

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 10, 1967

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 6, 1967)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The prayer today will be delivered by a friend of the Senate, a fine Christian layman, Mr. Mark Evans, vice president of Metro-media, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Evans offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, in humility, we ask Thee to hear our prayer. Accept our profound thanks for life and liberty, for this haven land of freedom, choice above all others, for home and hearth and health, for men dedicated to virtuous principles, for public officers who love this land and oftentimes, though unheralded, serve it so well. Guide those who face and fear temptation in duty's performance. We thank Thee, Father, for courage, so typified by the champions of freedom who this hour, in distant places, fight to preserve it. Bless their loved ones with a spirit of understanding; let them receive strength from a knowledge of purpose. May we who benefit so much be made more keenly and gratefully aware of those who stand, and those who fall, defending that on which all our blessings are predicated. We gratefully express our thanks for the safe return of the noble servant, HUBERT HUMPHREY, who presides over this legislative body. We ask Thy protection of the President of the United States, who departs shortly for the important task of reassuring our concern to millions of our American brothers to the south. May he engender in them the hope of a better tomorrow. Return him to his difficult tasks, Father, buoyed up in spirit and determination to give our blessed land unselfish leadership. Bless the Congress of the United States; guide them in its challenging decisions. May they seek Thy guidance, for in Thee we do truly place our trust.

Sincerely do we pray and in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 6, 1967, was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2536) to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2536) to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Commerce were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

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

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Endicott Peabody, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

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

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

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—AIR FORCE AND ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force and the Army which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for release of valueless liens, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the months of February and March 1967 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INCREASE OF RATES OF BASIC PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of acquisition and use of aeromedical research facilities, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of construction and related costs, Rayburn House Office

Building, House Office Building Commission, Architect of the Capitol, dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Ordered, That the above report be printed as a Senate document under the provisions of 78 Stat. 551.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an inquiry into alleged improper practices in providing nursing home care, medical services, and prescribed drugs to old-age assistance recipients in the Cleveland, Ohio, area, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated March 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of grants and fellowships to improve the education of students attending institutions of higher education in preparation for entrance into the service of State, local, or Federal governments, and to attract such students to the public service, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

POSTAL REVENUE ACT OF 1967

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

ENROLLED SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17

A concurrent resolution requesting Congress and the U.S. Department of Defense to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system available with burial spaces in national cemeteries for all U.S. military servicemen and servicewomen who are entitled to the same and wish to be interred therein; and directing distribution

Whereas figures compiled by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966, show that of the 4,873 servicemen who lost their lives in the fight for freedom in Vietnam, approximately 20% were buried in national cemeteries. In addition to those who were interred in national cemeteries, many more would probably have been buried in a national cemetery had there been available space near the home of next of kin; and

Whereas over the past three (3) years there has been a determined effort on the part of some federal agencies to sharply curtail or do away altogether with any further provision for national cemeteries, and the Bureau of the Budget has stated unequivocally, "We continue to believe that expan-

sion of the national cemetery is undesirable. The Administration firmly believes that funeral benefits now paid by the Veterans Administration and under Social Security are far preferable to the furnishing of interment facilities by the Government. Legislation to this end would not be in accord with the program of the President"; and

Whereas present day burial expenses are sufficiently high without placing on the veteran's and serviceman's dependent the added cost of purchasing a burial plot, which cost can run into astronomical figures for the widow who has little income; and

Whereas, the burial allowance of the Veterans Administration and that provided under Social Security are far too meager to provide for the last rites of most veterans and servicemen; and

Whereas, the Department of the Army has advised Congress that "The Administration has determined that it is opposed to any further expansion of the present national cemetery with the exception of Arlington National Cemetery"; and

Whereas, it is perfectly evident that the present administration is determined to end the national cemetery system just as soon as present facilities are exhausted. This procedure is a rank departure from the long-time precedent that veterans who have served their nation in the time of war are entitled to burial sites provided by the United States Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the first session of the thirty-first Oklahoma Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urged to take such action as necessary to forestall the present plans of the Bureau of the Budget and the administration, and to oppose the position of that Department of Defense, which supports the administration's policy of no further expansion of the national cemetery system, with the exception of the Arlington National Cemetery, as many national cemeteries have already exhausted available space and several others are scheduled for closing this year.

SEC. 2. That the Department of Defense be requested to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to make national cemeteries available with burial spaces for all U.S. Military servicemen and servicewomen who are entitled to the same, and wish to be interred therein.

SEC. 3. That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the United States Senate; the Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives; The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; The Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; The Honorable Charles L. Schultz, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by the Senate the 28th day of March 1967.

GEORGE HIGG, President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 29th day of March 1967.

REX PRIVETT, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

BASIL R. WILSON, Secretary of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 106. Resolution extending the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress (Rept. No. 160).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1468. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent the benefit amount of certain widows from being reduced on account of the changes made by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 in the provisions relating to determination of family status in the case of certain children born out of wedlock; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Wang Dal Pao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1470. A bill for the relief of the Ida Group of Mining Claims in Josephine County, Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1471. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hugo Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1472. A bill to protect the Nation's consumers and to assist the commercial fishing industry through the inspection of establishments processing fish and fishery products in commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CASE, Mr. DOBB, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PELL, and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 1473. A bill to provide Federal leadership and grants to the States for developing and implementing State programs for youth camp safety standards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HILL, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to extend the period for making no change of conditions under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

FISHERY PRODUCTS PROTECTION ACT OF 1967

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am today introducing a revised version of a mandatory fish inspection bill which I first introduced as S. 3922 on October 18, 1966.

By and large the earlier bill met with a favorable reception. There was wide recognition that Federal inspection of fish and fishery products would be beneficial to the consumer and would also strengthen the industry.

Since last fall I have had meetings with various segments of the industry, with several of my colleagues, and with Government officials. I believe that the new bill entitled the Fish Products Protection Act of 1967, is an improvement over the earlier version in several respects.

For example, the educational and preparatory period during which the industry will have opportunity to gear up to meet the new standards has been lengthened from 3 to 6 years. The role of the State inspection systems has been strengthened. The coverage of imported fish has been spelled out in greater detail. The sections on criminal penalties have been removed.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that with these changes the acceptance of this new proposal will be such that we can move forward promptly with hearings and floor action.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a summary of its provisions be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1472) to protect the Nation's consumers and to assist the commercial fishing industry through the inspection of establishments processing fish and fishery products in commerce, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1472

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fishery Products Protection Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) The term "commerce" means travel, trade, traffic, transportation, or communication in any State and a point outside thereof, or between points in the same State but through a point outside thereof;

(b) The term "State" includes the States of the United States, its territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(c) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(d) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or association;

(e) The term "fish" means any aquatic animal or part thereof intended for human food;

(f) The term "fishery products" means any edible part of fish that is processed separately or in combination with other ingredients for human food;

(g) The terms "process" or "processed" or "processing" mean the handling, storing, preparation, production, manufacture, preserving, packing, transporting, or holding of any fish or fishery products;

(h) The term "wholesome" means sound, healthful, clean, and otherwise suitable for use as human food;

(i) The term "unwholesome" means—
(1) Unsound, injurious to health, or otherwise rendered unsuitable for use as human food; or

(2) Consisting in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance; or
(3) Presence of bacteria of public health significance; or

(4) Processed under unsanitary conditions whereby fish or any fishery products may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby any fishery products may have been rendered injurious to health; or

(5) Packaged in a container composed of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health;

(j) The term "inspection service" means the agency or agencies designated by the Secretary as having the responsibility to carry out the provisions of this Act;

(k) The term "inspector" means any person authorized by the Secretary to inspect fish and fishery products;

(l) The term "official inspection mark" means any symbol prescribed by the Secretary;

(m) The term "official establishment" means any establishment that has been issued a certificate of registration by the Secretary;

(n) The term "establishment" means the premises, buildings, structures, facilities, and equipment used in the processing of fish and fishery products.

(o) The term "vessel of the United States" means any vessel of five net tons and upward that is enrolled, licensed, or documented under the laws of the United States and entitled to the privileges of vessels employed in the fisheries;

(p) The terms "container" or "package" include, but are not limited to, any box, can, tin, cloth, plastic, or any other receptacle, wrapper, or cover;

(q) The term "label" means any written, printed, or graphic material upon the shipping container, if any, or upon the immediate container of the fishery product or accompanying such product, including, but not limited to, the individual consumer package;

(r) The term "shipping container" means any container used or intended for use in packaging the product packed in an immediate container;

(s) The term "immediate container" includes any consumer package, or any other container in which fish or fishery products, not consumer packaged, are packed.

SEC. 3 Congress declares that wholesome fish and fishery products are an important source of the Nation's food supply; and that unwholesome and adulterated fish or fishery products moving in the channels of commerce or directly affecting commerce are injurious to the consumers, adversely affect the marketing of wholesome fish and fishery products, result in losses to producers and fishermen, and limit markets for such products. It is the purpose of this Act to prevent such adverse effects.

SEC. 4. (a) In furtherance of the purpose of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct, directly or by contract, a survey of the methods, practices, and sanitary conditions of the establishments in the United States and vessels of the United States processing fish or fishery products. The Secretary shall then develop and promulgate, by regulation, adequate sanitary standards and practices for establishments processing fish or fishery products in any State for movement in commerce and for establishments the operations of which directly affect the movement of fish and fishery products in commerce and for vessels of the United States.

(b) The Secretary shall, based on studies, surveys, and other information, also issue adequate and effective regulations to assure (1) that imported fish or fishery products are safe, healthful, wholesome, unadulterated, and suitable for human food, and (2) that the containers of such products are safe and comply with such sanitary standards as he may prescribe.

(c) Such regulations shall be promulgated within three years after the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 5. Effective three years after the effective date of the regulations promulgated under section 4 of this Act:

(a) No person shall process any fish or fishery products in any establishment for movement in commerce or in any establishment the operations of which directly affect the movement of fish and fishery products in commerce unless such establishment has

been issued a certificate of registration by the Secretary, or unless the Secretary determines, in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of this Act, that the State wherein such establishment is located provides an adequate and enforceable system of regulation, certification, and inspection of such establishment and the fish and fishery products processed therein.

(b) No fish or fishery products shall be imported into the United States unless they comply, as determined by the Secretary, with the regulations issued under section 4 of this Act for imported fish and fishery products. All imported fish and fishery products, after entry into any State in compliance with such regulations, shall be treated as domestic fish and fishery products within the meaning of, and subject to, the provisions of this Act.

(c) The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary, shall encourage foreign countries importing fish and fishery products into any State to establish enforceable sanitary standards and practices for establishments and vessels of those countries processing fish and fishery products for such importation and a system of certification and inspection of such establishments and vessels. Such standards and practices must be consistent with those promulgated by the Secretary under this Act. The Secretary may authorize such countries to use an official inspection mark on each immediate container and shipping container of imported wholesome and unadulterated fishery products. No country shall use such a mark on containers of imported fishery products unless authorized by the Secretary. Containers with unauthorized marks shall not be allowed to enter into any State.

SEC. 6. (a) Any person who is required by section 5 of this Act to have a certificate of registration, and who is denied a certificate of registration shall upon request be given a hearing by the Secretary whose determination shall be final.

(b) The certificate of registration of any official establishment that fails to comply with the provisions of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder may be suspended upon notice by the Secretary. The holder of the suspended certificate may at any time apply for reinstatement of the certificate, and the Secretary shall immediately reinstate it if, after an opportunity for a hearing, he finds that adequate measures have been taken to comply with the requirements of the Act and regulations.

(c) Any inspector shall have access to any official establishment for the purpose of ascertaining whether the conditions of the certificate are being complied with. Denial of access for such inspection shall be ground for suspension of the certificate.

SEC. 7. In order to provide technical assistance to the commercial fishing industry in meeting the requirements of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder, the Secretary shall utilize to the greatest extent feasible the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall encourage each State to provide an adequate system of regulation, certification, and inspection of establishments located in the State that process fish and fishery products for movement in commerce and establishments the operations of which directly affect the movement of fish and fishery products in commerce, and the fish and fishery products processed therein, including, but not limited to, the promulgation and enforcement of sanitary standards and practices that are consistent with those promulgated by the Secretary. Whenever the Secretary determines that a State has provided such system, he shall publish in the Federal Register a notice to that effect and thereafter establishments and persons in that State shall be subject to the requirements

of said system in lieu of the requirements of this Act, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Secretary from rescinding such notice and reasserting Federal jurisdiction over such establishments and persons under this Act if he determines that such action is in the public interest.

Sec. 9. For the purpose of this Act, fish and fishery products shall be deemed to be adulterated:

(a) If they bear or contain any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render them injurious to health, but, if the substance is not an added substance such fish and fishery products shall not be considered adulterated under this paragraph if the quantity of such substance in such fish and fishery products does not ordinarily render them injurious to health; or

(b) If they bear or contain any added poisonous or added deleterious substance, unless such substance is permitted in their production or is unavoidable under good manufacturing practices, as may be determined by the Secretary or under other provisions of Federal law limiting or tolerating the quantity of such added substance: *Provided*, That any quantity of such added substances exceeding the limits so fixed shall also be deemed to constitute adulteration; or

(c) If any substance has been substituted, wholly or in part therefor; or

(d) If damage or inferiority has been concealed in any manner; or

(e) If any substance has been added thereto or mixed or packed therewith so as to increase its bulk or weight, or reduce its quality, or make it appear better or of greater value than it is.

Sec. 10. Every vessel of the United States harvesting or processing fish or fishery products for movement in commerce shall be constructed, equipped, operated and maintained, to meet such sanitary standards and practices as the Secretary may prescribe.

Sec. 11. All fish and fishery products processed in an official establishment for movement in commerce or in an official establishment the operations of which directly affect the movement of fish and fishery products in commerce or on vessels of the United States and the containers of such products shall be subject to inspection and reinspection by sampling or other methods by the Secretary at any time when processed for introduction into commerce.

Sec. 12. (a) Each immediate container and shipping container of wholesome and unadulterated fishery products may bear in distinctly legible form at the time such products leave the official establishment an official inspection mark. Such container shall bear in distinctly legible form the name of the products, a statement of ingredients, if fabricated from two or more ingredients, including a declaration as to artificial flavors, colors, or preservatives, if any, the net weight or other appropriate measure of the contents of such container, and the name of the processor or the name and address of the distributor. The Secretary may permit reasonable variations and grant exemptions from the foregoing requirements when, in his judgment, such variations and exemptions would effectuate the purpose of this Act.

(b) The use of any written, printed, or graphic matter on or accompanying any fishery products or the immediate container or shipping container thereof leaving an official establishment which is false or misleading in any manner is prohibited.

(c) No fishery products leaving an official establishment may be sold or offered for sale by any person under any false or deceptive name. Established trade names which are usual to such products and which are not false and deceptive are permitted.

(d) If the Secretary determines that any label used or prepared for use by any person is false or misleading in any particular, he

may order such person to discontinue the use of such label except as modified in the manner prescribed by the Secretary. Such person may request a hearing, but the use of the label shall, if the Secretary so directs, be withheld pending a hearing and final determination by the Secretary. Such final determination shall be conclusive unless within thirty days after receipt of notice of such determination such person appeals to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such person has his principal place of business or to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. An appeal may be taken by filing with the clerk of such court a written petition praying that the Secretary's order be set aside or modified in the manner stated in the petition, together with a bond in such sum as the court may determine to cover the costs of the proceedings, if the court so directs. The provisions of section 204(b) through (h) of the Act of August 15, 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 194), shall be applicable to appeals taken under this section.

Sec. 13. No person shall:

(a) Process, sell, offer for sale, transport, or deliver any fish or fishery products from any establishment for movement in commerce or the operations of which directly affect the movement of fish and fishery products in commerce or from a vessel of the United States which is unwholesome, adulterated, or otherwise unsuitable for use as human food;

(b) Sell or otherwise dispose of for human food any fish or fishery products which have been inspected and declared to be unwholesome or adulterated or otherwise unsuitable for use as human food under this Act;

(c) Deliver, receive, transport, sell, or offer for sale or transport for human food any fish or part thereof separately or in combination with other ingredients, other than fishery products, from an official establishment or vessel of the United States except in accordance with the provisions of this Act;

(d) Deliver, receive, transport, sell, or offer for sale or transport for human food fish or fishery products from an establishment whose certificate of registration has been suspended;

(e) Use or reuse any immediate or shipping container bearing an official inspection mark except for fishery products from an official establishment unless the mark is removed, obliterated, or otherwise destroyed;

(f) Falsely make or issue, alter, forge, simulate, counterfeit, use, or possess any official inspection certificate, memorandum, mark, or other identification, or device for making such mark or identification authorized by this Act, or cause, procure, aid, assist in, or be a party to, such false marking, issuing, altering, forging, simulating, counterfeiting, use or possession contrary to the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 14. For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Act, any person engaged in the business of processing, transporting, shipping, or receiving fish or fishery products for movement in commerce or conducting operations which directly affect the movement of fish or fishery products in commerce shall maintain records showing, to the extent that such person is concerned therewith, the receipt, delivery, sale, movement, or disposition of fish or fishery products and shall, upon request, permit the Secretary at reasonable times to inspect such records. Such records shall be maintained for a reasonable period to be determined by the Secretary.

Sec. 15. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to any wholesale establishment where the only processing involved is the cutting up of fish or fishery products for sale to retail outlets of any kind or description; or to any retail establishments pri-

marily engaged in selling fish and fishery products and other items directly to retail consumers; or to any fisherman selling fish harvested by him directly to retail consumers.

Sec. 16. The cost of inspecting fish or fishery products, establishments, vessels, containers, labels, or other matters in accordance with this Act and the regulations issued thereunder shall be borne by the United States, except that the cost of overtime and holiday work performed in official establishments or vessels of the United States shall be borne by the owner or person in charge of such establishments or vessels at such rates as the Secretary may determine. Any amount received by the Secretary in reimbursement for sums paid by him for such work shall be credited to the appropriation from which payments for such work were made.

Sec. 17. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction for good cause shown to restrain any violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder.

Sec. 18. All fish and fishery products determined to be unwholesome or adulterated pursuant to any inspection or reinspection conducted pursuant to section 11 of this Act shall be condemned. Any person whose fish and fishery products are condemned may appeal to the Secretary from such initial inspection and the condemned fish and fishery products shall be marked and segregated pending such appeal. The determination of the Secretary on appeal shall be final and if he sustains the initial determination the fish and fishery products shall be destroyed: *Provided*, That any fish and fishery products that may be made wholesome and unadulterated by reprocessing shall not be condemned and destroyed if reprocessed under the supervision of an inspector and found by him to be wholesome and unadulterated.

Sec. 19. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Secretary may utilize the services, equipment, and facilities of any Federal agency with or without reimbursement in carrying out the provisions of this Act and may designate any Federal agency as an inspection agency.

Sec. 20. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The summary presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE FISHERY PRODUCTS PROTECTION ACT OF 1967

1. The bill provides a system for upgrading and inspecting fish and fishery products processing operations performed in establishments engaged in commerce and vessels of the United States. It applies both to domestic and imported fish and fishery products. The bill exempts retail outlets, certain wholesalers, and fishermen selling harvested fish directly to the consumer.

2. The bill provides an initial three-year period to study and survey the commercial fishing industry and its processing practices and to develop and issue sanitary standards and practices for processing establishments and vessels. At the same time, the Secretary must also issue regulations governing imported fish and fishery products.

3. After the regulations are issued, industry will have an opportunity to gear up to meet the standards and practices. Three years after the effective date of the regulations, each establishment will have to have a certificate of registration to show that the establishment complies with the Act. Simi-

larly, no fish or fishery products will be permitted entry into the United States unless the importer meets the sanitation requirements.

4. The bill directs the Secretary of State to encourage foreign governments importing fish and fishery products into this country to adopt a system of certification and inspection which is equal to the one authorized by this bill. Once a country does have such a system, the Secretary of the Interior may authorize the importers from those countries to use an official inspection mark.

5. The bill recognizes that States now have or will have an inspection and certification system of their own. Where this occurs, the Secretary will recognize the State system in lieu of the Federal system.

6. The method of enforcement is injunctive relief and suspension of the certificate. Where fish and fishery products are inspected and found to be unwholesome or adulterated, the Secretary may condemn them.

7. The cost of this program will be borne by the Secretary, except where overtime and holiday work are involved.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Youth Camp Safety Act."

The bill would establish a joint Federal-State program to improve youth camp safety standards, and has the following objectives:

First. The establishment and publication of Federal standards for youth camp safety developed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare after consultation with representatives of the States, private persons, and organizations concerned with youth camping and camp safety;

Second. The establishment of State programs to insure compliance with Federal standards;

Third. Encouraging camps which comply with Federal standards to publicize the fact, in order that parents and others seeking camps for their children might be assured that objective minimum standards of health and safety are met at the camp of their choice;

Fourth. Grants available during a period of 5 years to assist participating States to develop and carry out compliance and inspection programs;

Fifth. In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be required to submit an annual report to the Congress dealing with the implementation of the youth camp safety program, the problems encountered and recommendations for improvement.

The bill is not a Federal licensing mechanism. It specifically prohibits interference by any Federal or State official in the curriculum, program, or ministry of a youth camp. It establishes no additional Federal bureaucracy to administer the act—leaving that to the States. In short, it is a reasonable attempt to establish minimum safety standards for youth camps, and to give parents a simple way to determine that the camp they select for their children complies with those standards.

Each year about 6 million children attend resident or day camps or participate in travel camps or teen tours throughout the Nation and overseas.

In a few States, there are excellent, comprehensive regulations covering camp safety. In 19 States, there are no regulations at all—in the rest, only a few aspects of the situation are covered.

In the absence of State action, a number of private organizations have been active in the field. The American Camping Association, the Christian Camp Association, the American Association of Private Camps, the Boy Scouts of America, the Red Cross and National Safety Council, and many other associations and organizations, have diligently provided real leadership in the camp safety field. Yet it is estimated that only 40 to 50 percent of the more than 12,000 day, resident, and travel camps throughout the country meet basic safety standards.

Camps take the place of parents—they care for our most precious possessions: our children. It does seem to me reasonable that society, acting through its government, assure parents that the camps they choose for their youngsters meet minimum safety standards.

I emphasize that this legislation would not affect the vast majority of youth camps—for the vast majority, I am convinced, operate with primary concern for the welfare and safety of their campers and with a real love for children. But there are camps, far too many, which do not meet minimum reasonable standards of safety. In meetings with camping officials over the past months, I have heard enough horror stories about situations in nonaccredited and unaffiliated camps to be convinced that legislation in the field is desirable and necessary.

Last year I introduced similar legislation. During the recess of the Congress, my staff and I met with scores of camp directors, officials of camping associations, and leaders in the camp safety field. They suggested amendments to my original proposal, and for the most part, these amendments have been incorporated into the present bill. I am delighted that the American Camping Association, which has worked closely with my staff, has seen fit to endorse this legislation and urge its adoption. The ACA, with more than 7,000 members representing 1.5 million campers in a vast cross section of all forms and kinds of camping—Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, 4-H Clubs, Boys Clubs, Campfire Girls, and thousands more—states its official position:

"In summary, the majority of the membership of the American Camping Association conclude that the enactment of a Youth Camp Safety Act by the Federal government would contribute significantly to providing a safer milieu among all camps operating in the fifty states and, on that basis, the majority of the general membership of the American Camping Association and the National Board of Directors support and endorse the efforts of Senator Ribicoff to bring such a bill into reality in this session of the Congress.

I am also deeply grateful for the support and encouragement of the Association of Private Camps—an organization which has taken the initiative in establishing a strong and well-enforced safety

code for its over 250 member camps—and the Christian Camping Association, with whose leadership and many of its members my staff has worked closely in developing this bill.

How would the youth camp safety program work?

First, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would, after consultation with an advisory council, State leaders, and after opportunity for hearing, establish and promulgate youth camp safety standards.

Second, States would be encouraged to establish programs of annual inspection to insure compliance with Federal standards by camps operated within their boundaries. Federal matching annual grants-in-aid of up to \$50,000 per State would be available to help defray the cost to the States of such programs.

Third, camps which were found to comply with the Federal standards would be authorized and encouraged to display the fact of such compliance.

In essence, this would mean that a parent seeking a camp for his child would have a simple, readily available test. Does the camp meet Federal safety standards, or does it not? Surely, this is the least we can do to assure a safe and healthy camping experience for our youngsters.

Mr. President, this legislation has the support of the vast majority of organized camping. Most camps already measure up. Those that do not will have the opportunity to improve. Those that will not maintain safe conditions do not deserve to be in business.

We have an unusual opportunity here to insure the safety and welfare of millions of children at a relatively modest cost. I urge favorable consideration of the youth camp safety bill.

Mr. President, the bill is introduced on behalf of myself, and Senators BAYH, CASE, DODD, JAVITS, KENNEDY of NEW YORK, MAGNUSON, PELL, and MONDALE.

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

The bill (S. 1473) to provide Federal leadership and grants to the States for developing and implementing State programs for youth camp safety standards, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a position paper of the American Camping Association, a position paper from the Association of Private Camps, and a table prepared by Dr. John Kirk of the ACA, describing existing camp safety regulations in States throughout the Nation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the position papers and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Camping Association, Inc., Bradford Woods, Martinsville, Ind.]

POSITION PAPER: YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT, 1966 SENATE BILL 3773

INTRODUCTION

On August 26, 1966, Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut introduced the Youth

Camp Safety Act of 1966 (S. 3773) into the United States Senate. The American Camping Association had been aware of this pending legislation, and at the request of Senator Ribicoff's Administrative Assistant, the ACA Executive Director had, on several occasions been in contact with Senator Ribicoff's office.

The purpose of this Act is to protect and safeguard the health and well-being of the youth of the nation attending camps by providing minimum safety regulations to be implemented by states electing to participate in this program. The Federal Government will provide financial assistance and leadership for the states in order to accomplish this goal.

At the present time there are 17 states which require camps to be licensed and inspected annually, 26 states have regulatory programs intended to supervise the operation of various aspects of children's camps.

After much discussion and serious study, the ACA National Board of Directors at their October meeting, voted to submit a position paper that would support the intent of the Youth Camp Safety Act, since it is educational in scope. In the same motion, the National Board called for a Consultation to be held in order to provide the various elements of organized camping in the United States an opportunity to react to the provisions of Senate Bill 3773. This consultation, chaired by Dr. John J. Kirk, chairman of the ACA National Standards Committee, was held November 19, 1966, in New York City. A list of the participants is included as Appendix B. As a result of the consultation, a working paper was developed by Dr. Kirk and reviewed by Howard Gibbs, National President of ACA, Mrs. Hattie Smith, National Legislative Chairman, and Ernest F. Schmidt, Executive Director of ACA. The working paper was then sent to the forty Sections of the American Camping Association requesting that a special meeting be set up at which time the reaction and opinion of the general membership could be solicited.

The working paper reflected, in essence, the opinion of the representatives in attendance at the consultation, and that consensus was that Senate Bill 3773, and the principles embodied therein, should be supported. Thirty of the forty Sections of the American Camping Association have reacted to the working paper and the majority also support the principles and purpose of Senate Bill 3773. Some concerns and suggestions have been made by the various Sections of the American Camping Association, and these suggestions and concerns will be reflected in the Section-by-Section discussion of the bill which follows. In order that the minority opinion may also be heard, certain selected comments from Section representatives will be included in Appendix A.

The following Section-by-Section analysis of the bill represents the official opinion and position taken by the majority of the Sections reacting to the bill and the working paper which was developed as a result of the special consultation on November 19th:

AMERICAN CAMPING ASSOCIATION OFFICIAL POSITION ON SENATE BILL 3773

Section 2. Statement of Purpose. The majority of the membership of the American Camping Association is in agreement with the purpose of the Act as stated. This bill would serve, primarily, as an educational tool, whereby the participating states would have trained camp evaluators visit the camps in the state and determine whether or not the camps were meeting the established minimum criteria. Those camps that were satisfactorily complying with the minimum federal safety regulations would receive a

statement of compliance. ACA does not recommend using the term "Seal of Approval," "Accreditation," or "Certification," for camps meeting the minimum criteria. Camps that failed to meet the minimum federal regulations would be deprived of the privileges of indicating compliance, but would not be closed or placed on any provisional status as a result of the provisions of this bill.

Section 3. Definitions. In the definition of a Youth Camp, the membership expressed concern over the use of the term "Instructional" rather than "educational," and it is recommended that Line 8, Page 2, be amended to read "for educational and recreational purposes," rather than "recreational or instructional," as it now appears. It was also suggested that consideration be given to including the evaluation of travel camps, in addition to resident and day camps. Since the majority of travel camps move across state lines, they are frequently excluded from any state regulatory programs which are now in existence. In order to provide the general public with an awareness concerning minimum standards for travel camps, and in order to more adequately protect children attending these camps, it is recommended that the bill include a provision to evaluate such camps.

It was also recognized that some national organizations conduct rather extensive programs through travel camps and such organizations should be given consideration as a certifying agency and that under the provision of the state programs being developed would be permitted to certify their own travel camps. This provision would only apply when the standards of the organization in question were at least equal to, or above, the minimum safety regulations that would be developed by the Advisory Council and approved by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. This suggestion is made, since it might prove administratively impossible for state evaluators to visit and evaluate the many travel camps operated by some national organizations.

In order to standardize the language as applied to organized camping, it is further recommended that a glossary of camp terminology be developed in order that there be uniform understanding and interpretation of the various terms now applied to a summer camp operation. Such a glossary of terms would be of considerable assistance to those organizations which operate camps in several states.

