxes—the property tax.

The local real property tax fails to take into account the ability to pay. It places the greatest burden on middle- and low-income taxpayers and those persons living on fixed incomes.

The Federal Government does not seek to stifle the growth of local government, nor does it seek to curtail the increasing demand for services provided at the local level in the fields of education, health, welfare, and police and fire protection. Yet, as these services increase, local expenditures must inevitably rise and the hardship on the persons least able to afford it becomes greater.

Under the legislation, the regressive nature of the local property tax will be offset through a Federal tax credit based on progressive factors. Those who truly face a hardship, whose tax burden bears a disproportionate relationship to their income, will receive a benefit—others will not. Such a program will accomplish the primary objective of tax sharing but will bring direct relief to individuals instead of to the States.

The local tax burden with its regressive features, when added to the inequities in our Federal tax laws, represents a problem faced by the vast majority of Americans in all tax brackets.

On March 20, 1967, I introduced House Joint Resolution 454 to create a Commission on Unequal Taxation—an independent Commission of legislative and executive branch officials—to conduct a 1-year survey of our income tax laws and recommend to Congress a program for a complete overhaul. The Commission would direct its attention to inequities in the Internal Revenue Act, consider the closing of tax loopholes—such as the oil depletion allowance—which cost our Treasury billions of dollars annually. It would focus on inequities but also recommend increased benefits where needed—such as increasing the personal exemption.

In addition to the Tax Commission legislation, I have introduced bills to reduce the oil depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 20 percent over a 3-year period—H.R. 3803; and a bill to increase the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000—H.R. 6559. I plan to sponsor other bills—a bill to increase child care deductions for working mothers and a bill to provide a deduction for the cost of higher education based on income.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in seeking an overhaul of our tax laws and to call for the creation of an independent commission to assist the Congress with this task. Until the creation of such a commission I will continue to call for the enactment of a package of tax bills to close loopholes and correct inequities. All of this should be done before we consider an increase in taxes on individuals.

I add one note of caution—overemphasize the tax-sharing proposals which have and will continue to receive so much public attention. I agree that some form of tax sharing is necessary but in our consideration of these proposals, we must not forget the individual, the middle-income taxpayer who has felt the crushing burden of increased taxes, and the low-income taxpayer, and the person living on a fixed income.

The call for action has been heard but the answer is not a simple one. It cannot come with the passage of a single bill. If tax reform is to be meaningful, it must be complete reform, broad reform, and it must bring relief to the individuals who are least able to bear the burdens which we have discussed today.

The Prison Work Release Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, there has recently appeared in the press some confusion and criticism about the Federal work release program—the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965.

In view of the success of both the State and Federal work release program, I was very much disconcerted recently to read an editorial of the Chicago Tribune on February 11, 1967, characterizing this program as a step in the direction of providing a guaranteed annual wage for inmates of Federal prisons.

Such totally wrong-headed misconceptions about this program are due, in large part, to a confusion about the benefits and rights a prison inmate has when he is released during the last 6 months of his sentence for daytime employment in private or public occupations.

Recently it was published widely that a convict can solely as the result of his work while serving a prison sentence, establish his eligibility for unemployment benefits, qualify for social security benefits, and under certain circumstances have the time he served in prison counted as Federal service for the purpose of increasing his pension under civil service retirement.

The reason why an inmate who is gainfully employed under this program accrues eligibility for unemployment benefits, or qualifies for social security benefits or has his employment count as Federal service for purposes of retirement, is precisely because this man is earning wages and performing exactly the same kind of work that other wage earners perform.

In fact, a Senate subcommittee amendment in the 1965 act made it clear that the employee under the work release program was to be paid rates "not less than those paid or provided for work of a similar nature in the locality in which the work is to be performed."

Mr. Speaker, it was the intention of the Congress in the 1965 act to place the inmate in a regular employment environment so that he would gain work experience, perhaps learn new skills, and be provided a valuable avenue into gainful employment after his release from the institution.

In this context, there is no reason to deny the work-released inmate any work-related benefits to which he would be entitled if he were not an inmate of a Federal prison.

In short, inmates who are on work release, normally in the last few months of their sentence, are gainfully employed in private industry, State, or Federal jobs. Social security is deducted from their wages and their employers pay the unemployment insurance tax, the same as for any other employee. Such wages, earned as members of the labor force, of course, count toward eligibility for future benefits under the social insurance programs.

What is really at issue in this controversy is the conception of the purpose of Federal prisons. Some say that Federal prisons have been in the past recognized as just places of punishment for persons after their conviction of a crime.

This is a narrow, and outmoded view of penology. It neglects, perhaps, the most important role our present prisons have, namely, to rehabilitate those who have gone astray so that when they are released, they will be able to return and contribute to society. To ignore this element about our prison system is to ignore the real facts about criminal offenders who are sent to our institutions.

Here are some of the facts:

Although over 100,000 persons leave Federal and State prisons each year, few ever receive adequate job training. This is complicated further because in many communities in which persons are released, there are no modern training programs available.

Most offenders entering penal institutions have little training or occupational skills. More than half of the adult prisoners never progressed beyond elementary school; more than four-fifths of the prison inmates between ages 25 and 64 in 1960 had not completed high school; a majority of the prisoners have worked in occupations requiring the least skill and having the highest unemployment rates.

About 30 percent of all male prisoners are between 15 and 24 years old. Almost 20 percent are between 20 and 24 years old, a crucial time when most young men are embarking on careers and beginning family life.

Most offenders have had unstable employment experiences and long periods of unemployment; most offenders lack rudimentary job deportment.

When released, persons who reenter the labor force are hampered by their penal records.

Mr. Speaker, the work release programs are being adopted in more and more

States in this country, and we in Congress have strongly supported a work-release program on the Federal level. These programs are good, they are practical, and they are humane.

I hope that the press will do all it can to inform the public about the value and need for these work-release programs. And while, I am sure the records of the 89th Congress are replete with evidence demonstrating the need and value of such programs, I would like to bring the House up to date on the effectiveness of the Federal work-release program enacted 17 months ago:

As of December 31, 1966, inmates participated in the Federal work-release program earned $2,146,994, and reimbursed the Government a total of $203,213 for their keep, for which inmates are charged $2 per day for food and lodging.

They also contributed $303,200 in Federal, State, and local taxes and to the Social Security Trust Fund. No doubt, much of this money is used to support the State unemployment insurance program and the Old Age Survivors and Disability Insurance program.

Work release inmates sent over $400,000 to their dependent families which enabled many of them to leave the public welfare rolls. This not only provides dignity to the inmate's family but also reduces the tax burden on the local community.

Over $574,000 was spent in the community where they worked for food, clothing, transportation, and other needs.

Mr. Speaker, in the presence of this evidence of success, I have no hesitation whatsoever in voicing my continued support for the Federal work-release program, and I am certain that anyone who takes the time to examine and evaluate the effectiveness of this program both in terms of reducing recidivism and sound economics, could not help but come to the conclusion that this program fully deserves our continued support on both Federal and local levels.