Section 4. Grants to States for Youth Camp Safety Standards. The general reaction to this section of the bill is that the financial provisions appear adequate for the implementation of the program in the fifty states. With the federal government providing fifty percent of the cost to implement the program, this should be sufficient to encourage states to initiate a program intended to safeguard the health and welfare of children while participating in a summer camp experience.

Section 6. State Plans. The provision that a state agency be designated or created to supervise the program caused some concern. It seems that within the existing framework of the state health department, the state welfare department, or the state department of education, this program could be initiated, and it would be unnecessary to establish or create a new state agency. A provision should be added to this section that would require the participating states to hire a person to serve as supervisor for the new program. It is strongly recommended that the National Office of the American Camping Association be designated as the cooperating agency with which the states work in developing the job specifications for such an individual. This recommendation is made

since ACA is the only national organization which includes in its membership representatives from all segments of the organized camping profession, such as agency, private, church, government, and family. The strength and success of the programs could depend to a great extent on the qualifications of the supervisor of the program, such an individual should be trained in outdoor education, camping, and outdoor recreation.

Although implied, it is not specifically stated that the participating states would be required to annually visit and evaluate the camps in order for a said camp to qualify. Such wording should be included in the provisions of the bill.

This section of the bill also suggests that the participating states encourage the camps to advertise compliance with the federal minimum safety regulations. In any such advertising, the camps should be required to use the term "compliance with minimum regulations" rather than "certified" or "accredited" in order to avoid any confusion with the American Camping Association accreditation program, which stresses optimum camp operation rather than compliance with minimum safety regulations. The American Camping Association must educate the general public regarding the difference between compliance with minimum federal regulations and meeting the American Camping Association's standards, which are pointing towards the optimum of camp operation. A camp which satisfactorily complies with the federal minimum safety regulations means only that a child is less likely to be killed or injured in said camp. The federal minimum safety regulations in no way could be used as a measurement of the quality of the camping experience provided. This should be clearly stated in any literature or pronouncements made by the state or federal government.

Under Section 6, describing State Plans, there should also be a provision that camp directors be granted the right to an "Executive Hearing" in those cases where they feel the state has been unfair in the appraisal of their camps. In the bill, there is the implied provision that camp operators be entitled to a judicial hearing, and this provision would remain even with the addition of an Executive Hearing. The advantage of an Executive Hearing is that it would not be necessary for the camp director to hire counsel and such a hearing could be scheduled more quickly than a judicial review, which would have to follow the various steps which are common in any such court action.

Section 7. Determination Federal Share. The provisions under this Section of the bill seem adequate and would not adversely affect the administration or implementation of the bill in any way. The \$50,000 maximum appears to be quite generous, and it appears doubtful that any state would require this amount on a fifty percent matching basis.

Section 8. Operation of State Plans. The provision under this Section provide for the states to appeal the decision of the federal government to disapprove or terminate participation in the program. It appears that this Section adequately protects the right of the state to accept or reject the provisions of the bill, and it also provides adequately for appeal, if and when said state is dissatisfied with the ruling of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Section 9. Advisory Council on Youth Camp Safety. Considerable concern has been expressed by the general membership regarding the make-up and number of the National Advisory Council. The feeling has been expressed that this Council should be composed of camping professionals. It was further recommended that the make-up of

the Council be predetermined by designating the organization that should be represented. Since the American Camping Association stands as the only professional organization in the United States representing all segments of the organized camping movement, it is felt that one-third of the membership of the Advisory Council consists of American Camping Association representatives. The following groups and individuals are suggested for membership on the National Advisory Council: The Executive Director, American Camping Association; Chairman, American Camping Association, National Standards Committee; Chairman, American Camping Association National Legislation Committee; Vice-President for Private Camps, American Camping Associations; Director of Camping Services and Conservation, or designated representative, Boy Scouts of America; Director of Camping, or designated representative, Girl Scouts of the United States; Director of Camping, or designated representative, Camp Fire Girls, Inc.; designated representative from the National Council of Churches; designated representative from the National 4-H Programs; designated representative from the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults; designated representative from the Boys' Clubs of America; designated representative from the National Catholic Camping Association; designated representative from the Young Men's Christian Association; designated representative from the Young Women's Christian Association; Camping Consultant from the National Jewish Welfare Board; designated representative from the Christian Camps and Conferences Association, Inc. By selecting the twelve or more representatives from organizations of this type, it would insure that the voice of organized camping was represented to the fullest and that any safety standards developed by this group would truly represent the current and best thinking of organizations concerned with organized camping. This Advisory Council should also be empowered to call upon the services of such organizations as the National Safety Council, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and other specialized professional organizations which might have information and suggestions for the development of adequate safety regulations.

It was further suggested that the provisions of the bill specifically state that each participating state be required to establish a State Advisory Council made up of similar membership as that represented on the National Council. This would insure a local voice in the implementation of the federal minimum safety regulations and also provide an opportunity for closer supervision on the implementation and enforcement of the state program.

Section 11. *Authorization.* The financial provisions under authorization in the bill seem appropriate in order to pursue and carry out the intent and purpose of the Act.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The provisions of the Youth Camp Safety Act appear to strengthen organized camping and, if enacted, would actually contribute significantly to a safer milieu in all participating camps.

At the present time, there are over a million children attending camps that do not affiliate with any national organization and do not necessarily adhere to any established set of operating standards. Under the provisions of the Youth Camp Safety Act, a minimum set of safety regulations would be developed and through an appropriate state agency, camps in participating states would be able to have the educational benefit of being alerted to the need for following these minimum regulations in order to adequately

safeguard the health and welfare of the children they serve. This would also provide a means whereby parents could, at least, be aware of the minimum safety provisions necessary in order to adequately safeguard the child during the camping experience. *It must be stressed that the provisions of this bill and application of this bill by state programs in no way guarantees a quality camping experience, nor does it guarantee that all camps in a participating state would be operating at a level of competence which would adequately safeguard the health, welfare, and safety of children.* It does, however, require that states that participate will annually evaluate camps within their boundaries and measure the operation of these camps against an established criteria which would be the federal minimum safety regulations. The program would also provide an educational tool for those camp operators who do not, at the present time, have the benefit of guidance and supervision from a professional camping organization.

It must also be pointed out that some states already have very adequate regulatory programs, and this bill should in no way adversely affect the continuation and expansion of such existing programs. If a state with a regulatory program already has in effect regulations which are above the federal minimum safety regulations, then the state in question should not be required to lower or modify its regulations in any way in order to qualify for participation in the federal program, nor should such a state be denied the benefit of federal financial aid to assist in financing their existing programs. The advantage of having one uniform set of minimum safety regulations rather than 50 or more possibly conflicting operating codes is self-evident.

In summary, the majority of the membership of the American Camping Association conclude that the enactment of a Youth Camp Safety Act by the federal government would contribute significantly to providing a safer milieu among all camps operating in the fifty states and, on that basis, the majority of the general membership in the American Camping Association and the National Board of Directors support and endorse the efforts of Senator Ribicoff to bring such a bill into reality in this session of the Congress.

Approved by ACA Executive Committee, January 20, 1967.

Appendix A—Concerns and fears expressed by some members of the American Camping Association

The following comments were gleaned from the Section Reports, and although they do not reflect the majority opinion of the general membership of the American Camping Association, are being included in order that a more complete view of the opinions of the total membership might be reflected in this Position Paper:

1. "The National Advisory Council should be expanded in order to provide for broader representation. Fifteen or eighteen members would provide a more representative voice for all segments of the camping profession."

2. "The bill, as written, lacks 'teeth,' and unless a provision is added which would force camps to adhere to the minimum safety regulations, the bill has no real value. Unless a camp which fails to meet the regulations can be forced to comply, the bill fails to accomplish its purpose."

3. "Federal funds are not necessary, and the states should be encouraged to voluntarily develop minimum safety regulations to serve as a guide for organized camps. Federal funds only lead to federal control which is not needed or desired."

4. "The American Camping Association Standards Visitation Program should be used

in lieu of state inspections. Camp directors are already subjected to more inspections and evaluations than really required."

5. "There is a danger that government bureaucracy will smother all real camping experiences. Program areas should not be regulated in any way. This bill might open a 'Pandora's Box' of government regulations with applications going far beyond those now foreseen."

6. "There is no guarantee that state evaluators will have any professional training in measuring the effectiveness of a camp operation. This could be a 'pork barrel,' whereby states could award jobs based on political patronage rather than professional competence."

7. "Several states now have adequate programs and a federal program is not needed."

8. "The passage of such a bill will adversely affect the Standards Program of the American Camping Association."

9. "The federal government has no business in organized camping, and the implementation of regulations should be left to private agencies."

10. "There was a strong feeling that ACA might well be legislating itself out of business."

11. "A federal program will adversely affect present ACA relationships with state agencies."

12. "Before any federal legislation on camping is introduced, a thorough nationwide survey should be made to determine whether a real need for such legislation exists."

13. "The Federal Advisory Council could draft a model set of regulations to satisfy the intent of the bill—but without federal subsidy."

[From the Association of Private Camps, Inc., New York, N.Y.]

REPORT OF A STUDY GROUP OF THE ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE CAMPS CONCERNING THE YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT OF 1966, SENATE BILL S. 3773

On September 12, 1966, at the direction of the Board of Governors of the Association of Private Camps, a Study Group was organized consisting of the Officers of the Association of Private Camps and all Past Presidents of said organization for the purpose of considering the "Youth Camp Safety Act of 1966."

On the basis of the reports of said committee, representatives were appointed to meet with Senator Ribicoff's staff in order to discuss the provisions of the bill and to present the recommendations of the Study Group, as unanimously approved by the Board of Governors.

On February 21st, Mr. Abner Rabbino, Chairman of the Committee on "Youth Camp Safety Act"; Mr. Edwin Shapiro, President of the Association of Private Camps; Dr. S. L. Winnick, Past President and Mr. Lloyd A. Albin, Member; met with Mr. Wayne Granquist, Administrative Assistant and Mr. James Dorsch, Legislative Assistant to Senator Abraham Ribicoff in Washington, D.C.

Senator Ribicoff's office was advised that the Association of Private Camps, an organization representing professional camping for over 28 years, was wholeheartedly in approval of Senate Bill S. 3773.

It was indicated to the Senator's staff that our membership covers many of the states of our country and presently has more than 250 of the recognized leaders in the camping field. Nine years ago, realizing the necessity of maintaining high level standards, the Association passed a law making it mandatory for all its member camps to be Standards examined, in order to maintain accredited membership. Each of the member camps has been visited and its Standards have been evaluated by highly qualified pro-

professional people trained and experienced in the fields of camping, education, recreation and evaluation. The carefully selected staff of evaluators has no affiliation with any APC or other camp. This evaluating staff is comprised of faculty members from leading colleges and universities across the Country. Total membership compliance with up-dated APC Standards is insured by a continuing program of accreditation that schedules each member camp for a re-visit and a re-evaluation periodically, on a rotation basis.

We have contributed by way of Conventions and Symposiums in all phases of

camping. A vast amount of material is in the libraries of many Universities and also the Library of Congress. A number of our member directors have lectured at Universities and are on the Board of Trustees of many institutional camps. They have also served as advisors, without fee in this regard. Many colleges now give Point Credit to students who serve as counselors in our private camps, because these institutions of learning are aware of the vast opportunities that the student has under the aegis of our knowledgeable camp directors.

Most of our states have regulatory rules to which we subscribe. We enthusiastically

support the passing of any meaningful laws that will constructively contribute to raising the level of performance, leadership training, supervision, health and safety of camping. It is always true, however, that the implementation of any rules or laws becomes the dramatic and important objective.

We believe that we have outstanding and recognized professionals heading our camps. For the great contribution in thought and action that these people are capable of giving to a Council of from 12-18 members, we respectfully recommend that a minimum of five members of such a panel should come from the Association of Private Camps.

Analysis of State camp safety regulations

[Code—1 excellent; 2 good; 3 fair; 4 no regulations]

Category	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
I. Camp personnel:													
Age requirement for counselors.....	4	4	4	4	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Counselor to camper ratio.....	4	4	4	4	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Minimum age of director.....	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Required training for aquatic staff.....	4	4	4	3	2	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
II. Program:													
Supervision of activities.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Restriction for hazardous activities.....	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
III. Site and facilities:													
Location and drainage of site.....	4	2	2	2	1	1	4	1	1	4	4	4	1
Type and size of living quarters.....	4	2	4	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
Sleeping accommodations.....	4	1	4	1	3	1	4	1	1	4	4	4	1
IV. Administration:													
Responsibilities of the director.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	4	1	4	4	4	4
Personal histories.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
V. Health:													
Doctor on call.....	4	4	4	2	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	1
Physical exam required.....	4	4	4	1	2	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	2
Isolation quarters or camp infirmary.....	4	4	4	2	1	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	1
Health supervisor on staff.....	4	4	4	2	2	1	4	4	3	4	4	4	1
First-aid supplies.....	4	4	4	2	1	1	3	2	4	4	4	4	4
Medical treatment record.....	4	4	4	4	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
VI. Sanitation:													
Ratio of toilet facilities.....	3	1	1	4	1	1	1	4	1	4	4	4	4
Sewage disposal.....	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	4	4	1
Garbage and waste disposal.....	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	4	4	1
Food protection and food handling.....	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	1
Food storage and refrigeration.....	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	1
Milk supply and serving methods.....	4	2	4	1	1	1	4	3	3	4	4	4	1
Safe water supply.....	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	1
Sanitation of dishes and utensils.....	4	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	1
Insect, weed, and rodent control.....	4	4	3	4	1	2	4	2	2	4	4	4	2
Animal regulations.....	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Camp cleanliness.....	3	1	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	4	4	4	3
VII. Safety:													
Aquatic facilities.....	4	4	4	1	2	1	3	1	4	4	4	4	1
Archery ranges.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Rifle ranges.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Horseback riding procedures.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Fire regulations.....	4	3	3	4	1	1	3	2	3	4	4	4	1
Heating equipment.....	4	1	4	4	1	4	3	4	1	4	4	4	1
VIII. Transportation:													
Condition of camp vehicles.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Age and qualifications for drivers.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Category	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana
I. Camp personnel:													
Age requirement for counselors.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4
Counselor to camper ratio.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4
Minimum age of director.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4
Required training for aquatic staff.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4
II. Program:													
Supervision of activities.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	4
Restriction for hazardous activities.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4
III. Site and facilities:													
Location and drainage of site.....	4	4	2	1	4	1	4	1	3	3	4	4	1
Type and size of living quarters.....	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	1	3	3	4	4	4
Sleeping accommodations.....	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	1	2	1	4	4	4
IV. Administration:													
Responsibilities of the director.....	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	1	3	4	4	3
Personal histories of campers.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	4
V. Health:													
Doctor on call.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	2	1	4	4	4
Physical exam required.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	2	2	4	4	4
Isolation quarters or camp infirmary.....	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	1	1	1	4	4	4
Health supervisor on staff.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	4	4
First-aid supplies.....	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	1	1	1	4	4	4
Medical treatment record.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	4	4	4
VI. Sanitation:													
Ratio of toilet facilities.....	4	4	4	2	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	3
Sewage disposal.....	4	4	2	2	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	2
Garbage and waste disposal.....	4	4	2	3	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	3
Food protection and handling.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	4
Food storage and refrigeration.....	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	1	1	1	4	4	4
Milk supply and serving methods.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	4
Safe water supply.....	4	4	3	1	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	1
Sanitation of dishes and utensils.....	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	4
Insect, weed, and rodent control.....	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	1	4	4	4	1
Animal regulations.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	4	4	4
Camp cleanliness.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	2	4	1	4

Analysis of State camp safety regulations—Continued

[Code—1 excellent; 2 good; 3 fair; 4 no regulations]

Category	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana
VII. Safety:													
Aquatic facilities.....	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	1	1	3	4	4	4
Archery ranges.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	4
Rifle ranges.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4
Horseback riding procedures.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4
Fire regulations.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	4
Heating equipment.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
VIII. Transportation:													
Condition of camp vehicles.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Age and qualifications for drivers.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4

Category	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island
I. Camp personnel:													
Age requirement for counselors.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Counselor to camper ratio.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum age of director.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Required training for aquatic staff.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	2	4
II. Program:													
Supervision of activities.....	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Restriction for hazardous activities.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
III. Site and facilities:													
Location and drainage of site.....	2	4	1	4	4	2	1	4	2	4	4	1	4
Type and size of living quarters.....	3	4	1	4	4	2	3	4	2	4	4	4	4
Sleeping accommodations.....	1	4	1	4	4	3	2	4	1	4	4	4	3
IV. Administration:													
Responsibilities of the director.....	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	3
Personal histories of campers.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4
V. Health:													
Doctor on call.....	1	4	1	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Physical exam required.....	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	1	4	4	4	4
Isolation quarters or camp infirmary.....	1	4	1	4	4	4	3	4	1	4	4	4	4
Health supervisor on staff.....	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4
First aid supplies.....	1	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	1	4	4	4	4
Medical treatment record.....	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
VI. Sanitation:													
Ratio of toilet facilities.....	1	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	1	4	4	4	1
Sewage disposal.....	1	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	1	4	4	1	2
Garbage and waste disposal.....	2	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	1	4	4	1	2
Food protection and food handling.....	1	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	1	4	4	1	1
Food storage and refrigeration.....	1	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	1	4	4	1	1
Milk supply and serving methods.....	1	4	2	4	4	2	1	4	1	4	4	1	1
Safe water supply.....	1	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	1	4	4	1	2
Sanitation of dishes and utensils.....	1	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	1	4	4	1	1
Insect, weed, and rodent control.....	2	4	2	4	4	4	3	4	1	4	4	4	4
Animal regulations.....	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4
Camp cleanliness.....	1	4	1	4	4	3	1	4	1	4	4	2	3
VII. Safety:													
Aquatic facilities.....	2	4	2	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	2
Archery ranges.....	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4
Rifle ranges.....	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4
Horseback riding procedures.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Fire regulations.....	1	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	1	4	4	3	4
Heating equipment.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
VIII. Transportation:													
Condition of camp vehicles.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Age and qualifications for drivers.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Category	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin		Wyoming
										Residential	Day	
I. Camp personnel:												
Age requirement for counselors.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4
Counselor to camper ratio.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	2	4
Minimum age of director.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4
Required training for aquatic staff.....	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	2	1	4
II. Program:												
Supervision of activities.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4
Restriction for hazardous activities.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
III. Site and facilities:												
Location and drainage of site.....	1	4	4	4	4	3	2	1	1	4	4	1
Type and size of living quarters.....	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	1	3	4	4
Sleeping accommodations.....	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	1	1	1	4	4
IV. Administration:												
Responsibilities of the director.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3
Personal histories of campers.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4
V. Health:												
Doctor on call.....	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	1	4
Physical exam required.....	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	2	4
Isolation quarters or camp infirmary.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	3	4
Health supervisor on staff.....	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	2	4
First aid supplies.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	4
Medical treatment record.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	2	4
VI. Sanitation:												
Ratio of toilet facilities.....	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	1	1	1	1	4
Sewage disposal.....	1	4	4	4	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Garbage and waste disposal.....	1	4	4	4	4	1	2	1	1	1	2	2
Food protection and food handling.....	1	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Food storage and refrigeration.....	1	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Milk supply and serving methods.....	3	4	4	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	3	2
Safe water supply.....	1	4	4	4	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Sanitation of dishes and utensils.....	1	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Insect, weed, and rodent control.....	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	2	3	3	4
Animal regulations.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	2	2	4
Camp cleanliness.....	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	1	1	1	2

Analysis of State camp safety regulations—Continued

[Code—1 excellent; 2 good; 3 fair; 4 no regulations]

Category	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin		Wyoming
										Residential	Day	
VII. Safety:												
Aquatic facilities.....	1	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	1	1	1	4
Archery ranges.....	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4
Rifle ranges.....	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	4	4
Horseback riding procedures.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Fire regulations.....	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	2	1	4
Heating equipment.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4
VIII. Transportation:												
Condition of camp vehicles.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4
Age and qualifications for drivers....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of S. 1462, to amend section 602 of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 252) to provide that Federal financial assistance shall not be denied any hospital or patient therein on account of certain practices of said hospital, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] be added as a cosponsor at the next printing of S. 1378, a bill to designate the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore as the "Paul H. Douglas National Lakeshore."

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

CHANGE DUE IN U.S. POLICY TOWARD EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to many of us, the current dialog over changing attitudes in Europe, and how those changes should be reflected in official U.S. policy toward Europe, is long overdue. Clearly, policy has lagged behind these changing attitudes. There exists a real gap between Europe as viewed by the Europeans and the same continent as seen through American eyes.

Concern for this gap has prompted 44 Senators to cosponsor Senate Resolution 49, the aim of which is to bring about a substantial reduction in the number of U.S. military personnel now deployed in Western Europe. And it has stimulated considerable debate outside Congress, particularly in the Nation's press.

In this connection, I call the Senate's attention to an outstanding series of articles by Thomas W. Ottenad, staff correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The articles, which appeared in the Post-Dispatch on March 12 through 18, discuss in depth changes in England, West Germany, East Germany, the Common Market, and in the interrelationships between these and the United States.

Mr. Ottenad is a highly perceptive newspaperman who has the ability to ex-

tract the essence of an issue. He states in the opening article:

Radical charges are coming whether the United States wants them or not. Failure to cope with them will mean greater isolation from Europe.

In a first-rate piece of reporting, he goes on to prove his point. If any criticism may be implied, it is that Mr. Ottenad's series is not longer. I should think that an analysis of similarly high quality of the extent of interaction between other countries of Eastern and Western Europe would be most helpful.

Mr. President, I commend the reading of this series to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DOMINANCE IN EUROPE ENDS—WESTERN ALLIANCE IS WEAKENED BY DESIRE TO END THE COLD WAR—COMMUNIST SATELLITES ARE BECOMING MORE INDEPENDENT OF RUSSIA

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

First of a series

BERLIN, March 11.—Old values, beliefs and priorities in Europe are changing as the post-war world yields to a new order.

The final form and direction are by no means settled. However, some of the distinguishing characteristics are emerging:

Many Europeans believe that the Cold War is over and there is no longer serious danger of a hot war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

East and West are moving cautiously toward each other in business and political relations.

There is a greater tendency for America and Russia to communicate directly on the basic issues that only the superpowers can handle, leaving Europe in a subordinate role.

Behind the Iron Curtain the Communist satellites of eastern Europe, with East Germany a notable exception, are becoming increasingly independent of the Soviet Union.

A deepening gulf divides the United States from western Europe, marking the end of the age of American dominance and foretelling an era of looser, more difficult trans-Atlantic relations.

The political, military and diplomatic ties that bind the Western Alliance are weakening, although Europe's dependence on American nuclear strength prevents a fundamental rupture.

The old spirit of nationalism, with Gen. Charles de Gaulle the foremost advocate, is rising on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Radical changes are coming whether the United States wants them or not. Failure to cope with them will mean greater isolation from Europe.

These are some of the major impressions that emerge from conversations with diplo-

mats, political leaders, businessmen, academicians and others on a seven-week journey through Europe.

Nearly everywhere was a feeling of change. It made itself felt, not only in fundamental issues but in daily life as well. Living up to its reputation as Europe's "swinging city," London looked far sleeker than it did two years ago. Shop windows were colorful and contemporary rather than drab and traditional. The miniskirt was everywhere.

Paris and Rome were dotted with construction cranes. New high-rise apartment and office buildings are transforming the faces of these two handsome cities, not always for the better. Between Brussels and The Hague the Low Countries are becoming increasingly industrialized, with more chimneys than windmills dotting the Dutch countryside.

This divided city of Berlin reminds that the past is not completely gone. The Communist-built wall that in 1961 stopped the flight of East Germans to the West still cuts the city in two. Yet even here in this isolated western outpost, surrounded by Communist-held territory, the tension is noticeably less.

In general there is a feeling in Europe that the detente between East and West has been strengthened. Throughout the western democracies there is an all but universal belief that war is virtually impossible; thanks to the nuclear balance of terror. The Cuban missile crisis in 1962 is widely regarded in Europe as the turning point. When Russia pulled back there, it signalled a refusal to go over the nuclear brink.

The theory, so much more confidently accepted in Europe than in the United States, is not new, but it is more strongly held now than it was a few years ago. In Europe the split between the Soviet Union and Communist China is regarded as an unrivaled opportunity to forge closer bonds between East and West. As evidence of the Russian attitude Europeans point to a recent proposal by Premier Alexi N. Kosygin, for a treaty of friendship and co-operation with Great Britain.

The chance that is seen may not last, since the current chaos in China could end in the ascendancy of a group that would heal the rupture with Russia. So action must proceed quickly. And Europe wonders why the United States does not show more initiative, imagination and leadership in seizing the opportunity.

A visitor finds considerable criticism of the United States in Europe. In part, it stems from the war in Vietnam. American policy is condemned on moral grounds. The war is said to have damaged America's standing severely in some places. Yet for most Europeans the conflict in Asia is remote and of little direct concern. Diplomats agree that it has not yet endangered fundamental American-European ties.

Europeans grumble about the United States for other reasons, too. Many feel neglected. Others criticize President Lyn-

don B. Johnson for lack of interest in Europe or for policies that Europeans find confusing.

Rather surprisingly, there seems little objection in western Europe to the increasing tendency by the United States and the Soviet Union to deal directly on major world issues without consulting others. Of all the European nations, Germany remains most suspicious of any deal that might be made by the Big Two. But even the Germans are no longer completely hostile. Foreign Minister Willy Brandt told the Post-Dispatch:

"We welcome this American intention (to deal directly with Russia), for the German government wants to see East-West tension reduced. We realize that the United States and the Soviet Union carry a special responsibility in that."

A few weeks later, however, Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger attacked American-Soviet efforts to write a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. This, together with a threat to cut off its offset payments for British troops stationed in the Reich, raises serious questions about the unity of the new German coalition government and the continuity of its policies. It appears more flexible on some issues but more self-assertive on others. Worrisome, too, is a rising spirit of nationalism, demonstrated by the recent success of the National Democratic Party, which many regard as a neo-Nazi movement.

The German reaction to the projected nonproliferation pact suggests that Europe may be less amenable to the Soviet-American dialogue when it comes to grips with specific issues. The closer the Big Two come to agreement, the more Europe can be expected to be heard.

A number of recent developments emphasize the importance of the growing dialogue between Russia and America. They include the treaty signed last January prohibiting use of nuclear weapons in outer space and progress toward a nuclear nonproliferation pact. If the two big powers should be able to slow the antiballistic missile race, the pattern would be further strengthened and Europe would be even further cut off from the decision-making process. Soviet-American cooperation has been strengthened, too, by such minor steps as the consular convention pending in the Senate and an agreement for direct air service between New York and Moscow.

Adding a final thread to the East-West tapestry is the eastern policy being pursued by Germany. Actively seeking closer ties with the Soviet satellites, the Kiesinger regime already has succeeded in establishing diplomatic relations with Romania.

It is confident that others will follow suit despite East Germany's frantic efforts to halt the process. The Communist German regime fears it will be isolated if the West German policy succeeds.

The currents of change sweeping across Europe cut deeply on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Inside the Communist camp there is a clear trend toward greater independence, with Yugoslavia the notable frontrunner. Other eastern nations are beginning to shape a national communism that suits their own needs rather than the dictates of Moscow. Romania spoke out bitterly last spring against the maintenance of Soviet military bases and troops in eastern Europe. And throughout the satellite nations economic reform is under way, injecting profits, costs and incentives into the Communist system.

The European equation may be altered sharply by the new German government's ardent attempt to revive the intimate relations that formerly existed with France. How far it is willing to go in following Gen. De Gaulle's intransigent lead is not yet clear. However, it is not expected to risk a fight with the French over Britain's attempt to join the European Common Market.

This situation, now coming to a peak, is a critical one. The current belief is that De

Gaulle will again keep Britain out of the club, as he did in 1963. If he does, the results will be shattering for both the financially strapped British and Europe as a whole.

Strong pressures are being felt for changes in western defenses. The betting in informed quarters is that Britain and perhaps the United States will soon reduce the number of troops they have in Germany. This likelihood, coupled with other factors, tends to put heavier reliance on nuclear weapons and could lead to a return to the doctrine of massive retaliation advocated by the late John Foster Dulles.

Economic problems in Germany and Britain, together with a "technological gap" between Europe and the United States, add further to the feeling of change in Europe. And over it all hangs a major imponderable: Will France, which last year withdrew from the integrated military organization of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, break from the alliance itself after the treaty becomes open to renunciation in 1969? De Gaulle says he will not, but some informed diplomats here in Europe are skeptical. If he quits NATO, the result will be another major crisis for the Western Alliance.

Informed diplomats agree generally that a fundamental change is taking place in relations between the United States and Europe. Revived economically by the American Marshall Plan after World War II, the countries of Western Europe now are becoming more independent of the United States. They are turning to one another instead of to America in tackling basic problems. One high-ranking diplomat described the situation this way:

"The American age is ending in Europe. There is growing here a European consciousness of Europe."

He said that while an independent Europe was to be welcomed it will bring with it a period of strained relations with the United States.

"Greater independence will increase the gulf between the United States and Europe; not narrow it," he said. "Our relations are going to become looser. The future is going to be difficult. It will bring developments that we will regard as anti-American."

"We have assumed that we could have European independence without tears, that is, without negative effects on the United States. But we can't. There will be tears."

Relations between the United States and Europe have worsened significantly in the past two years, said another diplomat. However, he argued that the problem has not reached significant proportions and is not likely to do so.

Those who are most sanguine about the future argue that a healthier relationship will result if Europe is able to stand on its own feet and not be subservient to the United States. While agreeing philosophically, some officials warned that much will depend on the course Europe follows. If it retains a close tie with the United States, the Western world will remain strong. If, on the other hand, it seeks to become a third force, balancing between the West and the Communist East, American interests might be severely jeopardized.

At this stage it is difficult to see where the currents that are sweeping across Europe will ultimately lead. Much will depend on the fragile spirit of detente and whether it continues. Much will depend on efforts to scale down the armaments race. Much will depend on the course taken by Germany and whether it joins the Gaullist demand for a more independent military role for Europe.

And finally, much will depend on the post-war generation, now reaching maturity. In a sense, these young people typify the change that is occurring in Europe. For what is happening is that one age is ending, and a new one, as yet only dimly seen, is beginning.

STAKES ARE HIGH, ODDS POOR FOR BRITAIN AS WILSON SEEKS COMMON MARKET MEMBERSHIP—SHOWDOWN STAGE APPROACHING—DIFFICULT ECONOMIC PROBLEMS ARE FACED BY LONDON GOVERNMENT

Second in a series

LONDON, March 13.—The most exciting political game in Europe is moving into the showdown stage as the British push their effort to join the Common Market. The odds against them are nearly as heavy as those against a dice player in the gambling casinos here in London's sleek West End. Prime Minister Harold Wilson, never a rash man, is moving more warily than ever, for the stakes are high.

The nation's future is believed to hang in the balance. Whether Britain is to sink or swim as a major world power may well turn on how successfully Wilson handles the Common Market problem and a second big issue—the need to strengthen and modernize Britain's lagging economy and to overcome its persistent financial difficulties.

Energetic efforts are being made on both fronts. In a series of trips to the six nations making up the European Economic Community, or Common Market, Wilson and Foreign Secretary George Brown have sought to show that Britain is ready to end its traditional insularity and become a good "European."

At home an initial program of "freeze and squeeze" has severely pinched and domestic economy, easing pressure on the all-important balance of payments and bolstering the frequently shaky pound sterling.

Despite a firm beginning, early success is unlikely in either field. Even optimists who think there is a chance for membership in the common Market concede that it is probably two or three years away. And in the economic sphere, a long, determined effort will be required to modernize production methods, halt union featherbedding and make the other fundamental changes needed to cure the country's serious ills.

Complicating both problems is increasing political opposition. More than a hundred back-bench members of Wilson's own Labor party have signed a resolution opposing entry into the Common Market. And the powerful Trades Union Congress, the source of much of the Labor party's strength, has bitterly attacked the government's plans for continued wage controls.

Wilson has created a swirl of activity in dealing with both the Common Market and economic issues. But at times the flurry is more confusing than revealing. Never one to foreclose any options, Wilson, his critics say, has not yet committed himself unequivocally to Common Market membership. His economic program is regarded as a courageous move for a Labor Prime Minister, but skeptics wonder whether he can push it far enough.

The biggest obstacle to British hopes is again French President Charles de Gaulle. It was De Gaulle who in January 1963 vetoed the first British move to enter the European economic community.

There is an almost unanimous belief among European leaders that De Gaulle still does not want Britain in the EEC. Those who have seen the French leader find him suspicious of Britain's "special relationship" with the United States. The French say that if Britain is admitted to the EEC it will simply be a Trojan horse for further American domination of Europe. In this connection, a recent proposal by a group of Americans to strengthen U.S.-British relations was viewed as unfortunate and ill-timed.

De Gaulle is said to feel also that Britain is not sufficiently European-minded. Britain's strained economy is cited as a bar to membership. As remedies, the French have pondered such possibilities as ending the role of sterling as a reserve currency, devaluation

of the pound, and abandonment of British defense commitments east of Suez, which the U.S. wants continued.

In Europe, most of the French arguments are regarded as window dressing. At the heart of the matter is French fear of British ties with the U.S. and the realization that Britain would seriously challenge both their leadership of the EEC and the domination they seek of western Europe. The British position is weakened by the lukewarm attitude of West Germany. The Bonn coalition government, bent on restoring close relations with France, is regarded as not likely to risk a fight with De Gaulle over Britain.

Many who favor British entry into the Common Market are counseling delay. They want at all costs to avoid a direct confrontation that might provoke a final no from De Gaulle. A well-informed official at the Common Market headquarters in Brussels suggested protracted, informal discussions while hoping for more favorable conditions. The British seem to be leaning in this direction. Two weeks ago in the House of Commons Wilson himself appeared to hint that Britain might set out on a second round of exploratory talks rather than submit a formal application for membership.

There is a general expectation that any decisive step will be delayed at least until after the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, at which bargaining may end about April 30. Wilson told the House of Commons the other day that his government would decide what to do about May 1. His probable choices are to go ahead at once or to wait for a more favorable time, probably using the pretext of further exploratory talks. Some officials believe the whole matter may be put off until next year.

In substance, Britain needs the Common Market for one essential reason: Only as part of the EEC can it have access to the mass market it needs to hold its own against the United States and other world competitors.

Membership, however, would not be an un-mixed blessing. A major problem would stem from the shift from Britain's low tariffs on agricultural imports to the Common Market's relatively high levies. British food prices probably would rise by 10 to 14 per cent, with the cost of living jumping as much as 3.5 per cent and the balance of payments being adversely affected by \$700,000,000 or more.

The British would like to soften the impact by adopting the agricultural system gradually over a transitional period of perhaps seven years. Britain's relations with the Commonwealth and with its partners in the European Free Trade Association also might require special consideration.

While Wilson and Brown devote their energies to the Common Market question, Chancellor of the Exchequer James Callaghan and Michael Stewart, Minister of Economic Affairs, are trying to put the economy on a sounder footing.

It is difficult to realize on a visit to Britain that the country suffers from serious economic ills. The shops in London are filled with luxury items and there is no shortage of customers. There is a lively, vibrant air about London. Somehow there is a greater feeling of change in the air than you remember from a visit just two years ago.

But beneath the surface the problem is acute and familiar. Economic growth has been slow and unsteady, with the annual increase in gross national product in the decade ended in 1964 hovering between 2.8 and 3.4 per cent.

Recurrent financial crises—four in eight years—have hit the country. The balance of payments has been in deficit in nine of the last 14 years. Although more exports are urgently needed, imports have been growing faster, rising at the yearly rate of 4 per cent in the last decade against 3 per cent for exports.

Inflationary pressures have been strong.

In the 10 years ended in 1965 retail prices rose by 34 per cent. In the same period, weekly earnings of manual workers soared by 65 per cent. With incomes rising about 6 per cent a year and productivity by more than 2½ per cent, the upward spiral has quickened. As prices rise, imports increase, exports fall behind, and the old cycle is repeated with the balance of payments worsening and sterling coming under new pressure.

It was this kind of situation that came to a boil again last summer. The balance of payments had been in deficit since the second half of 1963. Demand pressures were heavy, with wages and salaries nearly 8 per cent higher in the first quarter of 1966 than a year earlier but with the gross national product up less than 2 per cent. Then a seamen's strike severely cut into exports. These and other factors put heavy new pressure on the pound.

The labor government decided that its previous limited measures were not adequate. In July it ordered a program of "freeze and squeeze." The aim was to curb domestic and overseas spending in order to relieve the pressure on sterling. Wages were frozen for six months and then severely restrained for six more. With few exceptions prices were frozen for a year. Credit was tightened, some indirect taxes were boosted and public spending was cut at home and abroad.

It was a tough program designed to reduce demand on the domestic economy by 1.4 billion dollars and to cut overseas spending by nearly \$500,000,000. It was hoped that the pause would allow productivity to catch up with the increases in incomes.

Callaghan and Stewart believe that their austerity program is working. The Chancellor of the Exchequer reported recently that sterling has strengthened, with reserves of gold and convertible currencies increasing. Exports are about 10 per cent higher than a year earlier. The rapid increase in imports appeared to have been checked, although the picture was not entirely clear. The balance of payments improved last year.

But the gains are not without cost. Unemployment has increased sharply, with the rate in February standing at nearly 2 per cent. This is a high level in Britain, but still only about half the rate of nearly 4 per cent reached in February 1963. Industrial production has declined more than 2 per cent since last summer, a significant decline. Automobile production dropped by 7 per cent last year to the lowest level since 1963, but the slump may have eased in the last two months.

What the Laborites have done so far is not very different from the "stop and go" policies for which they used to condemn the Tories. The Labor government has certainly stopped the economy. But the question now is how long it can safely be held in check. Already there are gloomy forecasts that unemployment may hit 2½ per cent by the end of 1967 and may continue to rise in 1968 if present policies are continued. Private investment in new factories may be down 10 per cent this year with private purchases of homes down by 4½ per cent.

The government already has taken some cautious reflationary steps. Government grants to encourage productive investments were stepped up. Government spending estimates for the fiscal year starting April show an 8.5 per cent increase, and the bank rate, which determines interest charges, was lowered from 7 to 6½ per cent in January. However, officials doubt any major reflationary moves are likely this year.

Complicating the short-run outlook are a number of other factors. Limited wage and price pressures are likely to be felt this spring. The current period of "severe restraint" is less rigid than the initial "standstill," and increases in wages and prices will be possible under certain conditions.

Even more uncertain is the outlook for

the period after the government's statutory controls over wages and prices run out next August. The government has proposed an extension of limited powers allowing it to delay but not to prohibit or rescind wage and price increases. The Trades Union Congress wants nothing more than a voluntary system. Business is not happy about government regulation either.

While this question remains unsettled, officials of the Labor government believe a significant gain has been made. They say that both business and labor now accept the idea that there should be some form of prices and incomes policy related to productivity and the nation's general economic well-being.

Government officials concede that a successful wage-price policy is one of the long-term goals they must achieve if they are to correct Britain's underliving economic ills. Others include: improvement in efficiency and productivity, stimulation of export production, job training, cost reduction and modernization of factories and methods. Efforts are being made in all of these fields through the recently established ministry of technology and economic development committees. But officials say it is too early to tell whether they are succeeding.

One of the fundamental questions is whether British businessmen and workers are ready to change traditional ways of doing things in order to keep pace with the world around them. An astute businessman who has broad contacts in industrial circles is convinced that the structure of British industry is changing.

If Britain is to have a viable, major economy in the future, some observers are convinced she must have a bigger base and market. It is here that the move to join the Common Market complements the country's economic program.

WEST GERMANY'S NEW DIRECTIONS LIKELY TO HAVE WIDE EFFECTS ON ITS TIES WITH UNITED STATES, BRITAIN—GROWTH OF RIGHT-WING PARTY, ECONOMIC SLUMP, RELATIONS WITH REDS ARE FACTORS IN NEW ROLE

Third of a series

BONN, March 14.—A new kind of West Germany is once again seeking a place in the sun.

More demanding and assertive, it appears to be ending some of its old ties. Politically and diplomatically it is moving in new directions and its actions could have far-reaching repercussions for both the United States and Europe.

Especially disturbing to some observers is an apparent tendency by the new coalition government of Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger to split with American and Britain and to tie itself more closely to France. Also unsettling is the emergence of an extreme right-wing political party that revives memories of the Nazi past. There is concern, too, that the country's current economic slump might further fan the flame of an emerging nationalism and political extremism.

At the same time there is an encouraging aspect to some of the trends found here in this small capital city on the banks of the Rhine.

Of major significance is a shift in West German foreign policy from the rigidities of the Adenauer and, to a lesser extent, the Erhard regimes. There is greater flexibility and realism than before on such key questions as a European detente, relations with the Communist bloc and reunification of Germany.

The course that West Germany settles on in the months ahead is of vital importance, because this grim and determined land, which only 20 years ago lay shattered, has again become an industrial and military power. In terms of population, trade, industrial plant and foreign financial reserves it is the leading power in Europe outside the Soviet Union. Its gross national product

ranks behind only that of the United States and Russia. Its military force of 462,000 men is the second largest in western Europe although, unlike France and Britain, it has no nuclear weapons of its own.

With power of this kind, what West Germany does may well affect the face of Europe. So far, this potential has been largely unrealized. For a cardinal point of western foreign policy has been to keep Germany so closely bound up in the Atlantic alliance as to block any opportunity for independent adventures.

Whether Kiesinger will try to free himself of these restraints is not yet clear. But certainly his Christian Democrat-Socialist coalition has shown no hesitation about setting out on an independent course and pushing for its own goals even at the risk of alienating old allies.

This tendency already has provoked a minor crisis with the United States over the proposed nuclear nonproliferation treaty. To the astonishment of nearly everyone Kiesinger suddenly has taken a hard line against the pact. His action has jeopardized prospects for the treaty, which previously had been rated good because of near-agreement by the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

The German attack was a virtual turnabout. Early last month Foreign Minister Willy Brandt, although raising some questions about the proposed agreement appeared to give it strong backing. Then came a whispering attack followed by open complaints against Washington by top German officials.

Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss, regarded by some as the strong man in the German government, is believed to be behind this move. Cynics charge that the real German objective—one they say Strauss holds dear—is to keep the way open for a more independent military role for Germany. These sources dismiss as phonies the Germans' ostensible objections that the treaty endangers their civilian nuclear industry and that it fails to guarantee the security of Germany and other nonnuclear powers.

In another area the Kiesinger government, with Strauss again calling the tune, suddenly has taken a tougher position on the question of offsetting part of the costs incurred by Britain in keeping 55,000 troops in the Reich. It has indicated it may cancel the offer of the previous Erhard government to pay one-third of the foreign exchange costs incurred by Britain.

Another shock to British-German relations may be coming soon. Many diplomats are convinced that Germany will do little to help the British in their current effort to join the European Common Market. Although Germany favors British membership, skeptics say Kiesinger will not risk a fight with France, which is strongly opposed.

The Coalition government has made the restoration of close relations with France one of the two touchstones of its foreign policy since taking office last November. In mid-January Kiesinger went to Paris to confer with French President Charles de Gaulle. The meeting was hailed on all sides as a start toward restoring the intimacy that had existed when Konrad Adenauer was Chancellor but which had cooled under Erhard.

How far Kiesinger is prepared to go in wooing De Gaulle is not clear. The German Chancellor insists that he does not share De Gaulle's opposition to an integrated allied military system, to the presence of American troops in Europe or to Britain's entry into the Common Market.

Most diplomats believe that Germany has no intention of trading the protection of the vastly superior American nuclear umbrella for that of France's tiny force de frappe. As a result, they expect the overall goal of the Kiesinger policy will be to preserve Germany's basic ties with the U.S. in defense and other essential fields while at the same

time striking a more independent attitude and paying court to France.

By far the most dramatic change in direction under the new German government involves its attitude toward the Communist world. The Kiesinger regime signaled its intention shortly after taking office by announcing that it intended to seek closer relations with the Communist governments of eastern Europe.

The effort has been pushed energetically. The first breakthrough came late in January when diplomatic relations with Romania were established. The Germans are hopeful that one or two other Communist governments, most likely Hungary or Bulgaria, will follow suit this year.

Diplomats generally believe that closer relations between Germany and the Soviet satellite bloc will help to relieve tensions in Europe. East Germany, fearful of being isolated, has reacted strongly. At its request an emergency meeting of the Warsaw pact nations was held a month ago to consider the West German campaign.

But it brought no assurances that other Communist governments would not follow Romania's lead. However, the Soviet Union, under pressure from East Germany, has gradually hardened its stand against the West German initiative.

The "eastern policy" being pursued by Bonn is far more ambitious than its previous actions. Under previous governments Germany made limited overtures to the Communist bloc, concluding trade pacts with Poland, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. The new government seems ready to bend, if not to scrap, the old Hallstein doctrine—which prohibited relations with any nation—except the Soviet Union—that recognized East Germany.

Germany's attitude toward the East has changed in other respects, too. Gone is the old insistence that East and West Germany must be reunited before there can be any thought of a general detente in Europe. The coalition government is willing to join in steps to relax. East-West tensions first, putting off until later the goal of reunification.

To many people one of the most worrisome developments in Germany is the growing power of the National Democratic party, regarded by many as Neo-Nazi. The problem is almost certain to become more acute in the months ahead.

The party, which scored its first successes last November when it polled almost 8 per cent of the vote in elections to the state legislatures in Bavaria and Hesse, is expected to make further gains in both state elections this spring and in the national contest for the Bundestag in 1969. Guesses are that it may win 10 per cent of the seats in the Bundestag.

This would give the NDP a national sounding board. Nonetheless, experts believe it will remain only a limited political force although they warn: Its popularity could zoom if it produces a magnetic leader or if the present stagnant economy changes into a serious recession.

The economic problems that confronts Germany is both unfamiliar and serious. Germany, the land of the "wirtschaftswunder," or "economic miracle," had become accustomed to never-ending growth as its economy soared at the annual rate of 7.5 per cent throughout the decade that ended in 1960.

It was shocking to find that the rate last year had suddenly slowed to no more than 2½ per cent, the slowest since the currency reform of 1948. The prospect for this year was even worse: absolutely no growth at all unless drastic measures were taken. "Never before have the indices been so gloomy," an expert at the Ministry of Economics told the Post-Dispatch.

The government responded with an anti-

recession package. Government spending on defense and social welfare was slashed. An emergency public works program to pour \$625,000,000 into highways, railroads and other projects was drafted. Tax incentives were offered and credit was eased.

There are serious doubts among some experts as to how well the program will work. For one thing, the growth estimates on which the budget is based are probably far too high. As a result, the government is likely to face the prospect of a sizable deficit later this year.

Although unemployment climbed to 2.6 per cent in January—or double the level a year earlier—most observers believe that the German economy is fundamentally sound. They expect it to shake off the present slump without serious damage. However, one German expert said a major economic disaster could develop unless the government was skillful.

Well-informed observers here in Bonn say it is too early to tell whether the coalition of Christian Democrats and Socialists will hold together until the next scheduled elections in 1969. For the most part, they think it will unless it stubs its toe on the economic problem or some other major issue. Some persons question how long men of such divergent views as Strauss and Brandt will be able to work together.

Some observers have been impressed with Kiesinger. Said one, "he is more decisive and effective than anyone expected. Furthermore, he is open minded about working with Brandt's Social Democrats to implement common policies."

In practical political terms, both the Socialists and Christian-Democrats face a common problem. To justify their joining hands, they must sharply differentiate their government from that of former Chancellor Ludwig Erhard. Basic criticism of Erhard's regime was that it had become too dependent on the United States, particularly at a time when American interests in Europe appeared to have waned. Erhard was censured also for neglecting French-German relations.

It is clear now that the Kiesinger government is determined to reverse these policies. In doing so it has created an image of a more demanding and more independent Germany.

"It is inevitable that there will be some loosening of its tie with the United States," remarked one diplomat.

LIVING CONDITIONS IN EAST GERMANY BEST OF ANY IN SOVIET BLOC BUT PEACE OF MIND IS LACKING—GOVERNMENT LIVES IN FEAR AND SUSPICION—ISOLATION FROM OTHER SATELLITE NATIONS IS INCREASING

Fourth of a series

EAST BERLIN, March 15.—The dismal wall of stone, barbed wire and guns that cuts through the heart of Berlin has brought the stability of a prison to East Germany but has failed to bring peace of mind or security.

Deeply mistrustful of the United States and the West, the Communist German government lives in fear and suspicion. It shows little interest in the detente that one feels with increasing force in much of the rest of Europe.

Its deepest hatred is reserved for its brothers in West Germany, whose every move is viewed as a plot to destroy the weaker Communist regime. Within the Communist camp itself, East Germany appears increasingly isolated, with other satellite governments ignoring its protests and moving toward closer relations with West Germany.

A week of traveling through East Germany leaves a Western visitor uncertain about this strange country, perhaps the darkest spot behind the Iron Curtain, but conversations with East Germans and with knowledgeable experts help, and at the end a few tentative conclusions emerge:

East Germany has become an economic reality ranking as one of the world's top 10

industrial countries despite limited resources and manpower.

The Communist government appears well established. Any thought of a popular rebellion against it is said to be unrealistic.

East Germany opposes reunification except on its own terms, and prospects for bringing the two Germanys together appear to have receded into the distant future.

There is little intellectual freedom here, with tougher government controls than in most other Communist bloc countries.

Living standards have improved, reaching the level of West Germany of 10 or 15 years ago.

East Germany claims to have eradicated all traces of the Hitler era but charges that the Nazi spirit is still strong in West Germany.

Unlike other satellites, which have loosened their ties with the Soviet Union, East Germany remains tightly bound.

East Germany is a grim and somber country. Somehow there hangs over it something of the depressing air that Christopher Isherwood described so vividly in his stories of Berlin in the 1930's.

The visitor who travels from East Berlin to Dresden and Leipzig finds himself bombarded by propaganda from morning to night. The Communist government is all-wise; it has made no mistakes.

Eager to be recognized as the equal of West Germany, the East German regime welcomes almost any kind of attention. Its officials are helpful and friendly to the few western reporters they see. However, the government controls and supervises a reporter's visit. It picks the people and places to be seen; the driver and guide it provides are always present.

By American standards this country lags far behind the western world. Its per capita consumption of goods and services is only about two thirds the level in West Germany. Wages are lower and many prices are higher. The necessities of life are generally low priced, but luxury items are expensive and consumer goods often are scarce. An East German worker has to work from two to six times as long as a West German to pay for such articles as a man's suit, woman's silk stockings, refrigerator, automobile and television set.

Yet by Communist standards East Germany is far above average. Living conditions are better than in any other country in the Soviet bloc. There is only one private automobile for every 66 persons, but that is far more than any other satellite nation can boast. In the European Communist camp it ranks second only to the Soviet Union in industrial output and productivity. Even the West Germans concede that in some ways the East Germans have outdistanced them, with lower rents, lower prices for basic foods, and in some ways more advanced social welfare, health and education programs.

East Germany has benefited heavily from its prison wall. Before the wall was built across divided Berlin in 1961, more than 3,000,000 persons had fled from East Germany. With only 17,000,000 persons left behind, this constituted a serious loss, magnified by the fact that many who fled were skilled workers, professional people and intellectuals.

Now the loss has been cut to a trickle. As a result, the labor force has been stabilized. Economic planning has a sounder base and production has increased. When a visitor suggested recently that East Berlin seemed to have far more new buildings than he remembered from a trip four years ago, his German guide replied, "Yes, most of our building has come in the past five years."

To one who is accustomed to freedom, the wall has an obsessive quality. Repeatedly one finds oneself wondering what would happen if it were suddenly torn down. Would there again be a rush to escape? And what

would follow if the 22 Russian divisions stationed in East Germany were withdrawn? Would the people arise and overthrow the government of Communist boss Walter Ulbricht?

Even the experts hesitate in answering. Undoubtedly many would leave if the wall were down. It is difficult to say, however, whether the rush would be as big or as protracted as before.

The air of acceptance that has come after nearly 18 years of Communist rule came through clearly in the conversations of a number of persons who spoke with a recent visitor. In East Berlin young factory workers parroted the government's line on every issue. They realized their obligations to the socialist order—to work hard, go to job training classes at night, increase production. They were determined to carry them out.

In Dresden the young personable economic director of a camera factory was delighted with the emphasis put on profits and costs in the country's recently liberalized economic system. On a collective farm near Leipzig, workers appeared well pleased with wages they said were far higher than they ever earned before the war as laborers on the estates of large landlords.

One comes away with the feeling that the Communist government of East Germany is not likely to be upset from within. It could be overturned by a drastic change in international conditions, if, for example, the Soviet Union decided that East Germany was no longer important to it. This seems unlikely at present.

The Communist German government appears out of step with the rest of Europe. At a time when its fellow satellites are showing greater independence of the Soviet Union and new interest in closer relations with the west, East Germany is marching to an older, harsher tune.

Ulbricht's government has been thrown into something near panic by the developing cordiality between West Germany and Communist nations in Eastern Europe. To the East Germans this is a dangerous move that may isolate them from their only allies. They saw the first step in Romania's decision late in January to establish diplomatic relations with the West Germans.

At the East Germans' urgent request, the Warsaw Pact nations held a meeting a few days later. East Germany failed to get any assurances that other Communist governments would not follow Romania's lead. However, the Soviet Union recently has taken a stronger line against the West German campaign, affording East Germany some moral support.

In the face of the more flexible attitude shown by the Bonn government, Ulbricht has stiffened his attitude. In an address last New Year's day the East German leader said, in effect, that West Germany would have to recognize the East German state before there could be any talks about joining the two nations in some kind of confederation.

East Germany, say the experts, does not really want reunification. In large measure, this reflects the concern that East Germany, with only one third the population of West Germany and a much smaller economy, would be overwhelmed in almost any amalgamation of the two. As time passes and the differences become more pronounced between the two Germanys, the prospects for reunification appear more remote.

Although its political face is turned to the past, a slow trend toward economic liberalization is moving ahead here just as it is in much of the Communist world. Although there are differences from country to country, the process consists essentially of loosening central state controls and giving more weight to the market place. Profits, wage incentives, realistic costs and other elements of a capitalist economy are being

introduced and are transforming the Communist system.

Economists rate East Germany as farther advanced than any other Communist nation in implementing this process. The "new economic system" here was launched with a blueprint in July 1963. The first stage, which has been completed, saw considerable decentralization in economic planning and control of industrial production. Decisions formerly spelled out in great detail by the central government were turned over to industrial associations. Prices of raw materials and some other goods, instead of being set arbitrarily, were revised to reflect costs more realistically.

Two months ago the second stage started. Describing its purpose, an economist for the State Planning Committee told the Post-Dispatch: "We used to say, 'the best factory is the one with the highest production.' Now we say, 'the best factory is the one that makes the highest profit.'"

The new phase allows a more independent role for individual factories in planning production levels and kind of output. It emphasizes bonuses and incentives for workers and stresses the need for factories to show a profit. Perhaps the most important aspect of the plan is a broad reform in the prices of finished goods and industrial machinery so as to reflect actual, rather than theoretical, costs. Subsidies are to be removed.

Nonetheless, some limits remain. The prices to be charged by factories will be indicated through government calculations of profits and costs. And price revision will not apply to consumer goods. Subsidies on these will continue; their prices will not reflect true costs. While other prices are expected to rise, the government has pledged that those of consumer products will not.

Economists outside of East Germany believe the Communist government here will have difficulty in carrying out its plan. They see inexorable pressure on consumer goods as prices of materials and other components rise to reflect true costs. "This is the year of truth," said one non-German expert.

Some economists believe that East Germany, although leading the way in implementing the new economic system, actually is far less radical in approach than some other Communist countries. They believe that it will retain the principal of price fixing by the government, although the figures are likely to be based more realistically on actual costs. In contrast, others, notably Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria, appear inclined to move farther away from government control of prices, with the market playing a larger part.

What the future holds for East Germany is difficult to tell. It is an artificial state created by the Soviet Union in the aftermath of World War II and its history has been harsh. It is estimated that Russia took more than 15 billion dollars in war reparations out of the country. A small nation no bigger than the largest state in West Germany, it has few natural resources. It must import much of its food as well as raw materials for industrial production. It did not reach the prewar level of industrial output until 1957, six years later than West Germany. In 1960 the production of consumer goods still was below prewar levels.

The future is likely to be influenced heavily by a rising new class of managers and technicians. For the most part, young men are moving into positions of importance in business and industry. Their interest is less in doctrinaire Communist ideology than in making the system work. Although they do not criticize the past, they feel that conditions have changed. They are all for profits and incentives within an elastic Communist framework. They are a more pragmatic, more business-minded breed than the aging professional Communists who still control East Germany.

Also important for the future are those who are even younger. The postwar generation, just reaching maturity, is disaffected in East Germany as elsewhere. Said one observer who has studied them closely:

"The young people in East Germany are politically disinterested, just as they are in West Germany. They want to be left alone. They are not interested in questions of war and peace.

"They feel no responsibility for the past. They are sick or nearing of the Nazi period and its concentration camps. All of that is for their fathers. They want to have fun.

"They have been forced to accept the Communist system, but they are not fully committed to it. They join the organizations so they can get ahead. They will never rebel.

"But they will be good technocrats and well trained specialists. They won't overthrow the system, but they may modify it.

"East Germany will never return to what it was."

GULF WIDENING BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND EUROPE; HOW TO CURB ARMS RACE IS CENTRAL ISSUE—DISARRAY, DISSENSION AND UNCERTAINTY SURROUND ALLIED DEFENSE POLICY—"BORED TO DEATH" WITH NATO

Fifth of a series

PARIS, March 18.—"If you want to clear the room at a cocktail party just mention NATO," remarked a young diplomat who is stationed here. "Everyone is bored to death with it."

Although exaggerated, this cynical comment tells something of the air of disarray, dissension and uncertainty that surrounds Allied defense policy.

Western strategy, already weakened by France's split with the 14 other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is under new pressure. With the British leading the way, a strong effort is being made to reduce the number of Allied troops stationed in Europe and to return to the doctrine of massive nuclear retaliation.

The Western squabble comes against a backdrop of urgent need to curb the arms race. Under discussion are a treaty that would bar the spread of nuclear weapons and an attempt to avoid the installation of costly antimissile defenses, which many see as another, perhaps unbearable, twist in the armament spiral. A decision on both rests largely with the United States and the Soviet Union. If they fail, it may be too late to slow the weapons race.

As one travels through western Europe, the impression grows that there is emerging a groping, awkward effort to break out of the patterns of the past. Many diplomats and others argue that the danger of war has eased if not disappeared. Now the West can—some say must—relax its defenses.

This sentiment is one measure of the widening gulf between the United States and Europe. For America clings to the Cold War doctrine that the Soviet Union remains a clear military threat to the West. Critics charge the United States with failing to respond vigorously enough to the opportunity for better relations with the Soviet Union which many Europeans think has grown out of the Russian-Chinese split.

Europeans differ in their prescriptions for the future. Some, like the young diplomat here in Paris, believe that NATO has outlived its usefulness. This view reflects the basic difficulty encountered in trying to hold together a military alliance when the threat confronting it appears to have dwindled. But it is an extreme attitude, not widely shared in European government circles.

Much more widely held is the belief that Western defense levels can be reduced safely. A high-ranking official at NATO headquarters here said privately, "There is an unspoken feeling that adjustments, that is, reductions, can be made." He said sentiment for a cut-

back was clear in Great Britain, Germany and some of the smaller countries in the Western alliance.

The first step may come soon. There is a general belief in European circles that Britain soon will reduce its garrison in Germany. Facing severe financial problems, the British have asked Germany to offset the foreign exchange costs of \$263,000,000 a year involved in keeping the troops there. The Germans have never offered to meet more than one third of the total, and their coalition government now appears unwilling even to go that far. The British have made it plain that unless they get help from some quarter they probably will cut their 55,000-man Army of the Rhine by about one third.

Such a move would give strong ammunition to those who favor a reduction in American military force in Europe, still totaling about 300,000 men. An increasing number of members of Congress have been urging a reduction. Mike Mansfield, the scholarly Democratic leader of the Senate, has been joined by more than 40 cosponsors in introducing a resolution calling for a substantial cutback.

This is an attractive suggestion, especially in view of the demands of the Vietnam war for men and money. Furthermore, some sources would not be surprised if Germany moved soon to cut its offset payments to the United States as well as to Britain. Under a two-year agreement ending next June 30, the Germans are committed to buy \$1,350,000,000 worth of military equipment in the United States to counterbalance American troop costs. As of Jan. 1, they were about \$500,000,000 short of purchases.

Despite accumulating pressures, the Johnson Administration has been standing firm against reducing the American garrison in Europe. Late last year it initiated talks with Britain and Germany seeking to avoid a hasty cutback. Two weeks ago it suggested a new formula: Germany would not be expected to offset American and British troop costs through direct purchases of arms. Instead, the Allies would try to work out a policy of monetary co-operation to prevent troop costs from contributing to balance-of-payments problems or to the continuing drain on gold reserves.

If the eventual decision despite U.S. opposition is for a substantial reduction in allied troop levels in Europe, the effects will be far-reaching. On the positive side, some European experts believe the Soviet Union would respond with a troop reduction of its own, although they doubt that it would agree in advance to do so.

Troop reduction might help also to defuse the dangerous situation that exists in Europe because of the intense concentration of armaments there. Alastair Buchan, director of the authoritative Institute for Strategic Studies in London, noted a year ago that "middle Europe is the most highly armed area in the world." This section of Europe, not much larger than Texas, held 1,000,000 armed men, 7,000 aircraft and more than 6,000 nuclear warheads. For Europe as a whole, the figures are even bigger.

Some military men and others believe there might be adverse effects from a troop curtailment by Britain and the United States. To some extent, they say, it would reduce the tight control that the allies have exercised over West Germany since World War II. It would also enhance the position of France, which is maintaining troops in Germany without any direct offset payments. And it would push the alliance toward greater reliance on nuclear weapons.

This last effect takes on added importance in view of the strong effort being made to revive the doctrine of massive nuclear retaliation that was advocated by the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Chief architect of the new move is Dennis Healey,

British Minister of Defense. His objective is to get rid of the strategy of flexible response evolved by the Kennedy Administration shortly after it took office in 1961. Under this approach, conventional forces were emphasized with the hope that the ultimate nuclear conflict could be avoided. In essence Healey's theory is based on the belief that a major war is most unlikely but that if it does occur, it will "go nuclear" almost at once.

The British feel they have support for their approach among a number of NATO countries, although the United States remains committed to the concept of a flexible response. However, the growing estrangement from Europe and rising pressure to cut American costs and troop commitments abroad could push the U.S. closer to the doctrine of instant nuclear retaliation.

Looming large over the future of NATO is the question of what France will do two years from now. For in 1969 the NATO treaty becomes open to renunciation. President Charles de Gaulle has said that he does not intend to take France out of the western alliance, but some allied diplomats think he might. If he does, it is questionable whether the Atlantic alliance will survive.

It is clear now that NATO has been damaged seriously by France's withdrawal a year ago from the alliance's integrated military structure. Diplomats in Europe make much of the fact that NATO survived the French actions and even took a few steps forward. But most of the gains they point to are largely procedural and bureaucratic in nature. For Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, supreme commander of NATO forces, and other allied leaders, there are serious military problems. Acknowledging that NATO has been weakened militarily, informed sources ticked off some of the major effects of the French move:

Northern and southern Europe have been separated by a de facto neutral belt made up of France, Switzerland and Austria.

Allied military operations have been made more difficult and expensive, for troops and supplies must now detour around France.

Military activity will be jeopardized even further if France closes its air space to Allied planes. Overflight rights, formerly granted for a year at a time, now are on a monthly basis.

Although France may, as it promises, stand by its allies in the event of war, it is not expected to make any significant commitment on which hard military plans can be based.

Critics feel that the French take a one-sided view of their relations with the western alliance. This appraisal was underscored by a French official who told the Post-Dispatch that France must have complete freedom of choice as to whether to join any future war involving western nations. Yet, he went on, the United States must be "trapped" into helping Europe in any emergency. Asked how he justified such a double standard, he replied:

"I don't justify it. I just state it as a fact. The truth is we need you more than you need us."

Germany's attitude on defense problems is viewed by some as curiously ironic. It demands that Allied troops be kept in the Reich for its protection; yet it balks at helping to pay for them. Further, its defense expenditures fell from 6 per cent of Gross National Product in 1963 to only 4.7 per cent last year; its level of defense spending has been lower in recent years than that of any other major western country except Italy.

The future for NATO is uncertain. There is some assurance in the widely held view that none of the 14 remaining members will follow France's example and withdraw. European sources are convinced that none of the countries is ready to abandon the defense shield NATO offers. But, they say, many are ready to reduce the size of the shield.

PESSIMISM REIGNS IN BRUSSELS AS IDEAL OF POLITICAL UNION FOR COMMON MARKET RETREATS—EEC COMPARED WITH YOUNGSTER ON A BICYCLE, PEDALING BARELY FAST ENOUGH TO KEEP FROM FALLING

Sixth in a series

BRUSSELS, March 17.—A visitor to the headquarters of the European Common Market here in Belgium scarcely has time to put down his suitcase before hearing about "the bicycle theory."

Like a youngster on a slow-moving bicycle, he is told, the Common Market is pedaling along barely fast enough to keep from falling.

The simile is apt. Even the best friends of the six-nation European Economic Community or Common Market concede that its momentum has slowed seriously. Beseated by internal problems, political changes in Europe and persistent French nationalism, the EEC has stalled so badly that it is doing little more than marking time.

The change is keenly felt here in Brussels. Informed sources say that President Walter Hallstein and other members of the executive commission appear to have retreated to a more cautious position. The executive arm of the EEC has boldly championed the idea that the countries of Europe must at last turn their backs on the outmoded concept of national independence and join in a United States of Europe.

But now some of the leaders of the fight are tiring. Speaking privately the other day, a major official of the EEC talked gloomily of the discouraging lack of progress. He wondered aloud whether he should get out and perhaps try to carry on the battle from outside. This tone is far different from that of a few years ago. Then despite setbacks the "Eurocrats" of the Common Market were confident that they were winning the fight for a new and better Europe.

The assessment today is far more pessimistic. Some competent sources see little early likelihood that the EEC will advance beyond its initial goal of creating a customs union to the broader and more difficult objectives of establishing a true economic, and eventually, political union.

It now appears that the customs union will be set up by July 1, 1968, 18 months ahead of schedule. Principal achievements will be elimination of all internal tariffs so that goods may move freely among the six member states, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg; establishment of a common set of external tariffs replacing varying national levies on imports, and creation of a common agricultural market.

Outlook for the second goal, that of unifying the entire economies of the member nations, is less promising. "The chances are fair," said one highly placed EEC official. "They're not bad, but they're not as good as they could be." Nonetheless, he predicted that the objective would be reached, probably between 1975 and 1980. Others were less sanguine. They felt that progress might be blocked by political opposition.

Beyond the first two goals lies the dream of eventually leading Europe into the promised land of political union. This alluring prospect, so bright when the Common Market was established by the Treaty of Rome just 10 years ago this month, has faded over the years. Principal reasons are a revival of nationalism and the unyielding opposition of French President Charles de Gaulle to political integration.

Even the most ardent supporters of political unity have retreated. In The Netherlands, one of the strongest advocates of a United States of Europe, a top official told the Post-Dispatch privately: "We are willing to water down our demands."

He suggested that something like the old Fouchet plan proposed by the French themselves in 1962 might provide a pattern. This

was a scheme for political co-operation by European nations through periodic national consultation without supranational strings. The Dutch official indicated that his country would insist on guarantees of eventual supranational authority for such an organization, but was willing to postpone them for "a long period, perhaps five, 10 years or more." In the interim, the result would be a return to the old-fashioned system of loose alliance among sovereign states that is favored by De Gaulle.

Whether Europe will ever be ready to move beyond the Gaullist concept to political federation is seriously in doubt. Authoritative observers disagree, although men like Jean Monnet, one of the principal architects of the European union, remain confident. But even the most optimistic say political union will not come for 15 years or more.

In the meantime, a more immediate danger threatens the stability of the EEC. It is widely expected in Europe that Great Britain's current effort to join the Common Market will be blocked by France just as a previous British move was in 1963.

If this happens, the shock waves may imperil the Common Market itself. The EEC will be transformed into a narrow, inward-looking organization. And it will lose a golden chance to build the broader base that many believe is essential if Europe is to compete with the giant economies of the United States and the Soviet Union. If Britain and its partners in the European Free Trade Association are allowed to enter, the EEC will have a mammoth market of 280,000,000 persons and a gross national product of 350 billion dollars.

The future of the Common Market and of Europe itself depends largely on Gen. de Gaulle. There is a serious question as to how long he can continue to carry the burdens of the French presidency. He is 76 years old. But informed sources in Europe say that the general, who comes from a long-lived family, enjoys good health.

"He can carry on for a long time," said one observer who sees him frequently. But it is possible that he will step down before his term ends in 1973 if he feels his abilities are impaired.

What will come after him is an intriguing subject for speculation. Some students of European affairs believe that France's present anti-American policies and its opposition to European unity will change after De Gaulle leaves power. But a realistic Italian diplomat dissented. He said:

"I think De Gaulle reflects the French people. His policies will not change quickly even after he leaves."

De Gaulle's position in France is somewhat weaker after last week's elections when the Gaullist majority in Parliament was all but erased. However, it appears doubtful that the setback will lead to any drastic change in his views on international affairs, for foreign policy was not an issue.

One of the most important tests of the Common Market's attitude toward the rest of the world, and particularly the United States, is the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, now nearing its close at Geneva.

Hopes were high when these protracted discussions started in May 1963. The immediate objective was commercial—to make reciprocal cuts of up to 50 per cent in tariffs on thousands of industrial and agricultural products and to lower other barriers to world trade. But the underlying aim was political—to create a great open market for the United States and Europe, encouraging the dream of political co-operation and Atlantic partnership.

Now, say some European diplomats, this noble purpose has faded in the face of hostile developments on both sides of the Atlantic. On the American side, some Europeans say, interest in western Europe has

been replaced by preoccupation with Vietnam. On the European side, the EEC, say some Americans, has become self-centered. As a result, the idea of an Atlantic partnership has become dormant.

In turn, the Kennedy round has lost much of its political meaning and become little more than a commercial exercise in bargaining. The United States has been irritated by what it views as a highly protectionist attitude adopted by the Common Market on agricultural items. The EEC has been angered by the "American selling price," which puts protectionist duties on chemicals and some other products.

Facing a June 30 deadline on American authority to negotiate, the talks at Geneva are entering the final phase. Negotiations may be wound up by April 30. Experts believe the eventual outcome may be an average cut of about 30 per cent across the board on industrial goods. This would be far greater than anything achieved in the past, but far below the original target. On agricultural commodities, far less progress is expected, with the most likely achievement a grains agreement governing prices, support levels and surpluses.

Here in Brussels, officials and technicians of the Common Market are at work on a variety of immediate economic tasks designed to implement the customs union and to move toward the broader goal of economic union. Top priority goes to the tasks of harmonizing varied, often conflicting, national tax structures, which frequently hamper the free movement of trade. A major accomplishment came last month with a decision to adopt a uniform, "added value" system of taxing manufactured goods. The full job of tax harmonization is not expected to be completed before 1972.

Work has started on measures to assure free movement within the EEC of capital, labor and business enterprises. It is expected to call for no fewer than 250 legislative changes by member governments. Forty already have been forwarded to the governments. Five or six years will be required to complete the undertaking.

Equally tedious work is under way to bring into harmony varying national standards governing production of automobiles, electrical appliances and hundreds of other manufactured articles. Also to be sought are uniform regulations for subsidies to shipbuilders and other industrial firms.

Later this year may come the first major debate on formulating a common scientific and technological policy. Also being worked on are common policies for transportation, monetary matters and economic problems.

"None of these has any political glamor," a top official of the EEC remarked with an apologetic smile. "But the total of them all is of the highest importance economically and politically."

The economic success of the Common Market has brought requests for limited, associate membership from a number of other states. Farthest advanced are negotiations with Austria, which have been under way since 1965.

Not yet resolved is the question of merging the executive branches of the Common Market and its two sister communities, the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. The eventual goal is to bring all three groups together into a single entity.

After 10 years the Common Market has made major progress toward uniting the small, nationalistic economies of its six member states. Some glimpse of where it will go in the future may come next month when its leaders are expected to gather at a special ceremonial meeting in Rome.

"The feeling," remarked one top official in Brussels who watches the EEC closely, "is that the Common Market will continue to exist. It won't fall off the bicycle. But the

question is—what will its form be, and how and when will it move forward?"

He paused a moment. "I don't know the answer," he said.

UNITED STATES HAS A BIG LEAD OVER WEST EUROPE IN MODERN TECHNOLOGY—AMERICAN FIRMS ARE BEGINNING TO DOMINATE FOREIGN MARKETS AS THEY SET UP SUBSIDIARIES ABROAD OR BUY OUT THEIR OVERSEAS COMPETITORS

Last of a series

ROME, March 18.—A distinguished leader of the European movement for political unity and closer relations with the United States held up a warning finger.

"I'm afraid a misunderstanding—to say the least—is coming between the United States and Europe and I don't know how we can avoid it."

The cause of his alarm was the "technological gap." Throughout Europe there is widespread fear that the United States has opened up such a commanding lead in computers and other glamour industries based on advanced science and technology that Europe's economic future may be jeopardized.

Adding fuel to the growing argument are two related problems: the "brain drain," or heavy loss of physicians, scientists and engineers suffered by many European countries as their best-trained young people, lured by bigger opportunities and salaries, migrate to the United States; and the increasing American domination of foreign markets as U.S. firms set up subsidiaries abroad or buy out European competitors.

These three intertwined problems are currently the most fashionable subject of discussion in Europe. Statesmen, economists, business leaders and others repeatedly brought them up in conversations with a Post-Dispatch reporter during a seven-week trip through seven European countries. Finding cause for concern on every side, they cited with alarm a long list of developments, including:

The United States spends two to three times as much money on research and development as the major countries of western Europe combined.

A total of 85,000 foreign engineers, scientists and physicians left their native countries to settle in the U.S. in the 15 years ended in 1964, and the rate is rising.

Great Britain, already having trouble keeping up with the world's economic leaders, lost 1900 scientists and technicians to America in six years.

Europe's aviation industry has fallen behind technologically and America's big manufacturers are swamping the European market with their commercial airliners.

Direct American investment in plants and equipment abroad, now totaling about 50 billion dollars, is soaring. The rise is particularly fast in Europe, with manufacturing investments in the six Common Market countries jumping by nearly 40 per cent last year.

American business threatens to dominate some European industries. U.S. firms already control 50 per cent of Britain's automobile production. When General Electric took over Machines Bull, it left France without a centralized computer industry.

The problem that Europe faces is a product of its small, divided, nationalistic economies. It stems also from Europe's failure to move swiftly into the technological age with its emphasis on computers, electronics and the other scientific industries utilizing the most sophisticated techniques. Said the statesman who feared a serious rift between the U.S. and Europe:

"Through the Common Market and the Coal and Steel Community, Europe has put its old, traditional industries on a sounder economic footing. Yet it has done little in the new scientific industries while the

United States has been developing a whole new technology. American firms have moved far out in front."

The danger, he went on, is "the growing impression that the United States is going to control Europe's industry and economy." An official in Belgium warned of an other hazard. Irritation over the American technological lead and the continuing U.S. takeover of European firms could well lead to a dangerous nationalistic reaction. This possibility is particularly true in his own country, he added.

There is another side to the coin, however. Some informed sources believe that the very seriousness of the technological problem may help to push Europe in the direction of greater economic and political co-operation. Said one:

"Europe must organize and unite. The pressures are all in that direction. The concept of national independence has become nonsense for European countries and perhaps even for the whole European continent."

Those who hold this view believe that Europe's problem will be solved only if a bigger, more unified economic base is constructed. This is one of the principal arguments used by Great Britain in its current effort to join the Common Market. With Britain and its partners in the European Free Trade Association as members, the Common Market would have a Gross National Product of 350 billion dollars. Its population would go from 180,000,000 to 280,000,000. This mass market, substantially larger than the United States, would be vast enough to support the costly research that is needed for top rank in the technological age, say the advocates of unity.

Chances for this kind of action appear remote at present. There is a general expectation that France will block the British move to join the Common Market. So if anything is to be done, it must be on a shorter-range, more limited basis.

One of the moves most favored by European businessmen is a relaxation of antitrust laws to allow mergers across national boundaries. Business leaders argue that only the largest concerns can afford highly expensive research programs and Europe has few business giants. Figures show that of the 65 largest firms in the world in 1963, more than three fourths, or 49, were American.

Robert Marjolin, the economist who is vice president of the Common Market, offers some other remedies. In a speech several months ago he called on European nations to raise the level of higher education, make liberal grants for research at universities, provide more public funds to pay for applied research and development projects, and encourage private research through changes in laws governing taxation, patents and operation of private foundations.

Marjolin and others have stressed the need for the six members of the Common Market to co-ordinate their policies relating to scientific research and technology and pool their resources for common undertakings. In a cautious approach to the concept of creating a broader base, they have urged that non-members, particularly Great Britain, be allowed to join in research efforts by the Common Market.

A solution that may become increasingly inviting to European businessmen is to link up with American concerns. This is the quickest, easiest way to get the know-how they need although the price they pay may be a share in their businesses. Obviously this approach is not indorsed by any European government. However, there is a tacit acknowledgement that American factories bring Europe badly needed resources of money and knowledge. For despite their protests about American investments, European leaders have not moved to restrict them. Even France, which has shown the greatest

hostility, recently took a somewhat softer line.

So far, there has been talk but little action toward remedying Europe's underlying problems. Studies are being made by the Common Market, the European Parliament and even the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The U.S. also is analyzing the situation, considering steps this country might take to reduce the gap. Several proposals have been advanced for European-American co-operation, including a rather vague suggestion by Italian Foreign Minister Amintore Fanfani for a kind of technological Marshall Plan to be financed jointly.

Whether the technological gap is as wide as it is painted is open to question. The "brain drain" to the United States is offset in part by a talent flow to Europe from less developed areas. Nor are all of those who migrate to the United States permanently lost to Europe, for many return. Those who are skeptical argue, too, that America's greater spending on research may simply reflect, in part at least, its generally higher costs. And a high level of technical expertise does not appear to be an economic panacea, for growth in the United States has been slower than in some European countries.

Despite these qualifications, it is clear that Europe lags far behind the United States. Some measure of the gap has been spelled out by the highly respected Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development in one of the new significant studies made of the problem.

Using 1962 data, it found that the United States spent about four times as much on research and development as western Europe, defined as including Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands. After allowing for differences in costs, it put the American figure at two and a half times the European level.

About 60 percent of the American expenditure was for military and space research, compared with only 33 percent in western Europe. The American lead in these fields was about 4 to 1. But in civilian research the margin was much smaller, probably about 1½ to 1. The study conceded that civilian activities in the United States probably benefit from the country's heavy military and space activities but said opinions differ on the extent of the "spinoff."

The OECD estimated that about 1,250,000 persons were employed on research and development projects in the United States compared with only about half a million in western Europe. Included in the totals were 436,000 scientists and engineers in the United States but only 148,000 in western Europe.

America was found to have a significant technical lead in "most industries," though not all. Its superiority was greatest in electrical equipment, machinery, vehicles and aircraft.

Several statistics confirm the general American advantage. The study found that the United States has a large and growing surplus in its "technological balance of payments" with Europe, measuring the flow in payments for technical know-how licenses and patents. American receipts from western Europe exceeded its payments by a margin of 5 to 1.

In the five years ended in 1961 Americans accounted for 17 percent of all the patents taken out in western Europe. But Europeans held only 10 percent of the total issued in America. The big American lead appears to be increasing.

The study was pessimistic about chances of closing the gap. Given a conscious, all-out effort, it may be possible in the civilian field although progress will be difficult and slow, the OECD said. In military and space research, where the American advantage is greater, it added, the chances are even slimmer.

Europe's lagging position is emphasized

even further when it is ranked against both the United States and the Soviet Union. Although the two big countries have only 14 percent of the world's population, they have over two-thirds of all the scientists and engineers engaged in research and development work.

The number of workers employed on research and development projects in the Soviet Union is estimated to be between 1,000,000 and 1,500,000. This is about the same as the American figure but two to three times the total in western Europe. In substance, the OECD found that Russia's relation to Communist eastern Europe is much the same as the United States' position with western Europe. Both big countries are major sources of technical knowledge within their spheres of influence. Both have heavy favorable balances. However, there is no evidence that Russia holds a lead like that of the United States in the field of civilian research.

Both the OECD study and a recent report prepared for the United Nations confirm the heavy "brain drain" from Europe to the United States. The OECD study showed that between 1952 and 1963 the number of scientists and engineers coming to America was equal to about 5½ per cent of each year's class of university graduates. In just five years ended in 1961 the total came to 6500. After some slowdown in 1961 and 1962, there appears to have been an increase in 1963. Most affected was Great Britain, whose net loss of scientists and engineers rose from 665 in 1962 to 917 in 1963.

American expenditures for research and development in 1962 were estimated at 17.5 billion dollars. In contrast, all of western Europe spent only 4.4 billion. Expenditures amounted to 3.1 per cent of Gross National Product in the United States but only 1.6 per cent in Europe. Per capita expenditures in the U.S. were nearly four times those in Europe. The ratio of technological workers to total population was more than twice as high in the United States as in Europe.

If Europe ever expects to catch up with the United States and the Soviet Union, the OECD stressed, it must expand its higher education facilities. The study noted:

"In the long run the scale of research and development effort which is feasible depends on the supply of scientific manpower, and western Europe has lagged far behind the United States and the USSR in this respect. The U.S. and the USSR both have a very much larger stock of scientists and engineers and a much larger output than all the western European nations combined."

The study acknowledged that most European countries have "ambitious" plans for expanding higher education, but added, "even if these are all realized the American and Soviet annual output of scientists and engineers will still be much bigger in 1970, and the disparity in the absolute size of the stock will be greater still."

It is clear that it will take a high order of political and industrial statesmanship if Europe is to be brought into the front rank of the technological age. It is also clear that this kind of leadership is not yet in sight.

SENATOR MUSKIE LAUDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when a colleague is accorded recognition as an outstanding public servant, it reflects great credit on the Senate as well as on the Member's own State. The latest to be so honored is the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

In a Wall Street Journal article of March 28, Senator MUSKIE is accurately portrayed by newsman Norman C. Miller

as a man whose "name seldom lands in the headlines," but who is "one of the Senate's most skillful legislators, a pragmatist who works quietly and effectively."

Mr. President, I know of no Member who is more worthy of this praise. The Senator from Maine eschews publicity, works hard, and has gained a well-deserved reputation among his colleagues for integrity, fair dealing, and effectiveness. What is more, his stature grows with each passing year. As a lawmaker, as a great American, and as a thoroughly decent human being, Ed MUSKIE has few peers; he is a Senator's Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article on the junior Senator from Maine be printed at this point in the RECORD:

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

MUSKIE OF MAINE—THOUGH HE SHUNS THE SENATE LIMELIGHT, HIS INFLUENCE IS CONSIDERABLE, AND GAINING

(By Norman C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The tall, lean Senator relaxes in his back-row seat on the Democratic side, his craggy countenance impassive as the orations flow on. A gallery visitor might well conclude that this quiet Senator is just another backbencher, a man of little influence in the chamber.

In the popular sense it is no doubt true that Edmund S. Muskie, the junior Senator from Maine, is a relatively obscure member. His name seldom lands in the headlines; his appearance on national television is rare. But the fact that the limelight has eluded Ed Muskie during eight years in the Senate does not mean that he has failed to achieve an influential role.

On the contrary, in cloakroom speculation about who may someday succeed Mike Mansfield as Democratic Leader, Ed Muskie's name is high on almost everyone's list. Such talk is premature, but it demonstrates the high regard colleagues have for him as one of the Senate's most skillful legislators, a pragmatist who works quietly and effectively for liberal goals without inflaming feelings by indulging in doctrinaire debate. And, since Sen. Muskie has a record of winning by massive margins in Maine, chances are that the 53-year-old Senator will steadily expand his Senate influence for years to come.

This prospect is particularly welcome at the White House. For Ed Muskie has guided through the Senate some of Lyndon Johnson's most controversial programs, notably last year's model cities bill, a legislative innovation given little chance of success until a Muskie compromise disarmed the opposition without sacrificing the essentials. Clearly, the President hopes to make use of Sen. Muskie's talents in future legislative battles.

"The President regards him as a real powerhouse," says a former White House aide. "He's one of the few liberals who's a match for the Southern legislative craftsmen."

There's irony in this admiration, for Ed Muskie is hardly one of Lyndon Johnson's Senate proteges. In fact, when he entered the Senate in 1958 he quickly found himself in the then-Majority Leader's doghouse, and there he stayed for quite some time.

A DEMAND UNHEEDED

The run-in occurred when the Majority Leader demanded the freshman Senator's help in defeating the biennial liberal attempt to amend Senate rules so filibusters could be curbed more easily. Sen. Muskie rejected the demand and voted with the anti-Johnson liberals.

But LBJ won anyway, and his retaliation was swift. Sen. Muskie was assigned to three moribund committees: Government Operations, Public Works and Banking. The assignments were far from satisfying to a man whose ambition on coming to Washington had been to work in the foreign affairs field. In his early years in the Senate, he recalls, "I was very frustrated, lonely, disillusioned and disconsolate."

The Washington letdown was particularly jarring for Sen. Muskie after his remarkable rise to the top in Maine politics as a Democrat in a traditional Republican stronghold.

Son of a tailor who had emigrated from Poland to Rumford, Maine, Edmund Sixtus Muskie worked his way through Bates College, winning a Phi Beta Kappa key, and got his law degree from Cornell in 1939. War interrupted his efforts to establish a practice in Waterville, Maine, and he spent the duration as a junior officer on destroyer escorts in the Atlantic and Pacific.

Returning to Waterville, the inexperienced lawyer found clients scarce. Thus, when local Democratic leaders approached him hunting fresh candidates for the state legislature, young Ed Muskie quickly accepted. The New Deal had cemented his allegiance to the Democratic Party, he recalls, and "I thought it would be interesting to be in the legislature once, while I was waiting for my law practice to build up."

Mr. Muskie won and was quickly captivated by politics. He was to stay in the Maine house for six years, becoming minority leader of a small band of Democrats. During this time, too, he married Jane Gray of Waterville and the first of the couple's five children was born.

In 1952 the rising politician became Maine's Democratic National Committeeman—just in time to preside over the near collapse of the state's shaky party. Dwight Eisenhower's triumph over Adlai Stevenson wiped out the Federal patronage that had sustained Democratic Party workers for years. And political misfortune was compounded by personal disaster. Early in 1953, while working on a second-story addition to his home, Mr. Muskie fell and broke his back. Almost a year passed before he was fully recovered, and by then he was almost broke financially.

Seemingly, it wasn't a promising prelude to another political campaign. Yet Mr. Muskie and a few other Democrats in 1954 found themselves in control of the Maine party by default; the old leaders had lost interest with the lapse of Federal patronage. Mr. Muskie was picked to run for governor, and scored a stunning upset.

His election as Maine's first Democratic governor in 20 years was less a personal triumph, however, than a product of voter reaction against long years of the GOP's one-party rule. Actually, Maine knew very little about its new governor; state politicians recall finding Yankee Protestants astonished to learn they had voted for a Catholic of Polish descent.

But Gov. Muskie established himself solidly with the voters during his two two-year terms. Taking a nonpartisan approach emphasizing economic and educational problems, he maneuvered most of his program through the Republican legislature. In 1958, when he made his bid for Washington, he rolled up 60% of the vote to become the first popularly elected Democratic Senator in Maine's history.

In Washington, however, Mr. Muskie was just another freshman from a small state and one, moreover, laboring under the handicap of having crossed Majority Leader Johnson. But in time the committee assignments that seemed second-rate gave Sen. Muskie his chance to make his mark.

Both pollution control and the problems of Federal-state relations came under the jurisdiction of Sen. Muskie's committees. In the

late '50s and early '60s these were matters of scant public concern, but they were familiar to the former governor and he immersed himself in them.

Consequently, when water and air pollution suddenly developed into major political issues in response to grassroots demands for clean-ups, Sen. Muskie was prepared to lead the long legislative battles that resulted in the Clean Air Act of 1963 and the Water Quality Act of 1965, which gave the Federal Government money and authority to begin policing pollution. This year he will lead the effort to enact President Johnson's proposal for Federal enforcement of new regional air pollution standards, which Sen. Muskie has long urged on the Administration.

UP FROM OBSCURITY

Similarly, Sen. Muskie's post as chairman of the once-obscure Senate subcommittee on intergovernmental relations has become a strategic spot. His panel's hearings have helped spotlight the shortcomings of proliferating Federal grant-in-aid programs intended to help states and local governments. But, while he has been sharply critical of bureaucratic bungling and red tape, he has disdained publicly-seeking exposés to concentrate on legislative remedies.

Sen. Muskie's legislative specialties now so absorb him that he has forsworn his original ambition to join the Foreign Affairs Committee. Having worked up to a senior position on all his committees, he has twice rejected chances to give one up for a junior seat on Foreign Affairs. That decision has curbed his participation in the Senate's highly publicized Vietnam debates. For, though he generally supports the Administration's war policy, he refrains from making a lot of speeches on matters unrelated to his specialties, recognizing that a Senator who talks too much loses influence in the chamber.

Anyway, dealing with practical problems like controlling pollution and making Federal-state programs work better is shrewd politics for a Democrat from a state that's still predominantly Republican. "In Maine they don't even think of me as a Democrat," Sen. Muskie says with satisfaction.

Indeed, his personal appeal back home is markedly similar to that of his popular four-term Republican counterpart, Margaret Chase Smith; both are disdainful of partisan bickering. Yet, while Mrs. Smith is truly a lone wolf in the GOP, Sen. Muskie always campaigns as a member of the "Democratic Team" (he is careful never to criticize Mrs. Smith, however—) which makes some Maine Democrats unhappy).

On the home stump, speechmaker Muskie can deliver a stemwinder, and in the Senate it was his eloquent appeal that carried the day for the model cities bill last year (afterward, Majority Leader Mansfield remarked to colleagues, "It's rare for a Senator to win any votes by a floor speech, but Ed did and pulled the bill through"). Yet, except about subjects on which he enjoys a special competence, he is reluctant to speak out, and this evokes misgivings among some other liberals. They fault him for shying from open combat on issues.

There are those, too, who think he is reticent about seeking power. This year and next he will have an opportunity to show his mettle in an additional assignment as chairman of the Senate committee that works to get Democratic members elected.

That job is another that probably won't win headlines for Sen. Muskie. But Senators do not rise in the club because of publicity. It is their "inside" performance that counts with their colleagues, and in that respect Sen. Muskie has no worry about his accomplishments escaping attention.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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.

COLOR IT RED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, my eye was caught by a full-page advertisement in the Washington, D.C., Post on April 3 with the crude headlines "Stop the Killing—Stop the Vietnam War."

Obviously designed in its flamboyance of appearance to attract immediate attention to the emotion-arousing sentiments which it expressed, the advertisement was stated to be an appeal from citizens of Japan and "The Voice of Hiroshima." In all ways it represented a blatant play on the emotions.

I am wondering if the same ad, or a similar one, appeared in North Vietnamese newspapers, and I would be willing to predict that it did not.

This dramatic advertisement, which purported to speak for the Japanese people, arbitrarily stated:

The U.S. must stop bombing North Vietnam, unconditionally and permanently. It must unilaterally de-escalate its war action.

It linked the Hiroshima atomic bombing with the bombing of military targets in North Vietnam, but it did not mention Korea.

It combined messages from so-called victims of the brutalities of World War II, and an accusatory plaint for return to Japan of control of the island of Okinawa, with a range of dramatic critiques of American policy in southeast Asia.

This published hodgepodge of dramatic charges had as its leadoff a beginning half page of pen-brushed oriental characters, a great contrast to the usual printed alphabet of American newspaper type. The effect was theatrical in appearance and emotion arousing in substance.

But to have been most realistically presented, the entire page-long advertisement should have been colored red.

I ask unanimous consent that this advertisement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STOP THE KILLING—STOP THE VIETNAM WAR
AN APPEAL FROM CITIZENS OF JAPAN AND THE
VOICE OF HIROSHIMA

An angry elephant, the most enormous ever seen, is rampaging through the Southeast Asian jungle. Contemptuous of all other life, he tramples all underfoot, smashing down the trees, vines and flowers, crushing beneath his ponderous feet the nests of birds and the homes of his weaker neighbors. By the law of the jungle, Might is Right. But by the same law, he too will be destroyed by his natural enemies and the creatures he has outraged. Such is the bitter truth of this Vietnam war.

The Japanese people and the citizens of Hiroshima say: In the past, we Japanese

waged war all over Asia as a means of attaining our political goals. To justify these wars, our leaders made up slogans: "Peace and Freedom in Asia!" and "Stop Communism!" We believed these slogans, and, like the elephant, we trampled on the rights of others. By the law of the jungle, we were crushed. With the atomic bombing of Hiroshima we experienced the utmost savagery of war. We learned of its futility: both the bombs and the bombers are victims.

The Vietnam war reminds us of Hiroshima and all our own bitter past. Having inflicted bombs and suffered them as well, we can imagine the feelings that lie deep in the hearts of the bombed Vietnamese. We can also imagine the emotions of American youngsters who are now sent out to destroy Vietnamese.

The Japanese are against this war: We are a nation of more than 100 million people. We consider ourselves to be among America's friends in Asia, but your government is losing our sympathy by its rampage in Vietnam. Eighty-two per cent of the Japanese adults are opposed to the United States war policy in Vietnam, according to a nationwide poll conducted by the Mainichi, a leading independent daily.

To your Government, we say: We have learned from past experience, and the lessons of our history, that policies imposed on other nations by force of arms, are futile. The minds of men cannot be won by destruction of life and possessions. If the United States values its national destiny, it must stop this destruction. The United States must stop bombing North Vietnam, unconditionally and permanently. It must unilaterally de-escalate its war action. All parties involved in the fighting must thus be brought out of the jungle to the conference table. Only such negotiations can bring this senseless war to a just conclusion—settlement of the Vietnamese questions by the Vietnamese people themselves.

We say this from our past experience—especially the painful experience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

To American citizens: We Japanese are with you whenever you speak up against this unjustifiable war. Let us cry together "We are against this war!" so that our policymakers will hear our compelling voice. This is no time for silence. We must speak up now!

JAPANESE POINT OF VIEW

(Mrs. Kurihara Sadako (atomic bomb victim in Hiroshima).—In the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, I lost my parents and everything I had. I am still suffering from radiation after-effects. It was on Aug. 6, 1945 that the first atomic bomb was used on man, largely as an experiment. Now, we survivors of the atomic bombing see Vietnam being used as a proving ground for new American weapons. As human beings sharing the same fate, we have deep sympathy with the bombed people of Vietnam. In one voice with all others, we cry out from Hiroshima, "Stop the war and restore peace to Vietnam!"

Kitazone Tadao (day-laborer, Tokyo).—Americans never forget Pearl Harbor. Before the Japanese Imperial Government started the perfidious attack, many people in Japan opposed the war and were jailed. I am one of the many. The Vietnamese people are now fighting against your government just as your forefathers led by George Washington fought against England, which refused to give them independence. I want to fight for the independence of Vietnam in the spirit of the American revolution upheld by George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

Hidaka Rokuro, (professor of Tokyo Univ.).—What America gained in Japan by its war in Vietnam is only the Japanese people's disappointment, distrust and indigna-

tion. In public opinion surveys, the Japanese used to point to America as the country they favored most. A recent poll showed that America is no longer the country best liked by the Japanese. This is the first time in the postwar history that the United States has failed to rank first in such polls. I remember that George Kennan warned about this in his testimony to your Senate. What he was fearing has already become a reality.

(Miss) Yokoi Miyako (sixth grade primary school pupil, Osaka).—I am terrified to hear many boys and girls of my age have been killed in Vietnam. American friends, do stop killing them.

(Mrs.) Uchiyama Ayako (housewife).—Is it true that the Vietnam war is being fought to defend Asia from Communism? Do you justify the killing of so many innocent children and women in Vietnam because you are against Communism? Misled by the military clique, the Japanese committed a grave crime in Asia years ago. Will you, American women, give your serious thought to the atrocities your men are acting in Vietnam?

Noma Hiroshi (novelist).—Eyes burning with hostility to China are like the blinkered eyes of the carriage-horse. This narrowed vision in man leads to recklessness. War is escalated in Vietnam and crisis hangs over Japan, Asia and the whole world. I write these lines in sorrow and anger.

Muro Kenji (student).—I was born in 1946, the year after the last war ended. I myself have no personal war experience. However, I believe those who can see the situation objectively can often grasp its meaning better than those who are on one side of the war. American friends, listen to Japanese young people who are definitely against your war. We may be seeing something which you in America fail to see in the Vietnam situation.

Dr. Muramatsu Hiro (physician).—Vietnam is now being showered with napalm bombs and sprayed with poisonous chemicals. Human lives are being taken on a mass scale. Those in the medical profession cannot let this murderous act continue because they live for the sake of saving human lives. America must immediately stop killing the Vietnamese.

(Miss) Shinzato Fumiko (Okinawa student).—Okinawa is actually a part of Japan, but it is subject to American military rule. All our islands have been turned into a military stronghold. There are 950,000 of us Japanese living in Okinawa. Our land has been confiscated arbitrarily for your military bases and our people are forced to work for your bases under humiliating conditions. Frequently, your planes accidentally drop vehicles, timber and light bombs on the homes of Okinawans, and many have been killed or injured. We have little political freedom under your military government. Your leaders explain that the Okinawans must endure all this for the sake of freedom. But there is no freedom to be protected in Okinawa. Nor are democracy and security of life. We want to be part of Japan again as soon as possible. We demand therefore that you end the Vietnam war and return our islands to our homeland.

(The fund for this advertisement has been raised by Beheiren (Japan (Peace for Vietnam) Committee) from among hundreds of thousands of people all over Japan and from all walks of life and of all ages, who responded to a call issued by 13 persons whose names are printed right at the bottom. Especially in Hiroshima, the local YMCA and other citizens' groups took an active part in the fund-raising campaign. Beheiren was founded in April, 1965, by writers, composers, artists, professors and citizens' groups with no political affiliation, with novelist ODA Makoto as chairman. Beheiren sponsored its first anti-war advertisement in the New York Times on Nov. 16, 1965. Your comments on

this ad and financial contribution are welcome to Beheiren.)

Awaya Noriko, Singer; El Rokusuke, Popular Song Writer; Izumi Taku, Composer; Kaiko Ken, Novelist; Kato Yoshiro, Cartoonist; Komatsu Sakyō, Novelist; Kuno Osamu, University Professor; Kuwabara Takeo, University Professor; Matsumoto Seicho, Novelist; ODA Makoto, Novelist; Okamoto Taro, Painter; Shiroyama Saburo, Novelist; Tsurumi Shunsuke, University Professor.

ADEQUATELY FINANCED RESEARCH PROGRAMS, RATHER THAN ARBITRARY AND RESTRICTIVE HEW REGULATIONS, ARE NEEDED TO INSURE BOTH CLEAN AIR FOR THE NATION AND CONTINUED ABUNDANT FUEL SUPPLIES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this Nation of ours is blessed above all others with abundant resources of fuel. Coal reserves alone are sufficient to last for hundreds of years at present rates of consumption, and a great deal of them are in West Virginia.

We must have ample supplies of readily available, low-cost fuel. The demand for energy is growing at a prodigious rate. Electric power consumption alone is doubling every 7 years. Our expanding industrial and transportation system will require more and more fuel. Without ample fuel supplies here at home we could be in serious trouble.

But our seemingly abundant supply of fuel is being threatened—not by some natural disaster which might deny access to our coal or oil reserves.

The danger arises from the zeal of some officials in the Federal Government to clean up air pollution without regard to the effect on our fuel supplies. Cleaning up the air is a laudable and important goal and one toward which everyone—Government, the Congress, industry, and the individual—should work.

Unfortunately, some of our air pollution control officials have decided that this goal of clean air can be achieved overnight simply by the issuance of regulations. They have decided that the only way the problem can be attacked is by imposing limits on the amount of sulfur contained in fuels which can be legally burned to reduce the amount of sulfur dioxide in the atmosphere.

Mr. President, the only difficulty with this approach is that the limits which are being pushed are so restrictive that they would prohibit the burning of almost all of our coal. They would kill the patient to cure the cold. For example, they are recommending standards which would limit the coal burned in metropolitan areas to that containing less than one-half of 1 percent sulfur. This is intended to achieve a goal which Public Health Service officials have adopted, calling for no more than 0.1 part per million of sulfur dioxide in the air. Many scientists contend that this is far lower than is necessary in order to protect health, but, nevertheless, it is being adopted as a national goal by HEW.

The plain fact is that we have very little coal which is that low in sulfur content—some States and some counties of other States, including West Virginia, produce no coal that could even begin to qualify under such rigid standards. Thus, if such unrealistic air pollution guidelines are accepted and adopted on a wide scale, they can only cause the closing down of many mines, the loss of thousands of jobs in the coal mine, railroad, and allied industries, and eventually severe economic disruption to the Nation.

Without free access to coal, I do not see how the Nation's future demands for fuel can be met. Nor can I understand why Department of Health, Education, and Welfare officials refuse to recognize that any sound air pollution control program must be based upon assurances that plentiful supplies of fuel still will be available.

Of course, we are going to have to have regulations governing the emissions of pollutants. But it simply does not make sense to issue regulations that are so restrictive they would bar the burning of the vast majority of our fuel reserves. In the long run, this would assure the collapse of any air pollution control program and, more seriously, it would raise the real danger of a fuels and power shortage.

There is no need for this Nation to get itself into the dilemma of having to choose between clean air and plentiful fuel.

We can, and must, have both. But the way to achieve this goal is not through the issuance of regulations which will cut off our major supplies of fuel. Rather, it is to emphasize research, to develop the technology that will reduce the sulfur in coal and the emission of sulfur oxide in coal combustion to the desirable level.

This approach, and I wish to emphasize this point, will move us as fast as practicable and feasible toward the ultimate goal of pollutant-free air, but it will not run the risk of a fuel shortage. Meantime, we will perfect ways to control sulfur emissions from smokestacks, to make it possible to burn all our coal without polluting the atmosphere.

HEW officials have talked a lot about the need for new technology. But, thus far, they have failed to match their words with action. In passing the Clean Air Acts of 1963 and 1965, Congress clearly recognized the technological deficit and instructed HEW to plan and carry out the necessary research program.

Unfortunately, we are not much further along than we were when the 1963 and 1965 legislation was passed. Some essential work has been done, but little if any of it by HEW, on the development of processes to remove the sulfur from fuel or to control sulfur dioxide emissions.

Private industry has been working on this problem for many years, as has the U.S. Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior. I am told that there are now at least four processes for removing the sulfur oxides from the stacks after coal and oil are burned. All of these are said

to offer promise although further research and development, including actual testing in large pilot plants, is necessary. This work needs to be greatly speeded up. We should start building large demonstration plants so that in the not too distant future we will have the necessary equipment ready for installation in new and existing powerplants.

If it is necessary to build pilot plants to test all of these systems at the same time, and if such a program would materially speed up the prospects of at least one of them being proven practicable and economically feasible, then it should be done. This is the procedure followed by the Atomic Energy Commission, which may have several different demonstration programs for different types of atomic power converters underway at once, hoping that one or more will prove successful. The need for learning how to utilize our natural resources for coal without adding to the problems of air pollution is greater than the need to develop new methods of generating atomic power, and the Government must recognize and accept this fact.

I do not believe Congress will quibble about the necessary funds to carry on this work. The Congress realized, as far back as 1963, that research is the key that will unlock the door to cleaner air. That is why we clearly instructed HEW to plan and carry on the necessary research work.

What is needed now is for HEW to come up with a research program which recognizes the urgency of the situation and the compelling need for developing the technology which will insure against the threat of a possible fuel shortage.

Ours is the most technically advanced nation in the world. Given a problem as important as the one we now face—that of developing adequate supplies of pollution-free fuel—I have every confidence in the world that we can come up with the answers.

In the meantime and pending the development of the necessary technology, I hope that HEW will go slow with any new regulations which ignore the realities of the situation.

This Nation can have clean air and continued abundant fuel supplies. The answer lies in research—and not in restrictive and unrealistic regulations, adopted before science and engineering have made it possible of achievement without economic disaster.

ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY EXPOSES INCREASE IN SLAVERY—NEED FOR HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION—XLIX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, while many people agree to the advisability of U.S. ratification of the human rights conventions on forced labor or political rights of women, these same people have asked me: "Why do you plead daily for ratification of a convention outlawing slavery? Certainly everyone knows that thankfully slavery has gone the way of the dinosaur and the dodo bird."

Mr. President, my answer to these peo-

ple is simply this: slavery is very much alive in 1967, and increasing rather than decreasing.

The Anti-Slavery Society in London, founded in 1823, is a fact-gathering private organization which provided the impetus and persuasion for legislation abolishing slavery throughout the British Empire in 1833.

Not content merely with the abolition of slavery throughout the British Empire, the Anti-Slavery Society has persisted to this day on a very limited budget and with a small staff—in its effort to eradicate entirely from our civilization this barbaric practice of man's inhumanity to man.

Between 1947 and 1962, the society has found, there has been a threefold increase in chattel slavery.

The contemporary practice of slavery is concentrated, but not confined, in the Middle East. There, the increased purchasing power from oil profits has nurtured the expansion of slavery, a traditional practice in that region.

However, there is a bright spot even in that area. King Faisal of Saudi Arabia has developed an effective program for stopping slave traffic within his nation.

Still, forms of slavery prevail in such diverse areas as Africa—on both northern and southern borders of the Sahara—in the Andes of South America, in parts of Pakistan and India, and even in a section of the Philippine Islands.

Slavery is decidedly a contemporary problem. We cannot ignore it. While slavery has been absolutely eradicated from our national life, the United States can exert a very positive international influence by ratifying the convention on slavery.

We can use our considerable international prestige to bolster those nations which are conscientiously attempting to expunge slavery from their own lands and to demonstrate to other nations, not making the effort, that we are aware of their practice of slavery and are diametrically opposed to it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate without further delay, to ratify the human rights conventions on forced labor, genocide, and political rights of women, as well as the convention on slavery.

THE AMERICAN DAIRY FARMER CHEATED WITH CHEEDHAM IMPORTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I am the principal Senate sponsor of S. 612, the Dairy Import Act of 1967. I am happy to say that this legislation is now being sponsored by one-half of the Senate. Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture has recognized the seriousness of the dairy import picture by calling for hearings under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

However, action under this section to curtail imports can be considered, at best, only a temporary solution. As we have seen in the past, once quotas are set on Junex and Colby cheese, the principal offenders of our import control

regulations, new mixes and cheeses will be manufactured to circumvent these controls. This invasion by evasion can be halted only by a permanent control measure such as the Proxmire bill, which permits imports to share in any increase in domestic consumption yet places controls, based on a historical import figure, on dairy imports.

In my estimation, the importance of S. 612 is highlighted by the fact that the proposed section 22 hearings have not dampened enthusiasm for import control legislation. In fact, since Secretary Freeman called for these hearings, three more Senators have placed their names on the Dairy Import Act of 1967.

Finally, I am delighted to note that cheese importers have finally, although probably inadvertently, decided to call a spade a spade. As most of us know, dairy imports have cheated the dairy farmer out of his share in the national prosperity by taking advantage of loopholes in our Nation's import control regulations. The Journal Of Commerce Import Bulletin for Friday, February 18, announced that eight cases of cheedham had been brought into the port of New York from Australia. If Congress acts this year to impose strict but sensible dairy import controls, foreign cheese manufacturers will not be able to "cheat 'em" any longer, with imports of cheedham or any other foreign dairy product.

NELSON PROPOSAL FOR APOSTLE ISLANDS DESERVES ALL-OUT SUPPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Senator GAYLORD NELSON has made a great fight for the preservation of the breathtakingly beautiful Apostle Islands as a national seashore.

Recently, the Milwaukee Sentinel commented editorially on why this fight by Senator NELSON deserves national support, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

BACKING NEEDED

Sen. Nelson (D-Wis.) says that the decisive stage has been reached for realization of a dream held by conservationists for many years—the establishment of the Apostle Islands national lakeshore. The difference between success or failure now may rest on the degree to which the private citizens of America are determined that this chance not be lost.

Bill S-778 would preserve for posterity a magnificent stretch of shoreline along Lake Superior, 21 islands still wild and undeveloped, and a 10,000 acre wildlife area. Chances for passage appear to be reasonably good, as the president has given priority to the proposal, and it has been cleared by the budget bureau for action by the senate interior committee. That committee will hold hearings soon, and the expression of public sentiment may determine the fate of the bill in the senate.

Nelson suggests that the Apostle islands bill will clear the senate, but will face a tough test in the house, and he urges, accordingly, that all of us tell our congressmen that we want the bill passed.

The advice is good, and it certainly is timely. It is far too seldom today that we

still have left the opportunity to preserve such a large and wonderful part of our natural heritage. The opportunity must be seized; if it is lost now, it may be gone forever.

The proposed Apostles park would also be a large boost for Wisconsin's economy. As Nelson says, it would provide northern Wisconsin with a tastefully developed national park service facility, which could well provide the nucleus for the recreational development of an area too long neglected. It could be one of the nation's truly great tourist attractions.

The time is at hand for all-out support of this project.

GRONOUSKI ENDORSES O'BRIEN POST OFFICE PROPOSAL

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the extensive proposal of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien to abolish his Department and substitute a nonprofit Government corporation in its place has evoked a great deal of discussion in recent days.

It is my view that the Postmaster General's significant ideas of reform for an operation that will become a \$1.2 billion deficit in the next fiscal year certainly bears our close attention. It may be the salvation of taxpayers who subsidize the U.S. postal service and result in putting the Department on a business basis.

Of special note is the fact that the former Postmaster General and now U.S. Ambassador to Poland, John Gronouski, in Warsaw made some sharply delineated and lively observations of his successor's plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement of Ambassador Gronouski printed in the RECORD.

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

As Postmaster General Larry O'Brien's immediate predecessor, I have been impressed by the important management innovations which have been inaugurated under his administration. None, however, are of as far reaching significance as the proposal to transfer the Post Office Department from an agency in the President's Cabinet to a nonprofit government corporation operated by a board of directors and managed by a professional executive. The Post Office Department is a critically important function of government, the efficient operation of which is vital to the flow of communications and commerce. Its functions both as user and supplier of services touch every facet of American life.

Yet, during my tenure as Postmaster General I became increasingly convinced that the Postmaster General's role does not rationally fit into the framework of the President's Cabinet. Matters that properly come up for Cabinet discussion only rarely have relevance to post office operations. Where the Postmaster General makes a meaningful contribution to Cabinet discussions it is usually in his individual capacity, not on the basis of his experience in running the post office.

Over the years the post office operation has grown dramatically both in size and complexity as one of the nation's largest business enterprises. Its successful management requires the exercise of sophisticated management skills. Furthermore, those who are responsible for its operation must be permitted a degree of flexibility and decision making authority comparable to that available to the

management of a major private business. Larry O'Brien's proposal is the sensible way to achieve these objectives and it has my unreserved endorsement.

REACTIVATION OF A BATTLESHIP FOR USE IN VIETNAM

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, over the past year, I have urged, time and again, in all the conferences I have been privileged to attend, that one of our battleships be taken out of mothballs and returned to the active fleet for use in naval bombardment of the railroads, highways, and other prime targets along the coast of North Vietnam.

For a long time, the Department of Defense took the unrealistic position that it was all right to drop thousand-pound bombs on these targets, but it would be highly improper and dangerous to fire shells upon them from ships at sea. They have finally been induced to use destroyers and cruisers.

But I have still been unsuccessful in persuading those who have the final authority in matters of this nature, that the use of a battleship is advisable. I may say, Mr. President, that I am more convinced than ever of the value of this additional attack capability.

It is, however, heartening to note that any political considerations which might heretofore have inhibited the adoption of naval bombardment of the north have now been cast aside. This, therefore, opens the way for the use of a battleship.

The destroyers and cruisers occupy an important part in our naval operations, but the armament on the vessels now being used has many limitations when compared with combat proven battlewagons. The 5-inch guns aboard destroyers and the 8-inch guns aboard cruisers have ranges of 7½ and 17 miles, respectively, while one battleship has nine 16-inch guns—each with a range of 24 miles. Indeed, Mr. President, some experts assert that this range can be increased to over 40 miles with the use of modern propellants.

In addition, each battleship is armed with 20 5-inch guns—the equivalent armament of five destroyers—and these weapons can be used against surface targets, as well as for their original purpose of protection from air attacks.

But the tremendous firepower of its main battery is the battleship's most important superiority. The destructive power of any weapon is based primarily on the weight of the explosive charge. The projectile of the 16-inch gun weighs 1,900 to 2,700 pounds and its nearest competitor, the projectile of the 8-inch naval gun, now being used, weighs 260 pounds. The notable superiority of this weapon against targets in the north needs no further testimony than these simple statistics.

Arguments against the use of a battleship in Vietnam relating to cost and the time it would take to activate one of these ships are unconvincing at best.

It has been estimated that it would cost between \$11 million and \$20.5 million to activate one battleship and the annual operating cost has been estimated at \$12.8 to \$16.8 million. In other words, the total cost of activating one of these huge vessels and operating it for 1 year is considerably less than the current cost of waging the war in Vietnam for 1 day.

But when we consider the price we are currently paying for air strikes against targets in North Vietnam, the significance of this cost diminishes even more. We are losing many fine, young American pilots daily and the value of their lives, particularly to their families and loved ones, is incalculable in financial terms. Considering it from the standpoint of hard dollars, many of the planes which go down with these young men cost more than \$2 million, in addition to approximately \$200,000 to train each pilot.

In addition, we currently have an adequate supply of workable 16-inch-gun ammunition, which no other ship in commission can use. This includes some 24,000 tons of projectiles—more than was expended during 31 months of battleship bombardment in Korea where it proved most effective. This ammunition was paid for long before our expensive operations in Vietnam even began.

Mr. President, it would take only a matter of months to remove one of these combat-proven vessels from the quiet waters of the back channel and prepare it for combat, and 3 additional months would be required for training and deployment. When compared with the leadtime for the development of some of the more fancy and sophisticated new innovations in weaponry, this leadtime is relatively short.

The Committee on Armed Services has been informed that there are between 500 and 600 targets in North Vietnam that could be effectively reached by gunfire from a battleship. A careful examination of the map of this long and narrow country confirms that a battleship could easily bring havoc on practically all of the strategic routes leading from Hanoi to the south.

An aircraft is over the target only a matter of seconds and the moment the aircraft departs, reconstruction of the damaged target begins. But one of these battleships can lie offshore and hurl one of these ton-or-more projectiles on the target every 35 or 40 minutes, regardless of weather conditions and visibility, and permanently interdict any reconstruction operations.

Some of our destroyers—which carry no armor—have been damaged in recent days in duels with North Vietnamese shore batteries. It has been reported that the weapons being installed along the shores of North Vietnam are of the 150-millimeter variety. The maximum range of weapons in this category—152-millimeter Soviet howitzer—which seems to be the most likely weapon—is approximately 10 miles. When we consider that the range of the 16-inch gun is 24 miles, it is obvious that any engagement between these Communist weapons and our battleships would be on our terms.

The four battleships in mothballs are

probably the most heavily armored vehicles in our defense system. Admiral Carney, the former Chief of Naval Operations, has called them "the strongest structures man has ever made."

The same size weapon that could sink a destroyer and take the lives of some of the crewmen on board would only damage without great significance a battleship because of its heavy protection.

It therefore seems to me, Mr. President, that the lives of American boys on a destroyer are needlessly jeopardized when we send one to do a battleship's job—just as the lives of our pilots have been needlessly jeopardized in attacking targets that could have been taken out by naval gunfire.

For the life of me, I cannot understand the adamant position of the Department of Defense and the administration against using this additional capability.

I may say, Mr. President, that I intend to discuss this matter on every available opportunity until some real reason is advanced for failure to reactivate a battleship.

MR. SULLIVANT—OKLAHOMA'S GREAT POLITICAL SAGE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, when Edmund Burke made that historical statement identifying the role of the fourth estate in the affairs of men, he predicted most accurately the service, the life, and the times of a beloved Oklahoma newspaperman, Mr. Otis Sullivan. Tomorrow night, April 11, 1967, friends of Mr. Sullivan will honor him at a testimonial banquet in Oklahoma City.

This event will be a much deserved tribute to the one individual who has influenced Oklahoma public opinion more than any other during my lifetime. It has been my good fortune over the years to have Mr. Otis Sullivan's respect and confidence. He has not always agreed with my position regarding legislative matters, but he has always been absolutely fair, honest, and interesting in his news and editorial treatment of me, my point of view and my record.

Let me clarify, however, my reasons for feeling pleased and sometimes flattered by Mr. Sullivan's reporting. It is not unusual for Oklahoma politicians to praise Mr. Sullivan one day and damn him the next. I must admit that while I praise him today, I might have reason to feel uncomfortable when I read what he writes tomorrow. He pulls no punches. Many times over the years Mr. Sullivan's analysis of my posture regarding matters of public interest have been most helpful to me.

I once hoped to become a great political writer myself. I once worked as a reporter in the Oklahoma statehouse alongside Mr. Sullivan—we were competitors. He represented the Daily Oklahoman and I was the Capitol correspondent for the long since defunct Oklahoma News.

In that long ago era of turbulent Oklahoma politics, when our young State set some sort of record in impeaching Governors, Otis Sullivan emerged as a living journalistic symbol of rigorous incorruptibility, compelling truth, and

sagacious observations. I have always admired his quiet professionalism.

Mr. Otis Sullivan has served the people of Oklahoma well over the past 40 years. He and Mrs. Sullivan have exemplified the highest type of citizenship. They have two married daughters and two grandchildren. Fortunately for our State, Mr. Sullivan's high standards of personal conduct and superb standards of journalism have influenced succeeding generations of young news men and women assigned to the State Capitol beat. Perhaps there will never be a cornerstone for the Sullivan school of journalism, but a tribute to his professional leadership is graven in the hearts of scores of those news gatherers who have benefited from watching him operate.

It is altogether fitting that the people of Oklahoma honor this journalist whose unselfish service to them has been of such great value to all the people of our State and to the Nation as a whole.

In recent weeks the editor of the *Sooner* magazine, the alumni publication of the University of Oklahoma, did a profile on Mr. Sullivan entitled "Otis Sullivan Is a Professional." In this article Mr. Paul Galloway documented most effectively this remarkable newspaperman and his contribution to society. I am privileged to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. Sullivan by requesting unanimous consent that Mr. Galloway's article appear at this point in the *RECORD*. For politicians who would serve more effectively, for newsmen who strive to do better, and for the reading public who benefits when the other estates and the fourth estate function constructively together, this biography essay has much meaning.

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

[From the *Sooner* magazine, Jan. 1967]

OTIS SULLIVANT IS A PROFESSIONAL

Oklahoma's peerless political scribe Otis Sullivan poses with his faithful 40-year-old typewriter in a rare photograph (Sullivan would rather be read than seen). The venerable L. C. Smith machine has turned out more page-one copy than any of its younger counterparts in the posh Daily Oklahoman newsroom. And the reputation of its master as a writer is legend. Says one colleague: "Otis is greatly respected for his accuracy and reliability. His stories have tremendous weight. People believe in them. You'd think they were chiseled on stone tablets—and for all I know, they are."

His voice on the telephone was clear and strong, the voice of a man younger than his 64 years, as I asked him if he would agree to an interview for an article in the alumni magazine. "Sure, come on up and we'll talk, though I'm not sure why you'd want to. All you're going to find is a cynical old man who no longer has any heroes." We arranged a meeting for a morning later in the week, and an hour or so before the appointed time, I entered the Oklahoma Publishing Co.'s new building on NE Fourth Street in Oklahoma City to talk with a couple of the men who have worked with Otis Sullivan, and known him as friends, for many of the 40 years that he has been writing for *The Daily Oklahoman*. We talked about him over coffee; about his reputation as the state's best political writer; about some of his big stories; about his unassailable accuracy and his unimpeachable integrity; about his ability to gauge the mood of the voters at election time and his methods at arriving at his consist-

ently unerring observations and predictions; about his family; about his farm east of Norman adjoining the Little River project; about the time while there when he was thrown by one of his horses, a mare named Ginger, in 1953 as he indulged himself in one of his few diversions—riding—and the state senate, in a moment of rare humor, countered the more respectful resolution passed by the house, which extended its sympathy for his broken leg and called for a speedy recovery, by offering its own resolution commending the horse. (Sen. Jim Rinehart cast the only vote against the resolution, explaining that since the horse had broken Sullivan's leg instead of his writing arm he, in good faith, could not vote to commend Ginger.)

One of the men told the story, which is perhaps apocryphal but which nonetheless captures the character of the man and thus is appropriately instructive, about the time a governor, one of Oklahoma's most powerful figures, was unhappy with some of Sullivan's articles, which he thought cast a less than flattering light on his administration. The governor summoned Sullivan to this office, and in no uncertain gubernatorial terms indicated his displeasure. He told Sullivan to stop. Sullivan's reply was laconic and direct: "Governor, I don't give a damn whether you like the articles or not," and with that he left.

When I asked one of the men about Sullivan's appraisal of himself as cynical and without heroes, he replied, "I think the only heroes Otis has are the people." The remark at first seemed corny, but I could see the man meant it. Later it seemed precisely correct.

I began an excursion into miscellanea: Is he a hunt-and-peck-man? (Answer: He uses both hunt-and-peck and touch methods.) Fast writer? (The inevitable answer: Yes, and always on deadline.) Short-hand? (Answer: No. He began with Gregg but soon abandoned it because it was playing havoc with his spelling.) I struck a responsive key when I asked about the kind of typewriter he used. We quickly adjourned from the first-floor cafeteria to the fourth floor and the newsroom to observe the machine.

The newsroom is something else. Hildy Johnson and his rakish cohorts of *The Front Page* would surely be struck incredulously speechless by its splendor. It does not resemble the cluttered, dingy, maelstroms of activity Hollywood gave us and, oddly enough, which actually exist. The Oklahoman's new newsroom is carpeted, fully and tastefully in blue; it is laden with Formica; it is windowless with automatic temperature control; it is very, very modern, extremely efficient, and just like any other large cavern-like office one might find in, say, an insurance company or some such business. But it's quite nice, and even the old reactionaries who hated to lose the former newsroom, the cramped, romantic relic right out of *Citizen Kane*, have made a happy adjustment.

We approached Sullivan's desk, indistinguishable from its uniformly exact companions except—wait. On his writing table, an anachronism. A black (yes, black and there are no black typewriters anymore) L. C. Smith sat, proudly and contemptuously too, I thought, flaunting its solid 40-year-old craftsmanship at the beige-and-white whipper-snappers which sat bulkily and self-consciously in its venerable presence. It was a reassuring link with the past, and its older sister, I am told, likewise reassures and retains links at the Capitol, subject to the words and wishes of another highly respected political observer, Ray Farr (*Sooner Magazine*, Nov. 1964).

Just as we were carefully and respectfully replacing the cover on the Smith, Sullivan entered the newsroom, came forward, and introduced himself. Like probably most of his readers, I had never met him. Further,

like many, I had never seen him, either in person or in a photograph.

I was quite familiar with his writing, of course. Every person who really reads the Oklahoman is. Though some may not venture past the asinine froth of Ann Landers and her ilk, many, and all of the shakers and movers of Oklahoma, know who Otis Sullivant is and read his columns. Tens of thousands, in fact, depend solely or at least heavily on him for insight into the machinations of their state government. Sullivant's style reflects the man. It is unpretentious, disciplined, direct, spare, knowledgeable. Each column is like an artisan's finely crafted piece of furniture: sturdily constructed, substantial, lasting, polished.

Surprisingly, for I do not customarily approach clairvoyance, he was very much as I had imagined him: tall (about six feet), slender, and erect. He is not given to smiling, and his appearance is therefore solemn, almost dour. His eyes are penetrating, not cold, and peer out from a pair of horn-rimmed glasses. His hair was once light it appears; it is now grey, closer to white really, sparse, and combed back. The man exudes incorruptibility.

The interview was held in a small conference cubbyhole off the newsroom, and the subject's apparent severity dissolved into unequivocal and relaxed cooperation. We spent a good part of the morning and the lunch hour talking about Oklahoma politics and reporting, and it was, in those deathless words, most "enlightening and entertaining." He is an arresting conversationalist, and his subject matter was enthralling. Propping his feet up, Sullivant led me through much of the state's political story, an exciting though often less than grand epic at which he has had better than a front-row seat: Otis Sullivant has been backstage for 40 of Oklahoma's 60 years of statehood. He has known every one of the state's governors, from Haskell to Bartlett, and the latter's is the thirteenth (of 19) administration under which he has reported. He is presently covering his twenty-first (of 31) legislative session. Through the years he has come to know most of the legislators and members of the executive branch, and he has in the course of his 40 years become an authority on government. A recent newspaper article about him says part of it: "He has helped many young men develop; he has given them credit for accomplishments but hasn't hesitated to report the bad as well as the good. Sullivant takes pride in knowing as much about legislation, the purpose and background, as legislative leaders themselves. Legislators know they can trust him, and he usually has advance and inside information on proposals. He has learned all the inner workings and the activities of lobbyists and pressure groups. . . . He is familiar with the problems of welfare, human rights, road building, aid to schools, mental health, and all the other issues."

Yes, and he has chronicled and interpreted the unfortunately occasional scandals and impeachments which have pocked the history of the state; he has been privy to the peccadillos, the indiscretions, the failings of some; in short, he has witnessed and reported the governing of a state by its citizens. This would account for a tendency toward cynicism, would it not? Again I resurrected his telephone remark. "Let me amend that some. Say I'm a realist. I have no illusions about the capacity of men for smallness and wickedness. I don't adore or idolize men. I've seen the rise and fall of too many, but I'm also an idealist. If I didn't think things were getting better, I wouldn't have continued."

Sullivant was born four years before statehood on the family farm near Norman which his father had homesteaded in the run of 1889. When he was two, his parents moved to town, and young Sullivant attended Norman elementary schools and graduated from

Castle Heights Military Academy in Lebanon, Tenn. in 1920. He then entered the University to study journalism. After his junior year he quit school to accept a job with the Fort Worth Press. "We weren't as obsessed with getting a degree in those days," says Sullivant, "and besides, work was hard to find." He stayed in Fort Worth three years as city hall, police, and general reporter. In 1927 he returned home to look after his father, who had suffered a stroke, and to try to save the farm. On the fifteenth of September of that year he began his unbroken association with the Oklahoman as a general reporter. "I wasn't happy with my assignment, then fate took a hand. The second spot at the Capitol opened up and I grabbed it—anything to get out of what I was doing. Joe O'Brien was the main political reporter for the paper then. I remember my first trip to the Capitol. While we were going out on the street car, Joe saw a judge from another county, guessed what he was doing in Oklahoma City, interviewed him, and had a story before we had even arrived. At the Capitol he noticed a state senator standing at the entrance. The man was involved in a key bill. Joe went straight to him, and in minutes had another important story. It was a valuable introduction for me. It pointed to the value of being well informed and developing contacts. You can't hurry the latter. You must build a reputation for trustworthiness, for respecting a confidence, for judgment and fairness. And it takes time to be accepted. Outside the surface fun and excitement newspaper work is hard work, and writing is only a small part. The preparation, the collection of facts, cultivating sources, knowing where to go, whom to see, and what to make of it all are the critical parts of reporting. A newspaper is no better than its good reporters. They are far more important than an editor." The room apparently was not bugged by any editors. No protest was forthcoming.

Shortly after arriving at the Capitol, an infamous event helped Sullivant decide to stay with politics. It was the "ewe lamb rebellion" of 1927 in which disgruntled legislators attempted to impeach the newly elected governor, Henry Johnston. The house called itself into special session, and Gov. Johnston activated the National Guard to prevent its meeting at the Capitol. A nocturnal rump session was held in the Huckins Hotel, and Sullivant was one of the two reporters allowed to witness proceedings. "I was a kid of 24, and it was fascinating and exciting. I was hooked," says Sullivant. "I hadn't intended to remain in Oklahoma City. My dream was to go to New York and write for the World (which later folded), the Mecca of newspapers at the time. Well, the senate decided not to accept the impeachment although two years later Johnston was impeached and turned out of office."

"In 1928, however, Joe quit, and I took his place. I came to stay a year, and I'm still here. I resolved to get out at age 30. I felt reporting was a young man's game, and I never wanted to be an editor or executive. The Depression came along, though, and I was making \$50 a week. Some lawyers and bankers weren't making that much then. Too, Bill Murray was governor, and it was fun. I stayed, and I wouldn't trade the years I've had. I know a lot of rich men, and I don't envy any of them. Lately though I haven't had any fast heartbeats on any stories, and I wouldn't give a nickel to do it again," he said, almost smiling.

Sullivant is his own man and has been for his four decades. His technique is to remain aloof from the leaders. "I've never tried to be a buddy to any governor. I prefer to shun any familiarity, which prevents a reporter from being objective, I believe. I pay my own way, and I protect my independence. I'm grateful to the Oklahoman, for they've left my copy alone. My

observations have been contrary to the editorial conclusions on occasion, but my articles have not been interfered with. In 1944 Mr. Gaylord was for Dewey and thought he'd be elected. A front-page editorial to that effect and my story, to the opposite conclusion, appeared side by side."

In the fall Sullivant plans to retire, and he's looking forward to it. Though he is not a wealthy man—a newspaperman does not retire as a wealthy man—he has exhibited the same foresight in his private affairs that he demonstrates in his professional career and his retirement will be comfortable. He plans to spend time on his farm; he would probably live there were it not for the urban preferences of his wife Betty. He may write a book about the political scene he has witnessed and he may not. He will certainly be visited by his daughters, Sydney (Mrs. John Draper) and Alice Ann (Mrs. Charles K. Smith Jr.) and their families, which include two grandchildren. And he can reflect on an important, valuable, and renowned career as one of society's most indispensable members—the political reporter. Says Sullivant: "I've watched 40 years of Oklahoma politics, and it's been interesting and exciting. I'm glad I decided to remain. I have attempted to present the authentic picture for the people. A political writer has to be responsible to the people, and to them only." So Otis Sullivant *does* have heroes after all.—PG.

CREDIBILITY GAP IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it should be a matter of concern to all Americans that there is a credibility gap, so-called, when it comes to news released from the Department of Defense. Credibility gap is rather delicate phraseology for what would be termed issuing incomplete or false information to the American people. To the junior Senator from Ohio it seems it would be far better if the Defense Department would issue no statements rather than inaccurate ones regarding the total losses of our combat aircraft through hostile action while flying missions in Vietnam.

Earlier this month the Defense Department announced that 500 of our combat warplanes had been destroyed by hostile action over North Vietnam. To the American public such a total must have caused some shock. The destruction of more than \$2 billion worth of the finest warplanes in the world seems stupendous. This is somewhat insignificant, however, compared to the terrifying fact that many priceless lives of American pilots and airmen were lost in the destruction of their aircraft. This necessarily followed notwithstanding heroic efforts made by our helicopter pilots, quite frequently successful in reaching and rescuing pilots who have been able to parachute from their planes. Unfortunately, this statement from the Defense Department was merely a half-truth. It failed to mention that during the same period approximately 175 additional combat airplanes have been destroyed by enemy action over South Vietnam. Again, we have only a half-truth.

Pentagon officials have acquired the habit of reporting losses of airplanes due to "accidents and incidents." This includes many, many aircraft destroyed by mortar fire and other forms of Vietcong attacks while on the ground. The

American people are entitled to know by statements giving in detail the total number of airplanes destroyed by enemy fire while on the ground at our numerous airbases in South Vietnam. What is this total since the time of the beginning of our involvement in the civil war which has been raging in Vietnam for 10 years?

Unfortunately, in this civil insurrection or civil war in Vietnam in recent years American ground forces have finally turned it into an American war with more than 500,000 young Americans doing the fighting. Furthermore, we are on the side of the Tory element which fought on the side of the French colonial masters when during the war of liberation, when following the end of World War II the French sought by force to reestablish their Indochinese colonial empire. The Saigon government in June 1965, was a civilian government. Then in a sudden coup 10 generals overturned that civilian government. Who were the 10 generals? Nine had fought with the French forces seeking to reestablish the French-Indochinese colonial empire. The French were finally defeated at Dienbienphu, which was overrun May 7, 1954. Following that time, the Geneva Conference brought about a cease-fire and created a temporary demarcation line dividing Vietnam at the 17th parallel.

It was distinctly and definitely stated in the Geneva accords that this was a temporary demarcation line. Historically, over hundreds of years, there has never been a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam. The French withdrew their thousands and thousands of soldiers and their naval forces, on the demand of the French people who had elected Mendes-France Premier of France on the promise that he would end the war in Asia and withdraw some 200,000 French soldiers who had been fighting there. The conflict waged from 1946 to 1954 had bled France white. Did the French Republic lose face by withdrawing from Vietnam and making peace? No, indeed. Nor did De Gaulle lose face later when he gave up that huge French department in Africa known as Algeria. In fact, France is stronger today than it has been at any time within recent decades.

Nine of those ten generals come from what is now termed "North Vietnam." They selected Ky as Prime Minister. Ky was born in Hanoi and served as a pilot in the French Air Force, allied against his fellow countrymen fighting for their liberty. Their involvement was identical with those Tories who fought with the Redcoats against the patriots in our Revolution. We Americans who like to consider ourselves the most revolutionary nation in the world have become the most unrevolutionary.

To advert again to the credibility gap, the Defense Department has reported that nearly 500 helicopters have been destroyed by accidents and incidents. This in addition to approximately 325 helicopters and other rotary-wing aircraft which they report as having been shot down and destroyed over South Vietnam. Therefore, it appears there is a misrepresentation of fact. Of the nearly 500 helicopters destroyed by "accidents and incidents," let the American people know how many were destroyed on the ground

by Vietcong mortar fire and other hostile action.

American citizens have a right to know the facts. "Give light and the people will find their way."

THE THREATENED RAILROAD STRIKE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 104)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. The clerk will read the message.

The legislative clerk read the message and it was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

The threat of a crippling and paralyzing nationwide railroad strike now faces America.

At 12:01 a.m. on Thursday, April 13, 137,000 shopworkers—mechanics, power-house employees' and shop laborers—without whose services the trains cannot operate are scheduled to begin a walkout against virtually every major railroad in this country. Over 95 percent of the Nation's railroad mileage will be affected.

For almost a year the parties have engaged in extensive collective bargaining to reach a settlement. These negotiations have proceeded with a seriousness of purpose. The parties have bargained hard and with skill.

The major issues on the bargaining table are traditional but vital. They include higher wage rates, larger wage differentials between skilled and unskilled workers, and the length of the contract.

Since October 1966, the negotiations have taken place under the Railway Labor Act—the machinery established by the Congress to handle disputes involving the Nation's railroads.

Through mediation and through the recommendations of an Emergency Board that I established last January, some progress has been made. Recently, at my direction, Secretary of Labor Wirtz and Under Secretary of Labor Reynolds have worked, with National Mediation Board Chairman O'Neill, to achieve a fair settlement. Out of this process many of the issues have been narrowed. Others have been eliminated.

Now, however, the procedures under the Railway Labor Act have run their full course, but the parties have still not been able to resolve their differences.

Under the law, the unions are free to strike on 12:01 a.m. April 13, unless—

A settlement is immediately reached;

The unions agree to a voluntary extension of the no-strike period. The Government's request for such an agreement has already been rejected;

Congress takes special action to keep the trains running while the parties can continue to work toward a settlement through collective bargaining without a nationwide strike.

In this message I call upon the Congress to take that special action.

THE PROPOSAL

I have carefully weighed the type of action Congress might usefully consider to meet the needs of the immediate situation.

I have consulted with the wisest advisers available to a President.

The legislation I am proposing takes full account of two central considerations. The first is the significance of uninterrupted rail service to the national welfare and safety, and particularly to defense production. The second is that even in these extreme circumstances, collective bargaining must be given every opportunity to work, with the bargainers fully aware of the national significance of their responsibility.

With these considerations in mind, I recommend that Congress approve a joint resolution to extend the 60-day no-strike period in this case for an additional 20 days

The resolution would have the effect of extending the no-strike period under the Railway Labor Act for this case to a full 80 days—the same period allowed under the Taft-Hartley Act. The normal period of restraint under the Railway Labor Act has already expired.

The proposed joint resolution follows the finding made by the Emergency Board of three distinguished Americans to whom this case was referred under the Railway Labor Act. The Board was of the conviction that—

There should be established a longer period of statutory restraint subsequent to the submission of an Emergency Board's report in order to give the parties additional time to negotiate a settlement. The Board notes that under the Taft-Hartley Act the parties have a period of 80 days after the Board Report is submitted to the President.

The proposed resolution gives the process of collective bargaining a last clear chance in this case, while giving the Nation the uninterrupted railroad service it must have. I have always believed that solutions arrived at through hard and honest negotiations are preferable to those imposed by decree.

I will appoint a panel of special mediators to assist the parties in reaching a settlement during this 20-day period. I have also asked Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd, and representatives of the other interested Government agencies to work with the parties.

THE IMPACT OF A STRIKE

The differences which remain in this dispute are important. But they are slight when compared with the price to the country and to these parties from a suspension of rail service.

The purpose of this message and of this proposal is to impress upon the parties and to make clear to the Nation what is at stake here.

The cost of a nationwide railroad strike would be incalculable. I urge you to consider these facts:

On the first morning of the strike three-quarters of a million rail commuters in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia alone would be unable to take their trains to work.

Shipments of perishable foodstuffs to many major cities would be halted at once.

Actual food shortages could soon occur in several cities.

Some health hazards would develop. For example, supplies of chlorine used to

purify community water supplies would grow short.

The coal-mining industry, with 140,000 workers, would cease operations almost at once.

Many other industries which rely heavily on the railroads—such as metal mining, steel, chemicals—would be badly crippled and soon begin to close down.

For a week or more most factories could operate from their inventories. Soon, shortages and bottlenecks would begin to curtail production drastically. A spreading epidemic of lost production and lost jobs would sweep through the Nation.

A 1-month strike would reduce the gross national product by 13 percent. That would be nearly four times as great as the total decline that occurred in the Nation's worst postwar recession. It would drive the unemployment rate up to 15 percent for the first time since 1940, putting millions of workers out of jobs.

In short, a railroad strike would affect every man, woman, and child in this Nation. It would increase the cost of living. Each day the strike continued would bring pyramiding losses in goods, services, and income—losses which can never be fully regained. A prolonged strike could well break the back of the Nation's stable prosperity for some period to come.

Beyond this, there remains the impact of a rail strike on defense production, and particularly on our 500,000 brave servicemen in southeast Asia.

For example:

Forty percent of the total freight shipped by the Defense Department is moved by the Nation's railroads. A strike would materially disrupt these vital operations.

Shipments of ammunition will be critically affected. During April 210,000 tons of ammunition are scheduled to move to ports for overseas shipment. About 175,000 tons are going by rail.

Production of ammunition will be hindered. Sulfuric acid, a key ingredient for ammunition, moves only by rail car.

The movement of gasoline and jet fuel for our combat and transport aircraft heavily depends on railroads.

The M-48 tank and other heavy military equipment used in Vietnam, can be shipped only by rail.

Strategic missiles such as Polaris and Minuteman are moved by specially equipped rail cars.

CONCLUSION

The costs are so heavy and the consequences so dire that there have been only two brief national rail strikes in this century. This is a clear example of the responsibility, and restraint, which can be displayed by railroad labor and management.

Almost 3 years ago to the day the Nation was faced with an equally grave railroad strike. Then, both the carriers and the unions placed the national interest first. The strike was postponed and a fair and just settlement reached.

On that occasion I said:

This agreement is American business and American labor operating at its very best, at the highest levels of public responsibility. This is the face of American industrial

democracy that we can proudly show to the entire world, that free enterprise, free collective bargaining, really works in this country, and that the needs and the demands of the people's interest are understood and those needs and those demands come first.

It is my fervent hope, and, I believe that I speak for all Americans, that the parties to the railway dispute which now threatens the Nation arrive at a just settlement, for "He that keepeth understanding shall find good."

More drastic measures could have been proposed. But I believe that the parties should be given one more opportunity—a last clear chance—to resolve their differences, in their own way, in the spirit of free collective bargaining.

As President I have the firm responsibility to represent this Nation at the meeting of the heads of Latin American States at Punta del Este. The commitment to go to Punta del Este was made many months ago, and, it must be honored.

But as President, I also have the clear responsibility to take action that will assure uninterrupted rail service for our Nation. I am taking that action in submitting this joint resolution today and requesting prompt action by the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 10, 1967.

S.J. Res. —

A joint resolution to extend the period for making no change of conditions under Section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees

Whereas disputes exist between the carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers functioning through the Railway Employees' Department, AFL-CIO, labor organizations; and

Whereas the President of the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, by Executive Order No. 11324 of January 28, 1967, created an emergency board to investigate these disputes and report its findings; and

Whereas the emergency board has reported and the statutory period for making no change of conditions, as extended by agreement of the parties, is about to expire, without the parties having resolved the issues in dispute, thereby continuing to threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive the country of essential transportation services; and

Whereas it is essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that an emergency measure is essential to security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers; and

Whereas it is desirable to achieve the above objectives in a manner conducive to resolution of the disputes through collective bargaining; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the final paragraph of Section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) shall be extended for an additional period with respect to disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 11324 of January 28, 1967, so that no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference, or by their employees, in the conditions out of which such disputes arose prior to 12:01 a.m. on May 3, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware in the chair). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the President of the United States for sending this message and proposing a joint resolution which would accomplish one thing, and one thing only: an extension of 20 days beyond the 60 days allowable for a cooling-off period under the Railway Labor Act. The extension of 20 days would bring the period into conformity with the time allowed under the Taft-Hartley Act.

As the President has said, he had made a commitment which he will honor, a commitment which he should and must honor, to attend the Latin American meeting of the chiefs of state at Punta del Este in Uruguay beginning on Wednesday. To that end, he is leaving the country tonight, and the reason why he has sent this message to Congress and is proposing a joint resolution for our consideration is that next Wednesday at midnight all the machinery and facilities which he has at his disposal under existing law will terminate. He has pursued every course he is authorized to pursue. He has no other alternative but to turn to Congress.

In view of the fact that the President has fulfilled his responsibility, I think he is doing the right thing by seeking our assistance in an effort to bring the proposed strike to an end.

The country is faced with a most difficult situation, and no part of the Nation will escape its results. On the one hand, we are confronted with a possible strike by the shopcraft employees beginning at midnight on Wednesday next, a strike, by the way, which could have been—and could still be—avoided if they would agree to what the great majority of railway workers have already assented to. On the other hand, it appears that we have a combined lockout on the part of employers and some wildcat strikes on the part of some unions in the transportation industry.

No one need look very far or possess exceptional wisdom to know just what the effects of these two difficulties will entail for the Nation as a whole—for all segments of the economy—for all parts of our population.

I therefore commend the President. I commend him for honoring his commitment to go to Punta del Este, for conferring with the bipartisan leadership this morning for almost 3 hours, for calling to the White House the committees of both the House and the Senate which are most directly concerned, and for seeking our aid to help him to bring about an extension of the cooling-off period. To that end, we may hope that with the additional 20-day period, the contending parties will get together and

reach an agreement which will result in a continuation of the fulfillment of the needs of this country, not to mention the needs of the men overseas, men who are there not by choice but to carry out a policy laid down in Washington. We hope that by supporting the President, this crucial matter will be concluded before it is too late.

It is my understanding that insofar as the lockout and wildcat strike situation in the transportation industry are concerned, the administration at the present time is considering invoking the 80-day cooling-off period under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Some problems need to be ironed out. Some questions need to be answered. However, I think for the moment that the most important matter to be considered is the potential strike which will affect the railroad industry beginning at midnight Wednesday next.

The important consideration is maintaining service in the transportation industry of the country. With respect to the situation concerning the truckers and their employees—I would hope that a timely agreement will be arrived at so that the 80-day clause under the Taft-Hartley Act need not be invoked.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I, too, commend the President for sending his message to Congress and asking us to pass a joint resolution to extend the cooling-off period from 60 to 80 days. The 80 days would be equivalent to the cooling-off period provided in the Taft-Hartley law.

The President has significantly pointed out that a strike in the railway industry of our country would reduce our annual gross product by 13 percent. It would paralyze innumerable businesses. A railroad strike would adversely affect our men in South Vietnam.

The President in his message rather clearly describes the plight that we will find ourselves in if the railroads of the country are struck next Wednesday midnight.

Some 750,000 commuters in two of our largest cities will be immediately affected. The transportation of food will be impaired. The impact upon the Nation would be far greater than we could immediately comprehend without deep thought such as has been given to the situation by the President.

The President, in the concluding paragraph of his message, states:

More drastic measures could have been proposed. But I believe that the parties should be given one more opportunity—a last clear chance—to resolve their differences, in their own way, in the spirit of free collective bargaining.

I am convinced that the President has determined to choose for the time being the remedy of extending the cooling-off period by 20 days. However, I frankly state that as I read in the newspapers about the strikes of schoolteachers, city employees, the threatened strikes and violence to be anticipated, and threats of policemen striking, and when we realize that the trucking industry of the country is on the verge of a national strike which is very nearly as important as the threatened strike against the railroads, I am led to believe that the time

has come when Congress should give consideration to a review of all the laws dealing with the right to strike.

I cannot bring myself to a peaceful state of mind and belief that Government employees have the right to strike. I cannot believe that employees of a city, village, county, school board, or the U.S. Government should be vested with the right of stopping the business of Government.

Yet, that is what is happening. In Toledo, they have had a strike for several months. The strike paralyzed the collection of garbage and rubbish in the city.

The chairman of this meeting today has read about threatened strikes of firemen. No word has yet reached us of threatened strikes of policemen, but we can anticipate that that will happen.

Mr. President, I contemplate submitting to Congress, through the Senate, one, a bill that will prohibit public employees from striking; second, a bill that will require compulsory arbitration in all industries whose rates are fixed by public bodies, either of the States or of the National Government.

The railroads are under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That Commission fixes the rates which may be charged by the railroads. The ability to meet pay schedules, of course, is related to the amount of revenues that the railroads collect.

Hence, it is my belief that all industries which are subject to rate-fixing by the Federal, State, or local governments should be required to arbitrate their disputes rather than to have those industries affected by strikes.

Which are the industries that would be covered? Companies that supply gas, telephone, railroad, telegraphic, and other services. It may be that the bill should also include all industries against which strikes would affect the national economy.

I commend the President for his message. It is a step in the right direction. My hope is that if the strike is not settled in the 20-day period which will elapse if the President's proposal is adopted, he will then recommend compulsory arbitration of this dispute between the railroad labor unions and the railroad industry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the Senator from Ohio yielded the floor?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If there is an ominous threat to the well-being of the economy of the country, it has had very little discussion or attention on the front pages of the newspapers. I doubt very much whether the American people are adequately alerted to what is involved, for if there is to be a strike against the rail carriers of the country, coupled, of course, with the difficulties that now confront us by virtue of a possible strike against the trucking industry, that really is an ominous threat, as I say, to the country, not only to its food supply, but to nearly every activity that takes place in the country.

Probably the only thing to do, in the event the leaders of the union forces will not agree to an extension, is to have Congress extend the time under the Railway

Labor Act. Sixty days are now allowed in which to achieve an agreement. If that period were extended for 20 days, the effect would probably be the same as under the 80-day provision in the Taft-Hartley Act.

At the present stage of negotiations, it would appear that something ought to be done as an emergent measure before the President departs on his trip to Latin America. I am advised that the House will take up this matter tomorrow under a suspension of the rules. But I am hopeful that the Senate probably can take the matter up today. Obviously, if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare meets this afternoon, an objection might be made on the ground that whatever is reported will have to lie over for a day. In that event, we could adjourn the Senate, then reconvene the Senate, and still take action this afternoon. I sincerely hope that this course of action may be pursued, because we cannot trifle with the matter.

There are those who think that perhaps the strike should be allowed to eventuate and that action be taken thereafter. But the readjustments, the damages, and the difficulties that ensue after a strike actually gets underway are absolutely incalculable.

I trust, therefore, that we can find a way to extend the negotiating period for 20 days. By that time, the President will have returned from his Latin American visit, and there will be adequate time to pursue further the equities that are involved on each side of the bargaining table.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will meet at 2 o'clock to consider the joint resolution. I hope that we may get action on the measure this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That sounds extremely hopeful. I trust that that will eventuate.

(At this point, Mr. YARBOROUGH assumed the chair.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the majority leader and the minority leader in commending the President for sending this message to Congress. I express the hope that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senate, and the House of Representatives will take prompt action and that perhaps the Senate may even be able to act this afternoon.

IMPACT OF FREE ENTERPRISE CAPITALIST SYSTEM ON POSTWAR COMMUNISM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the recent debate on and passage of the Consular Treaty has served to increase the public discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of extending and further developing East-West contact through trade. I believe a growing number of Americans—of all walks of life—are concerned that alternative means of competition with the Communist bloc be found to replace the present militarily oriented basis of the relationship between East and West.

The Caterpillar Tractor Co., of Peoria, Ill., is one of our most prominent American industrial enterprises. As such, they export throughout the world not only goods but good arguments for the merits of the American free enterprise system. Mr. William Blackie, the highly respected chairman of the Caterpillar board, is an extremely interested observer and participant in international trade in general, and of East-West commercial competition in particular.

Accordingly, I was extremely interested in Mr. Blackie's views on the impact of our free enterprise capitalist system on postwar communism. His able address at the annual award dinner of the Moles in New York on January 25, 1967, will assuredly be of equal interest to Members of both bodies of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AN ADDRESS BY WILLIAM BLACKIE, CHAIRMAN, CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO., AT THE ANNUAL AWARD DINNER OF THE MOLES, NEW YORK, JANUARY 25, 1967

Throughout this strife-ridden world there is today one great yearning—one great hope: peace. But hanging over all is the knowledge that men are fighting and dying—for what? For peace! The objective of war is peace. It must be! War in itself can never be an end. It can only be a means; but toward what, if it is not something which ends in peaceful enjoyment of the result achieved—by the side which is not the loser?

The objective of war by those who start it is to achieve peace by ultimately reestablishing it under a different set of conditions than those theretofore prevailing—conditions which they deem better—for their purpose. Historically, the causes of aggression are usually described by the aggressors as need for security or for expansion of living space, and by the attacked as lust for power or greed for possession. But whatever they may be, the ascribed causes can usually be resolved into attempts by the aggressor to impose his will upon the attacked; while the attacked seeks to preserve his own right to live and act in accordance with his own will.

Now there exists in the world today a body of thought which professes that it is the enlightened protagonist of a superior way of life—one which should be imposed upon those who do not choose to accept it voluntarily. Its concentration occurs in a number of countries where the governing power has been seized by those protagonists, though not necessarily held by the will of the majority. These are the communist countries—among which there are two of present major significance, Soviet Russia and Communist China. And it is from either or both of these two sources that directly or indirectly can be traced most of the major trials and tribulations which have beset worldwide international relations since the end of World War II.

If this be true, then two developments of recent origin deserve very serious attention by all who, like us, seek to have a world in which there shall be both peace and goodwill to men. One of these is the unconcealed evidence that the Soviet Union and most of its East European allies are discovering some of the errors of their economic ways and are making appropriate modifications of their systems. The other is that the adoption of these modifications accompanied by other departures from classical communist dogma is creating a widening schism between Soviet Russia and Red China.

These are the primary developments. Two more might be deemed secondary, though they are not unrelated. One of these is the resurgence of a spirit of nationalism among the separate communist countries in East Europe; the other is the growing disaffection and the resulting power struggle which is dividing Red China. The former of these, more nationalistic independence, is undoubtedly being encouraged in Eastern Europe by the diversionary influence of the split between the two major communist regimes; the other, the division within Red China, is caused, at least in part, by the same kind of reform movement which is going on in Soviet Russia.

Taken in combination and as a preface to what I am about to say, these developments may become compounded into the most important political event of our times.

II

The schism between Soviet Russia and Red China is based on a charge by the Chinese that in changing its ways Soviet Russia, in common with most of the other communist countries of Eastern Europe, is departing from classical Marxist-Leninist doctrine and moving toward Western-style capitalism, while at the same time it is espousing the idea of peaceful coexistence with that capitalism. The "crime" is called revisionism—presumably because that is just what it is: a revision of earlier ideas about ways and means of best developing "the greatest good of the greatest number".

Among others, the changes being proposed or adopted involve movement toward some of the most basic elements of free enterprise capitalism. Thus the influence of a freer marketplace as expressed in more flexible pricing would be given recognition as a necessary functional mechanism having the purpose and effect of more closely reconciling supply with demand—production with consumption. This was an objective which the central planners sought, but they bogged down in an unmanageable morass of bureaucratic paper and statistics which, even if it could have been handled and interpreted, would still not have put shoes on the feet or clothes upon the backs of people who did not choose to buy them because they did not like the fit, the style, the quality or the price. In many cases there appears to have been an obsession with quotas so unrelated to needs that a considerable proportion of production went into obsolescent inventories. And even where there was economic intelligence in the introduction of new products there was serious lack of knowledge or decision about when to discontinue old ones. There were simply too many unknowable and interdependent variables for planners, anywhere, to anticipate the contingencies or evaluate the probabilities.

A change of this kind would, of course, create both the need and the opportunity for a reduction of price controls and price subsidies. In Hungary, for example, about 80% of all prices have been set by the state. Under the new model, nearly that same proportion would become free or at least flexible under ceilings. More important is the Soviet decision to raise basic industrial prices even though these would still remain under control. Heretofore, coal, oil, gas and steel were sold at prices obviously far below cost. This was part of the method to force development of a heavy industry base. That kind of price subsidy is now to be eliminated and, in a modification of emphasis, the needs and demands of the consumer are being more generally recognized. This admitted responsiveness to public pressures has, in turn, required that the managers of the various enterprises become obliged not to ignore something which we would consider to be the influence of a freer and even competitive marketplace. They need, just as we do, the feedback of the market servomechanism.

As explained by Professor Ota Sik, the

architect of the reforms in Czechoslovakia: "There was no other way but to start using the market again . . . If we take free enterprise to mean free price competition in the market, then even socialism cannot do without this enterprise . . . If the system is to work as a market, it needs real market prices."

Profit would be determined as a means of measuring the efficiency of an enterprise and would be employed as an incentive for promoting higher productivity and greater cost effectiveness. This incentive would operate in two ways: one applicable to the enterprise as a whole, the other to its managers and employees—who are called workers. Part of the total profit would be retained for the expansion or security of the enterprise, as through capital additions and modernization. (Let there be no doubt that this is a management incentive.) The other part of the profit would go to the managers and workers as bonuses (almost like profit-sharing dividends) which, in certain instances, could supplement basic salaries and wages by as much as 20%. There would be a limitation upon the amount of such bonuses designed under some kind of formula to ensure that wage costs do not increase faster than productivity. Nevertheless, resort to any material incentive is a notable departure from the classical Marxist credo that the profit motive is both evil and unnecessary. It means that profits and return on investment would supplant the fulfillment of quantitative quotas as the standard of performance.

Wages would be "de-leveled." Under the egalitarian Stalinist system, professionals and both skilled and unskilled workers within each profession, trade or industry received about the same pay and did so without regard to how well or how badly they performed. There was also little spread between the compensation of the manager and worker. The effect was deadening. Now the stimulus or penalty of relative personal reward and status is to be brought into the system—a surely significant departure from a creed which held "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need".

Accompanying these changes as a matter of necessity, if not wholly of desire, authority and responsibility for investment and production decisions are being decentralized. Henceforth central planning will be confined largely to projections reaching out five or more years and be concerned with overall economic goals. Shorter term execution will be assigned to the managers in charge of the individual enterprises and they will operate with a substantial degree of autonomy. In what would seem to be a natural concomitant managers will henceforth be selected less for their loyalty to the party and more for their industrial competence.

One means of governmental control would be continued through the allocation of capital funds. Heretofore such funds came directly out of the state budget as required to meet the master plan—and free of charge. The concept of capital in terms of cost and productivity was considered a capitalistic phenomenon, and the result was a most inefficient use of capital. Now central government banks would make capital advances or loans on the basis of investment analyses submitted by the industry trusts or the individual enterprises and would do so at a charge or rate of interest which would provide a reasonable return to the lender and at the same time impose a much-needed degree of financial discipline upon the borrower. The very introduction of such a capitalistic instrument as interest or its equivalent is, of course, significant. (And note, please, that their government-owned business enterprises would be paying taxes, interest or capital charges to the state. Ours are not usually obliged to face up to such a proper responsibility.)

As will be observed, these changes could

not achieve their purpose without another capitalistic element: competition. If the efficient are to be rewarded and the laggards are not, then the former must establish their supremacy over the latter. In industry, the final test of this occurs at the point of sale, i.e., of customer purchase. So goods and services will vie for the favor of the user, and he, accordingly, will have a choice among competing alternatives. This, in turn, is already encouraging an idea that the time has come when communist "entrepreneurs" should be resorting to that most despicable device of the capitalists: advertising.

Listening to Soviet officials in Moscow two years ago, I was told that these changes need cause no surprise in capitalist circles. Lenin, it was said, had always advocated the adoption of whatever methods produced the best results even though this might require departure from what theretofore had been considered communist doctrine. As opposed to our concept of free enterprise based upon private property, the one and only basic tenet of the new economics, communist style, is now said to lie in state ownership of the means of production and distribution. When pursuing this particular matter further in the East European countries two months ago, I was given a subtle modification. Ownership of the means of production and distribution, I was told, is to rest in the hands of *society*, with management by the state. To work for another—a private employer—is deemed to be a subjugation to degrading, undignified, unprincipled exploitation. Working for society—for all of the people—is held to be an uplifting, dignified, highly principled duty—an honorable obligation and even a privilege. This sharpens the point of the hackneyed story of the communist who, when asked to distinguish between the two systems, replied that "capitalism is the exploitation of man by man and communism is just the opposite".

(Incidentally, those we call communists in Europe refer to themselves as socialists.)

Concomitant with these economic reforms there would inevitably have to be another—a growth of personal and political freedom. The evidence shows in a variety of ways. If centralized planning could not be made to work effectively for the major industries, how could it ever succeed for the hundreds of thousands of small businesses which are necessary to service the living habits of big urban populations—the barber, the beauty shop operator, the tailor, the self-employed repairman, the individual craftsman, and thousands of others whose work is of a more personal nature and does not lend itself to mass bureaucratic regulation. So small business people of that kind are gradually having their freedom restored. They will work as independent entrepreneurs rather than as servants of the state. And the intention to let small farmers have ownership and operation of their farms is probably not as significant as the decision to let them sell their surpluses on the free market at prices of their own setting. This may hardly justify description as *laissez-faire* rugged individualism but it certainly is a form of free, private enterprise.

(In Poland, which is perhaps the most pro-western country in Eastern Europe, there are now 98,000 privately owned workshops employing 164,000 people; and 85% of its farmland is in private hands. Poland, incidentally, is granted most-favored-nation tariff treatment by the U.S. and is supplied surplus food-stuffs under our Public Law 480.)

It is further reported that decentralization of the communist economy is being accompanied by growing demand for more democratic rights. If so, that would be in full accord with our belief and experience that economic freedom and personal political freedom go hand in hand. Destroy one and the other dies because it cannot live alone. And

it is surely not without significance that voters in Hungary and Poland as well as in Yugoslavia are to be allowed to elect government representatives from among a choice of candidates—even though all of one political party. This suggests a possibility that within that party there could be graduations or, some day, even wings—left and right—just as we have here. In that event there could at least be some choice between differing ideas.

III

The changes mentioned are not all being made or being introduced contemporaneously in all of the communist countries of Europe. Most of them are being adopted in Russia where it is planned to have all important industries working under some form of profit measurement and incentive by 1968. Czechoslovakia, which has been ahead of Russia in several respects is moving into a formally approved program this year. Hungary will adopt a substantially similar program at the beginning of 1968. In varying degrees, Poland and East Germany are ahead of or behind the others; while Rumania holds back, watching the developments in the others from a position of somewhat greater economic security. (It is Rumania, however, which repudiated the Soviet principle of a "socialist division of labor" wholly within the COMECON countries as a bloc. And it was the Rumanians who insisted upon complete freedom of economic action—in particular to trade with the West when they deemed it advantageous to do so. The process going on there is not so much revisionism as it is "de-Russification".) Nevertheless, it should not be assumed from these developments that any of the countries of Eastern Europe intend to build their society on anything which they would consider to be a radical departure from communist principles, and there is no present reason to believe that dissolution of "the bloc" or a break with Moscow is in the offing.

It should also be understood that the changes mentioned are apparently being introduced not so much out of any great admiration for free enterprise capitalism—successful as it may be—as in recognition of the failures of the communist system to begin to produce equivalent results. If underlying communistic ideas could be made to work effectively, they would presumably be retained; but when they do not succeed, alternative methods will apparently not be ignored—even though this might mean the adoption of what had earlier been considered improper capitalistic practices.

Failure, of course, is a relative term. It is to be measured only against some standard—some calibration of what constitutes success. This was recognized by the early communist prophets. They preached that our system had to be destroyed, presumably in order that theirs might succeed. The matter was not one to be based on any "self-determination of peoples"—to be established independently, internally, country by country. Instead, the "true believers" undertook the greatest attempt in all history not only to convert others to their way of thinking but to subvert them in a manner which would seek to strengthen the communist hold in the world by weakening that of all who believe otherwise. It was not to be a matter of open international rivalry—one in which there would be any willingness on the communist side to let the better system win. It was to be an open battle for the minds of men to the end that those enslaved by the power of communism—ideological, political, economic or military—would join or be forced together in a world in which there would no longer be room for our kind of free, private, competitive capitalism.

Now in this context, and in this one aspect of their dogma, I suggest that the doctrinaire communists are correct: their economic sys-

tem cannot, in the long run, survive or succeed in the same world as ours. The reason: ours, by producing infinitely superior results, is proving theirs to be fundamentally inferior.

The whole idea of communism and a communistic state lies entirely in a body of theory which defies all human experience. In one place or another and at one time or another, it has been tried—and it has always failed. On the other hand, our theories of capitalism were not conceived in advance of trial and test. They are the derived principles of a long economic pragmatism which has proved their worth.

A viable economic system is not a matter of theory or faith; it is one of empirical results. It is an instrument for a purpose—to be shaped and perfected in the course of its use until it becomes the most appropriate tool for the purpose. Ours is the best—not because it is ours, but because it has produced better results than any other. And it is the best because it has also achieved its success with a minimum of infringement upon that one precious virtue which transcends all other considerations, freedom of the individual.

Nevertheless, as with change everywhere else, the reforms described are meeting with resistance within each country where they are being proposed or introduced. The "conservatives" defend the status quo of classical communist ideology and cling to its doctrinaire clichés while the liberals press for change. In several countries the political survival of present incumbents would be jeopardized by reform; and entrenched bureaucrats—being the same everywhere—behave like entrenched bureaucrats. Workers will presumably have to work harder and better if the motivating incentives are to be effective. They may not like the change. And for many of the old-line "reactionaries" it could hardly be easy to accept such radical departures from a system for which they had fought, worked or suffered so much. Think too of the horrors of repression, terror and punishment through which so many had to pass in order to reach something which, in part at least, is now being found unworthy of the terrible cost. Sometimes progress has to wait for an older generation to die out.

So it cannot be presumed that all the reforms will come into being quickly—or even at all. On the other hand it can be assumed that if they are given a fair trial those changes which move in the direction of our established practices are more likely to succeed than the abortive theories they would supersede. And should they succeed, the further erosion of communist faith would surely create more doubt about the validity of other aspects of what had therefore been treated as immutable dogma.

IV

Today there is evidence that the two sides are shaping up inside the communist world. The center of doctrinaire Marxist-Leninist communism has moved to Peking while the sheer force of liberalizing pragmatism has been working evolutionary change in the capitals of Eastern Europe. The Red Chinese condemn the whole Soviet idea of coexistence—peaceful or otherwise. The East European sees a nearby Western civilization flourishing at a level which far exceeds his own. The contrast and the choice between communist austerity and capitalist prosperity stares him in the face—and he is not blind. He may believe that revolutionary dictatorial communism did carry him away from downtrodden serfdom faster than might have been possible in any other manner. But now that progress has slowed to an embarrassingly low rate, the deficiencies of the system are beginning to reveal themselves.

In all of these circumstances we, the United States, are surely faced with both the need and the opportunity for a reexamination of postulates—for a farsighted recon-

sideration of national policies and objectives. To proceed without responsible recognition of what is going on now as contrasted with the conditions prevailing only a few years ago would be to ignore the march of history. Soviet Europe has been de-Stalinizing itself; we often seem to be harboring hate of the past more than hope for the future.

And there is hope for the future—if we who, by the random fate of history, are the leaders of the world accept our obligation to lead.

First, I suggest that our objective should be, as I think it is, not the killing of communists but instead a lighting of the way toward a reform of communism—by the voluntary decision of the communists themselves. Men are not “converted” by force of arms or even by punishment. True conversion can only come from within, whether the subject be individual man or that body of men recognized as a state. But—and more by tangible evidence than oral suasion—the way toward conversion can be shown by the demonstration of better alternatives. It is the very nature of man that he must live on the basis of choice among competing and sometimes conflicting alternatives; and to the maximum extent possible within the mores or conventions of his society that choice should be a matter of his own personal decision. This is the very essence of freedom. To make his selection intelligently, there must, however, be adequate knowledge and understanding of the alternatives.

Among the peoples of Soviet Europe there has been little or no exposure to the concept or practice of capitalism as a feasible alternative to communism—and few ever lived in a democracy. Prerevolutionary Russia and several of the other communist countries never had the chance to enjoy modern style capitalism, and even those older people who might once have known something of its advantages and successes are now heavily outnumbered by younger generations who have not only been deprived of the opportunity to study comparison of the two systems but have been indoctrinated with a philosophy which would reject any idea that there could be an alternative to communism.

That is—until now! Today there are signs which portend a possibility that the walls of ignorance, intolerance and international hostility may be cracking under the strain of failure on the one hand as compared with success on the other. It is in this spirit that on October 7, 1966, the President of the United States delivered a major foreign policy speech. In it he said that “A just peace remains our most important goal”. “Our purpose” he continued “is not to overturn other governments but to help the people of Europe to achieve together a continent in which the peoples of Eastern and Western Europe work shoulder to shoulder together for the common good—a continent in which alliances do not confront each other in bitter hostility but instead provide a framework in which West and East can act together in order to secure the security of us all.” After espousing “the vigorous pursuit of further unity in the West” the President emphasized that “one great goal of a united West is to heal the wound in Europe which now cuts East from West and brother from brother. That division must be healed peacefully; it must be healed with the consent of Eastern European countries and consent of the Soviet Union. This will happen only as East and West succeed in building a surer foundation of mutual trust. Our task is to achieve a reconciliation with the East, a shift from the narrow concept of coexistence to the broader vision of peaceful engagement. Where possible we shall work with the East to build a lasting peace. We do not intend to let our differences on Vietnam or elsewhere ever prevent us from exploring all opportunities. We want the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe to know that we and our allies shall go step by step

with them just as far as they are willing to advance. So let us, both Americans and Europeans, intensify, accelerate and strengthen our determined efforts.”

There might be differences of opinion about the means of pursuing these policies, but surely there can be no quarrel with the objectives.

V

Everywhere in the world today communism, as a political or an economic system—and occasionally as both—is on the retreat. It is being defeated in some countries, repudiated in others, and in Europe, it is receding of its own volition. The causes for this turn of events lie in the paucity of what communism has to offer, in its restrictions of personal freedom, in its denial of human motivations, and—perhaps more than any other single factor—in its failure. One of the major causes of communist reform is undoubtedly the increasing evidence of capitalist success and the growing knowledge of this among the communists. The idea that the capitalist countries are more successful because they are capitalist is penetrating through the rusting iron curtain. If this be so, the major contribution which we might make to the peace of the world need not necessarily be the deterrent of armed strength; it could be industrial strength as demonstrated by the quality and quantity of the benefits brought to our society by the wise employment and continuing development of our still evolving capitalism.

These benefits would include our personal freedom and political democracy; our mode of living, our institutions, and the patterns of our culture; our goods and services; our comforts and pleasures; and whatever other qualities go into life as we know it at its best. Not all of these might, of course, be desired by others. That is not the point. The essential requirement for individual freedom and dignity is that there be personal choice—free from enslaving dictation by others. In the long run the healing of the rupture which has split the world into two—or three—camps will not come through nations or governments. It will come through ordinary people who, like us, have the normal human aspirations for a society in which they can enjoy freedom and family, work and play and the pursuit of that same kind of happiness which our forebears deemed to be a worthy objective.

Nothing in these remarks conflicts with what we have to do at this time in Vietnam: win by achieving an honorable termination of the hostilities on terms which will offer the prospect of something more than another truce between wars. For the time being, positions and emotions on both sides of the Atlantic regarding these hostilities will have the effect of retarding movement toward peaceful engagement in Europe. But sight should not be lost of the larger objective: an enduring world peace. We seek to find means of abolishing war—hot and cold. The goal may never be attainable, but how will we ever know if we do not try everything in our power to make it possible.

In the words of Winston Churchill, let the moral of our leadership then be—

“In War: Resolution.

“In Victory: Magnanimity.

“In Peace: Goodwill.”

EPILOG

In a sort of “far out” extrapolation of these changes and aspirations let us, for the moment, accept it as a premise that the principal difference between the two economic systems might become only one of the ownership of the means of production and distribution—a sort of state capitalism as contrasted with our private capitalism. Could that of itself ever be a valid cause for international war, or subversion or for anything more than dialectical difference? We live in harmony with many countries where public

or tax-supported ownership of industry is an accepted and even desired way of life. Such a type of ownership exists within our own federal system as well as in numerous state and municipal enterprises. It is seldom if ever as effective as a private profit-earning tax-paying enterprise. But it can be tolerated if the tax-paying voters are willing; and in certain circumstances it has the advantage of providing earlier what private capital might only be willing to provide later.

Carrying the hypothesis a generation further, suppose—for the moment, at least—that the two great proponents of the opposing systems were to find their differences evaporating into nothing more than separate forms of self-determination. Our basic quarrel with the communists is not that they are communists per se; it is that they are not content to be whatever they want to be within the confines of their own countries. We still subscribe to a policy which favors the self-determination of peoples, but communist aspirations and actions are international, and it is this which gives us proper cause for concern. Should they manage to succeed beyond their own boundaries our national security would be jeopardized; were they to stay at home and abandon Soviet imperialism, all our security needs might not be met, but peaceful coexistence would then seem more readily possible. That kind of existence is already generally preferred to an alternative of unpeaceful coexistence. But might it not be possible to find a less coercive, more moral foundation for coexistence in peaceful engagement.

If the changes now being proposed or wrought in communist practice were to become successful—as we of the West should hope they will—it would appear to be only a matter of some further time until there could be personal earnings which would exceed the cost of mere sustenance and become disposable income or savings. Wealth is created only by people and their personal savings are the very essence of investment capital. How then could enlightened communism fail to move—almost automatically in spite of itself—toward that kind of progress which would seek to regenerate itself on the wealth created by the constructive work of its own people?

Will success spoil communism? Is it possible that with the substitution of practices that succeed for theories that fail, communism will evolve toward a compatible compromise with capitalism? If the test lies in results measured by the greatest good—why not?

FEDERAL SHARING OF REVENUE WITH THE STATES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, no one has done more to encourage the beginning of Federal revenue sharing with the States than the economist, Joseph A. Pechman. Mr. Pechman, director of economic studies at the Brookings Institution, was Chairman of the President's Task Force on Intergovernmental Relations, which recommended the adoption of revenue sharing. Because of the administration's studied refusal even to encourage serious consideration of this bold new initiative in federalism, that task force report has never emerged from the White House.

Mr. Pechman, nevertheless, has continued through lectures, articles, and discussions with interested legislators to advance the cause of revenue sharing.

His latest statement on this important subject appears in an article “Money for the States,” published in the April 8, 1967, issue of the New Republic.

The article goes to the heart of the revenue-sharing controversy by considering the question whether State and local governments are to be trusted to act upon their own initiative to meet in an imaginative way the increasing demands that society places upon government. One would think that today no one would suggest that State and local governments are virtually obsolescent as policymaking bodies in the Federal partnership and are more properly to be regarded as mere administrative extensions of a more powerful Central Government.

Yet that seems to be the assumption, whether expressed or implied, that dominates this administration's attitude toward the traditional Federal partnership between Central, State, and local governments.

Mr. Pechman disputes this assumption. He admits, as we all will, that there is considerable room for improvement in State governments. But he also recognizes that—

The State governments do not have a monopoly on incompetence—many of the Federal bureaucracies administering grants are something less than models of efficiency.

He further points out that during the last decade the States, "without central direction or coercion—have actually used most of their scarce resources for urgently needed State and local programs."

I wholeheartedly subscribe to Mr. Pechman's view that if our Federal partnership of governments is to be able to respond most efficiently and effectively in the future, there must be a strengthening of and more reliance upon State and local governments. The first step in this reform should be to improve the financial condition of the State governments through Federal revenue sharing. Polls show that 70 percent of the American people favor this sort of program. Sentiment favoring revenue sharing grows every day in Congress. In the Senate, nearly 2 dozen of my colleagues have committed themselves to some form of revenue sharing. On March 9, I, together with 15 cosponsors, introduced the "Revenue Sharing Act of 1967." The plan would begin modestly by committing 1 percent of the Federal revenues remaining after the cost of national defense and the national debt has been subtracted from the annual Federal revenues. Our plan would cost about \$500 million in its first year of operation. The President has said that within 5 years Federal aid to cities and States will amount to about \$60 billion annually. If Federal aid to States and cities is to increase at anywhere near the rate the President predicts, it is inconceivable to me that we should not commit a small percentage of this total effort to no strings attached aid.

Mr. Pechman's article deserves close examination by every Member of this body who is interested in the reinvigoration of our sorely pressed State and local governments. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New Republic, Apr. 8, 1967]

MONEY FOR THE STATES

(By Joseph A. Pechman)

First broached in 1964 by Walter W. Heller, the idea that the federal government should share some of its revenues with the 50 States and over 90,000 local governments has an unusual degree of support from moderates in both political parties. The opposition comes mainly from conservatives who always prefer tax reduction to better public services, and from liberals and bureaucrats who believe that major decisions about public services should be made in Washington.

Revenue sharing is intended to allocate to the States and local governments on a permanent basis a portion of the very productive and highly "growth-elastic" receipts of the federal government. Most federal revenues come from income taxes that rise at a faster rate than income as income grows. By contrast, state-local revenues barely increase in proportion to income. One reason is that the federal government has virtually preempted the fruitful income tax. Ninety percent of the taxes that are levied on incomes of individuals and businesses in this country goes to the federal government, though 33 of the 50 States tax incomes. States are generally reluctant to increase taxes on incomes, for fear of losing business to other States.

State-local needs have outstripped the potentialities of their revenue system at constant tax rates, so that the rates have been pushed steadily upward throughout the post-war period and many new taxes have been added. But essential public services are starved by governors, mayors, and legislators who naturally try to avoid the politically distasteful—and sometimes politically suicidal—choice of increasing taxes. Furthermore, state-local taxes are on balance regressive; they impose unnecessarily harsh burdens on low-income recipients.

Stripped to essentials, the revenue sharing plan would operate as follows:

A portion of federal revenues would be automatically set aside each year in a special trust fund on the basis of a predetermined formula.

Disbursements from the fund would be made primarily on a per capita basis, a method that automatically helps the poorer States relatively more than the richer States.

The funds would be turned over to the States, with the understanding that a major share would go to the local governments.

Constraints on the use of the funds would be much less detailed than those applying to conditional grants. However, the funds would not be available for highway construction, since there is a special federal trust fund with its own earmarked revenue sources for this purpose.

An audit of the actual use of the funds would be required, as well as certification by the appropriate State and local officials that all applicable Federal laws, such as the Civil Rights Act, have been complied with in the activities financed by the grants.

The per capita method of distributing the grants was chosen because it is the best available index of State fiscal capacity and need. It allocates more money to the populous States; at the same time, it automatically distributes relatively more to a poor State than to a rich State. For example, a \$25 per capita distribution would amount to 10 percent of the budget of a State that can afford to spend \$250 per capita and only 5 percent of the budget of a State that can afford to spend \$500 per capita. More equalization could easily be provided if desired; for example, a small part of the fund, say, 10 percent, could be allocated to the poorest third of the States. Tax effort could also be given some weight in the formula, thereby encouraging States to maintain or increase tax collections out of their own sources, and

penalizing those which might yield to the temptation of reducing State taxes.

On the other hand, it would be totally inappropriate to allocate the funds in proportion to the amounts collected from each State. This would give disproportionately larger shares to the wealthiest States, and would widen rather than narrow differentials in State fiscal capacities.

The same criticism holds for the various types of Federal income tax credits for State income taxes, which are often proposed as a substitute for revenue sharing. The tax credit is a method to coerce States to adopt income taxes (and is needed for that reason), but it is not a good device for achieving the equalizing objectives of revenue sharing. So long as State shares of Federal money depend on income, wealthy States will do better than the poorer ones.

Several methods can be used to calculate the amounts to be set aside annually for revenue sharing. The two most important criteria are that (a) the amounts should grow more than in proportion to the growth of the economy, and (b) the changes that might be required with the passage of time should be held to a minimum. The first criterion would be satisfied by any one of a number of growing bases—for example, total Federal revenues, total income tax revenues, and the individual income tax base. The second would be satisfied best by the individual income tax base (*i.e.*, taxable income) which is changed only rarely. Actual income tax receipts could also be used, provided Congress is prepared to change the revenue-sharing formula when tax rates change. On balance, the income tax base is preferable.

ANOTHER \$6 BILLION

At this year's expected income levels, that base is in the neighborhood of \$300 billion and the allocation would amount to \$3 billion for every percentage point of the base. If the Vietnam war were to end soon, the Nation could easily afford to allocate two points of the income tax, or \$6 billion, for revenue sharing, as an addition to the \$15 billion a year that the Federal government already sends the States in grants in aid. This extra \$6 billion would be enough to finance general grants average \$30 per capita. At this rate, California would receive about \$580 million, New York \$560 million, Massachusetts \$160 million, Wisconsin \$125 million, Maryland \$110 million, Mississippi \$65 million, and so on. Equally important as the amounts, the grants would automatically grow with the tax base—in a full-employment economy, they would double every nine years.

The plan is often criticized because the States and local governments might be in trouble if the revenue-sharing funds declined during a recession. But it turns out that this is not a matter of great concern. The tax base has declined only twice since the end of World War II—by four percent in 1949 and by less than one-tenth of one percent in 1958. These are within the range of fluctuations that State and local governments are accustomed to in some of their own tax sources. But even if a deep recession occurred, Congress could easily add to the statutory amounts to prevent state-local distress. Few anti-recession measures would satisfy both the efficiency and stabilization objectives as well as revenue sharing. Rather than reducing the Federal government's flexibility to combat recessions, as some allege, the plan would provide another useful outlet for Federal funds in these circumstances.

Some people have embraced the revenue-sharing plan as a method of undercutting the present Federal conditional grant system: a few would even replace the present grants by unconditional or general-purpose grants. But the two types of grants have very different functions and these cannot be satisfied

if the federal system were limited to one or the other.

Conditional grants—*e.g.*, for urban renewal and public assistance—are justified on the ground that the benefits of many public services “spill over” from the community in which they are performed to other communities. Expenditures for such services would be too low if financed entirely by state-local sources, because each state or community would tend to pay only for the benefits likely to accrue to its own citizens. States have a well-developed system of conditional grants to local governments for this reason. Additional assistance by the federal government is needed to raise the level of expenditures closer to the optimum from the national standpoint.

General purpose or block grants—*e.g.*, for health, education and welfare as a block—are justified on different grounds. In the first place, all states do not have equal capacity to pay for local services. Even though the revenue effort of the poorer states is average, they are unable to match the revenue-raising ability of the richest states. Second, federal use of the best taxes (*i.e.*, on income) leaves a substantial gap between state-local need and state-local fiscal capacity. Moreover, no state can push its rates much higher than the rates in neighboring states for fear of placing its citizens and business enterprises at a disadvantage. This justifies some federal assistance even for purely state-local activities, with the poorer states needing relatively more help because of their low fiscal capacities.

For these reasons, the general-purpose grants are intended to supplement the conditional grants, not to replace them. Considering the large unmet needs throughout the country for public programs with large spillover effects (education, housing, etc.), adoption of revenue sharing should not be the occasion for reducing conditional grants. It is a well-known axiom of logic that two objectives cannot be satisfied by using only one instrument.

The most serious criticisms of revenue sharing come from those who have lost faith in the state governments. On the whole the states have been doing a good job, although there are exceptions. Without central direction or coercion, they have actually used most of their scarce resources for urgently needed state and local programs. Between 1955 and 1965, general expenditures of state governments rose steeply by \$23 billion, to around \$40 billion. Of this increase, about 60 percent went for education, health, welfare and housing more than 40 percent went to education—most of it through grants to local governments. This evidence suggests that, if the states were to receive unencumbered funds from the federal government, they would spend them on urgently needed services whether the particular services were stipulated in the legislation or not. To be specific, if the federal government allocated \$6 billion for revenue sharing, there is little doubt that about \$3 billion of this money would be spent on teachers' salaries, school buildings and other educational needs.

The federal government would, of course, expect the states to pass the funds through to their local governments in an equitable manner, but this is much less of a problem than most people might suppose. All states give aid to local units and most give significant amounts. As a matter of fact, the state grant-in-aid system for local governments is much more highly developed than the federal grant system. In the aggregate, transfers from state to local governments account for more than a third of state expenditures and about 30 percent of local general revenues. By contrast, federal grants amount to only 17 percent of state-local revenues. Thus, even without any specific requirements, the local governments would receive at least a third of any general funds the states might receive from the federal government.

SAFEGUARDING LOCAL UNITS

But there is no reason why the federal government should not write a “pass-through” formula into the plan to be sure that the states will turn over to their local units an even larger share of the revenue-sharing receipts than they might otherwise allocate. This can be done in two ways:

1. The revenue-sharing legislation might provide that all states must pass along a certain percentage of the grants to their local governments. In view of recent trends, the minimum should be at least 40 percent and might even be as high as 50 percent. This would prevent any state from short-changing its local governments (although it might be difficult to detect offsetting reductions in existing grants if the state legislature was of a mind to do so). The disadvantage of a fixed percentage is that the extent to which the states delegate responsibilities to, and share revenues with, local governments varies greatly. In some states, the appropriate percentage may well exceed the 50-percent mark, and in others it may be below it. The danger is that any minimum percentage is likely to become a maximum, so that stipulating the percentage may do more harm than good in some states.

2. A more flexible method of handling this problem is to require the governors to prepare detailed plans for the use of the funds. As guidance for the development of these plans, the Congress might indicate the general areas which it regarded as most urgent, including the need for making funds available to local governments. To be sure that the plan represented a broad spectrum of opinion in the state, the governor would be directed to consult with local officials and representatives of local citizens' associations before incorporating the plan in his budget. The development of such plans would provide the occasion for a complete review and possibly a revamping of state-local relations throughout the country.

The second method provides more flexibility and greater opportunity for initiative and innovation in state-local relations. However, if Congress believes this decision cannot be left to the states, the fixed percentage method is certainly consistent with the spirit and intent of the revenue-sharing plan. In either case, the net additional funds that would be funneled to local governments would be greatly increased.

The states are an essential feature of our federal system of government. A local government is efficient to do some things, but not others. In taxation, for example, large local tax rate differentials encourage people to move to other communities or to purchase elsewhere to avoid taxation. As for expenditures, not a single large city has the financial capacity to support higher education, health facilities and other urgent expenditures, as well as to pay for the heavy welfare costs. With the growth in population, the states are rapidly becoming metropolitan governments in the true sense of the word—Maryland and Connecticut, for example. For reasons of efficiency, the state governments cannot be permitted to wither away.

There is little doubt that the quality of state governments varies greatly. But this is changing quickly in many parts of the country, as the effects of reapportionment are felt. Furthermore, there is no point in denying urgent fiscal aid to the “good” states merely because there are some “bad” states (“good” or “bad” in their attitude toward public services). As the last election demonstrated, states change complexion rapidly—Maryland is an example of a state that went from bad to good last November, and California is an example of one that went from good to bad. It should also be added that the state governments do not have a monopoly on incompetence—many of the federal bureaucracies administering grants are something less than models of efficiency.

In brief, revenue sharing will provide the states with a growing source of income from taxes that are much more equitable than those now available to them. Much of this money will go to local governments with or without legislative safeguards. There is no better way to help finance the urgently needed public services, and at the same time, to strengthen our federal system of government.

THE FALL OF BATAAN RECALLED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which was published in the Washington Star of April 9, 1967, written by Frank Hewlett, entitled “Reporter Recalls Fall of Bataan 25 Years Ago Today.”

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

REPORTER RECALLS FALL OF BATAAN 25 YEARS AGO TODAY

(By Frank Hewlett¹)

Twenty-five years ago today the sick and hungry American and Filipino forces on Bataan surrendered after a gallant 98-day stand which so upset the Japanese timetable for conquest that it was never again to get back on schedule.

One little-known reason why our nearly 80,000-man garrison was able to hold out so long was that someone in Washington had goofed and sent to the Philippines a million gallons of unordered gasoline.

General Douglas MacArthur's quartermaster had asked the War Department for enough 55-gallon drums to hold that much fuel. He didn't request gasoline because there was already substantial amounts in storage throughout the Philippines. Besides, plenty more was at refineries on the nearby islands of Borneo and Sumatra where our Allies had surplus stocks after having cut off sales to the Japanese as punishment for their takeover of French Indo-China.

Old records of USAFFE (United States Armed Forces Far East) show the order was filled less than two months before the war started but the asked-for empty drums arrived in Manila harbor filled with gasoline.

No one seems to know why but most of this gas ended up in storage dumps on Bataan. Either someone showed remarkable foresight or it was just a stroke of luck because our defense plans at that time didn't call for any last stand on the Bataan peninsula across the bay from Manila.

Anyhow, the gas was there and was more than welcome because when MacArthur finally decided to follow an old war plan, which called for holding out on Bataan until relief arrived, there wasn't time to move much in the way of supplies to the jungle-covered peninsula.

Those 18,000 gas drums were long since empty when on April 9, 1942 the Filipino-American defenders of Bataan surrendered. The fuel situation had become so acute that when the last of the USAFFE reserves were committed most of them had to walk to their front line positions even though there were hundreds of idle trucks and buses at Bataan's main motor pool. Some of our few remaining tanks ran out of gas on the way to the front and had to be abandoned.

Before the men of Bataan finally gave up the peninsula had been picked clean. The rice crop had been commandeered and milled

¹ Frank Hewlett, veteran Washington correspondent, was in the Philippines with the United Press when World War II started and covered the Bataan campaign. He escaped to Australia after being the last correspondent on Corregidor which held out for nearly a month after Bataan surrendered.

by the quartermasters. They not only butchered Bataan's 600 carabao (water buffalo) but also the 250 horses of the 26th Cavalry regiment and their 48 pack mules. Before the end came some of the Americans had eaten dog, iguana and monkey meat.

Bataan had a field bakery which managed to operate for two months and the GI's there were an ingenious bunch. Coconut oil was used when they ran out of lard. They even salvaged two barge loads of flour from the waters of Manila Bay.

Sugar was the Philippines main export but there wasn't enough on Bataan to sweeten a cup of coffee, if there had been any coffee.

Neither was there any pineapple, although it was rotting in the fields of the big Del Monte plantation on the island of Mindanao. Pineapple was a high priority item because it helped check beriberi which was taking a heavy toll among the fighting men.

April 3, 1942—Good Friday—was the beginning of the end of Bataan. Then the forces of Gen. Homma made a major breakthrough over a wide front. This came after a devastating artillery barrage and an attack in force by bombers of the 22nd brigade.

On Easter Sunday the Japanese resumed their brutal artillery and air bombardment and followed it with a new drive by their Fourth division.

Bataan's main reserves consisted of four badly depleted regiments. Maj. Gen. Edward P. King Jr., committed them all with orders to counter-attack. Some of the lost ground was regained but only for a short time.

One of these units was the 57th regiment, an organization with American officers and an enlisted personnel of seasoned Filipino Scouts. Its third battalion was commanded by Maj. Harold K. Johnson, now the army's chief of staff. Four times in five days this regiment valiantly tried to establish new defense lines. When the end came the gallant 7th was down to 500 officers and men.

Bataan's last defense line was established by New Mexico National Guardsmen from an antiaircraft brigade commanded by Col. Charles G. Sage who died in February of this year a retired major general. Sage was directed to destroy all his guns except those that could be used for infantry and set up a defense line on high ground just north of the village of Cabcaben. The New Mexicans were all alone there when Gen. King decided the situation was hopeless and sent two officers forward with an improvised white flag.

During the night about 2,000 persons escaped from Bataan to the island of Corregidor less than five miles away which was to hold out another month. They included most of the army nurses, 300 survivors of the All-American 31st infantry regiment, navy personnel from sunken ships and a few scouts from the 26th cavalry regiment. The force which Gen. King surrendered was the largest in American history and included 12,500 Americans and 66,500 Filipinos.

SENATOR BYRD HONORED IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my Senate colleague, ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, was honored by the Morgantown, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce at a luncheon followed by a tour of Federal facilities in the area, on Saturday, March 25.

I have a copy of the commendatory remarks made by Mr. James R. McCartney in introducing Senator BYRD at the luncheon. Mr. McCartney served for 16 years as managing director of the Morgantown Area Chamber of Commerce prior to this year, when he became direc-

tor of personnel and public relations for the Consolidation Coal Co., a part of Continental Oil Corp. He has thus had excellent opportunities to observe fully the benefits which have accrued to the citizens of West Virginia from Senator BYRD's dedicated efforts in behalf of his home State.

I am happy to see that Senator BYRD's effective work as a public servant is recognized in a fully merited manner in West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McCartney's presentation by printed in the RECORD.

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

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen: This a great day for Morgantown. We have come together to recognize the outstanding public service performed for our State and more specifically for our community by one of our U.S. Senators, the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD. Senator BYRD, I am pleased to publicly have this opportunity to welcome you here and we are all delighted that you have accepted the Morgantown Chamber of Commerce invitation to visit our community and inspect a few of the Federal facilities that you have been so instrumental in locating here.

At this time I also want to welcome our other out-of-town guests who have joined us in honoring you here today. At the head table:

Reverend Doane.

C. G. McVay, president of Monongahela Power Company.

Roy Gerard, superintendent of the National Training Schools for Boys.

James McGee, Director of Coal Research, U.S. B. of M., Morgantown Station.

Homer Parker, Director of the U.S. Forestry Sciences Laboratory.

Dr. Heflin.

BYRD.

Martin Piribek, president of the chamber of commerce.

Judge Christie.

Joseph Leonard, director of the fly ash research project.

George Fumich, Jr., Director of the Office of Coal Research, Department of Interior.

Arthur W. Beuhler, mayor.

Dr. C. D. McClure, Director of Alfor.

The Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Joel Hannah, managing director.

Henry B. Brown, Jr., president of Keystone Bituminous Coal Association.

William M. Poundstone, executive vice president, Consolidation Coal Company.

One of the many institutions that Senator BYRD has helped over the years is West Virginia University. Having himself experienced the hardship that many children encounter in obtaining an education, Senator BYRD has always been a great friend of our schools, colleges, and universities. As most of you know, while serving as United States Senator, he attended American University in Washington and obtained his law degree through sheer hard work and loss of sleep. What many do not know is that he was graduated at the top of his class. We are pleased that Dr. Harry B. Heflin, acting president of West Virginia University and a tried and true West Virginian in his own right, is here today to express his compliments to our distinguished United States Senator—Dr. Heflin:

"I want to commend the chamber of commerce for its fine efforts in arranging this affair, and Senator BYRD, I think you should know that this chamber of commerce, now almost 50 years old, is not in the habit of

giving testimonial affairs like this just as a passing fancy or because of some whim of a few of its members. This chamber has always been aware of its civic responsibility and very jealous of its position as a leading organization working for the economic progress and general welfare of the Morgantown area. It is well known that this chamber has not arranged this type of occasion because it thought it was good politics or because it might bring added economic gain to this community. This testimonial luncheon for you has been arranged because our members and many others in this community believe you have been and are a dedicated public servant. (Read letters from Senator RANDOLPH and Governor Smith)

"To us you are an honorable man, very hard working, and a man who does what he believes to be right and just rather than what is politically expedient.

"This is why we are glad you are here today. It is pleasant to our ears to hear the oft said comments like, 'BOB BYRD is not controlled by anyone,' or 'BYRD votes his own beliefs and convictions,' 'BOB BYRD is one of the hardest working senators in Washington.'

"Certainly you have the utmost respect of your fellow Senators or you would not have been elected to the extremely important and sensitive position of secretary of the democratic conference in this session of Congress. In this capacity you, along with Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, the majority leader, and Senator LONG of Louisiana, the floor leader, have the responsibility of meeting weekly with the President to discuss administration policy. You were elected to this most important position by your Senate colleagues because they respect you just as we do . . . certainly not because you represent one of the largest and most influential States in the Union.

"Our congratulations to you for having this great honor and responsibility bestowed upon you. You are also a most effective member of the Senate Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services—two of the most important committees of Congress.

"I hope that the tour you have just been on this morning clearly convinces you that your influence and leadership in having these Federal installations located here have been more than justified. I also hope it has shown you that this community is willing to do its share in providing a desirable home for the employees working at these facilities and that we are cooperating fully in helping these installations to be successful.

"Senator BYRD, your life is an outstanding example of a true American Horatio Alger story. I doubt if there is in our Congress today or, possibly ever has been, any other person who has travelled a tougher road than you have to reach the high position you now hold. It is a great tribute to you and it has certainly meant much sacrifice, hard work, great determination and *willpower* to succeed or it could not have become a reality. We admire you and respect you for making this success out of your life.

Being a U.S. Senator is not an easy job. No one that I know of has ever thought or said that being a Senator is a "soft job." Rather it is a job for a man of your character and qualities which include your:

"Spotless personal integrity.

"Complete devotion to your State.

"A champion under pressure.

"A man of great metal capacity.

"A person of total honesty.

"A deeply religious individual.

"A human being with complete compassion for his fellow men.

"A fine husband, father, and grandfather.

"A dedicated public servant.

"A great patriot wholly devoted to the basic principles of this democracy.

"And a man of unswerving faith in himself and his ability to clearly see right from

wrong and to talk for, work for, and vote for what is right in every instance.

"You have demonstrated all of these qualities and you have been invited here today so that we could tell you of our appreciation for your dedicated efforts.

"We are also greatly pleased that Mrs. Byrd has accompanied you to Morgantown. First, let's face it. When she married you, you had nothing but potential! She has been a most devoted, understanding, encouraging, and unselfish wife and we are glad to acknowledge her help to you and to your career. Mrs. Byrd, we were proud to see in the newspapers the picture of you dedicating one of our nation's newest atomic submarines several months ago. Incidentally, Mrs. Byrd, I understand that you have a very husky grandson, and we hope that you and the Senator will use your most persuasive influence to have him attend West Virginia University.

"Senator Byrd, again welcome to Morgantown. We salute you for being a dedicated United States Senator from West Virginia, for standing up for your beliefs and convictions, for your steadfast integrity, for your complete devotion to duty, and above all for being truly a great American. And now I introduce to you our United States Senator, ROBERT C. BYRD."

WAR AGAINST CRIME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, by all odds, 1967 appears to be the year of this Nation's war against crime. The pendulum of concern for this serious problem, which has too long been on the side of neglect, is beginning to swing toward action. President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, proposed a safe streets and crime control bill, calling for \$350 million in Federal aid to State and local law-enforcement agencies over the next 2 years. Later, the President's Commission on Crime issued a lengthy report which, because of unusual public interest, has had to be reprinted. Last week, a large number of the Nation's most important law enforcement officers gathered in Washington to hear the President, Attorney General Ramsey Clark, ex-Attorney General and current Crime Commission Chairman Nicholas Katzenbach, and other top Federal officials. Hopefully, out of all this activity will come congressional laws to put teeth into our anticrime efforts.

High on the list of priorities is the task of restoring to the individual police officer both the public backing and the technological tools to do his job. He represents our first line of defense against crime, but more and more he has been left to fend for himself and more and more he is the subject of ill-merited abuse and castigation. As a result, morale among many metropolitan police forces has slipped to an alarming degree, and recruitment has become difficult, if not impossible.

The plight of police departments today is described in a thoughtful article by Talmage Powell which appeared in the April issue of the American Legion magazine. Mr. Powell points out, for example, that Washington, D.C., is 230 men short of its authorized strength of 3,100 despite a \$100,000 recruitment drive and \$50 rewards to each member of the department who recruits a new officer.

No one will deny that this Nation must maintain its enviable record of protection of the rights of persons suspected of crime. Nor will they question our continued attack on poverty and ignorance as root causes of crime. But, Mr. President, if this Nation is to remain a land of law, the public had better begin to equip its police departments so that they can function effectively within the new ground rules of recent years and to accord to them the respect to which they are entitled and which they deserve. It would be my hope that Congress will move swiftly to consider the proposals made by President Johnson and his Crime Commission. If it does not, the Nation will face not a few "long hot summers."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Talmage Powell be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OUR DOWNGRADED POLICE: A NATIONAL PERIL (By Talmage Powell)

A whole series of events has been unfolding in recent years that is downgrading and demoralizing our American municipal police.

While some people would debate the right and wrong of the many things that are increasingly demoralizing our cops, there are two things that are beyond debate:

1. Police are starting to disappear. Fewer and fewer men want the job.

2. Respect for police is on the wane. And it is respect for police—rather than the police themselves—that actually enforces most of the law in this country.

It is a perilous thing for a nation to cheapen its police *en masse*, to drive people away from wanting to be cops, and to permit respect for the blue coat to vanish.

That peril, too, is beyond debate. It was demonstrated in the laboratory of the Boston police strike of 1919. Let's turn back the clock and take a second look at an American city without police.

The Boston police had real grievances in 1919. They worked a 12-hour shift. Their annual wage of about \$1,100 was about half that of an industrial worker. When nobody higher up would hear their grievances they went on strike.

Of 1,544 Boston police, 1,117 walked out on a Sunday afternoon. Massachusetts Governor (and later President) Calvin Coolidge at first wanted no part of the mess. He wanted Boston to solve it. So he did not call out the State Guard, and Boston was lawless.

News of the strike swept the city. With darkness, crowds were jostling in the flop-house-and-gin-mill area of Scollay Square. A few fistfights tested the new freedom from restraint. Then wanton vandalism followed. Trolleys were pulled off wires. A window was smashed. A car overturned. A woman screamed and that was the signal turning the crowd into a mob.

The next 72 hours wrote one of the darkest paragraphs in American history. By Monday night, mobs were looting and smashing stores. Men were being slugged and robbed in plain view. Screaming women were dragged into doorways and assaulted. Police stations were stoned as a minor pastime. Terror-stunned citizens covered behind locked doors, with loaded guns to protect themselves, their wives and children. Hurdled organized citizens took up armed posts in the banks and larger stores behind barbed wire and barricaded doors. Out-of-town criminals picked up their arms and headed for Boston. By Wednesday, the mobs were partially armed, and Boston teetered on the edge of total catastrophe.

Finally, Police Commissioner Edwin Curtis found a technicality whereby he could call out a small part of the State Guard on his own authority. As these moved into Scollay Square with bayonets fixed, a pitched battle was started, with flying bricks, stones and bottles from the looting mob. Guardsmen killed three people before the mob fell back. Debris and wounded people littered the area. One on-leave sailor was killed. He was only an innocent bystander. Two men were killed in South Boston. Four Harvard undergraduates, citizen volunteers, fell into the clutches of a lawless mob and were almost lynched before help could reach them. Finally, when Curtis' limited Guard had restored some order, Coolidge sent the State Guard in force into Boston on Thursday and the hoodlum's holiday ended.

Today, year by year, the whole nation is so ignoring the fundamentals of public safety that men are less willing to be cops. The Boston police strike is coming over us everywhere by degrees. Police aren't striking—they are quitting—and young men aren't as anxious to become today's police.

In Chicago, 64 men quit the force in the month of July last year.

San Antonio estimates that it needs 1,200 police. Only 800 are authorized. The force is 10% short of that.

Baltimore reports 360 police vacancies.

Washington, D.C., is 230 men short of its authorized strength of 3,100, in spite of a fantastic recruiting program. The National Capital went on a \$100,000 drive for new cops, seeking them as far afield as New Hampshire and Indiana—with few takers. A member of the Washington, D.C., force gets a \$50 reward each time he recruits a new officer to active duty.

Many cities have thrown out the window a requirement that their police must be residents. Police forces in various cities and towns are raiding one another.

Fairfield, Conn., waived the residency requirement but got only half as many applicants as there were vacancies.

Phoenix, Ariz., created a new category, "police aides," 18-year-olds doing non-critical work.

Houston lowered the age limit for police recruiting from 21 to 19.

Dallas is thinking about lowering its eye-sight standards for police.

Sometimes the police shortage is present even when invisible. In Des Moines, where crime rates go up about 12% every year, 30% of the police have less than five years' experience—an indication of the turnover. It takes about five years to season a good officer, but Des Moines is only one of many cities that must depend largely on rookies for police protection.

Mobile units beat the bushes for potential policemen. Posters appeal to the above-average young man to serve, in ways reminiscent of military recruitment. Display ads are splashed in newspapers far from home base.

Oakland, Calif., plans a van equipped with a police-science display as a recruiting gimmick. The International Association of Chiefs of Police reported this January that several cities plan to set up police recruiting desks in shopping centers, and to accept applicants on the spot for the first time in history.

As the actual number of policemen falls below the need, and as respect for policemen is downgraded in many ways, and as courts and laws make it increasingly difficult for policemen to do their work, the inevitable is happening in the field of crime and public disorder. It is increasing by degrees the way it went up swiftly in Boston in 1919.

FBI figures show crime climbing six times faster than population. Police Chief Phillip Purcell, of Newton, Mass., bluntly told the recent police chiefs' convention that law enforcement "is at the point of crisis in our

country." While crimes are increasing, solved crimes are diminishing—by about 10% a year, says the FBI. Last year, of about 2-800,000 serious crimes known to municipal police, about one in four was solved. San Diego Police Chief Wesley B. Sharp has warned that: "If there isn't a change it [the increase in crime] will lead to anarchy—and criminals will control the nation."

The terrible thing about the accelerating destruction of the image of the policeman is that it is not a corrosion of the bad cop, but of the good one. If it were aimed at the corrupt police force and the grafting cop, it could be all to the good. Corrupt police are an old and unsavory story. In recent years, the biggest exposé came from Denver, which woke up one morning in November 1961, to discover that more than 35 of its police had been arrested as burglars. Over a seven-year period they had committed at least 129 crimes—stealing \$40,000 in one blow from a Safeway supermarket.

Yet the national corrosion of our police today is eating away at the policeman who tries to do his duty. He is being so demoralized on many fronts that a veteran New York officer recently said: "If a son of mine even mentioned going into police work, I'd think about having him committed." In earlier years it was not an uncommon thing for police officers' sons to follow in their policeman-father's footsteps.

While the policeman was seldom well paid in money, there was another kind of pay that we didn't begrudge him. We gave him that respect and public support that made his position one of great public trust. The courts supported him. The law supported him. Only a few years ago, though the pay was no better, the police candidate lists were rarely exhausted. A young man had to beat the competition if he wanted to win a job on the force. When he graduated from the police academy he felt that he had been singled out for a special responsibility. He knew the public was behind him. His duty to enforce the law and keep the peace was clear. If he performed well he had a sense of accomplishment that he could find in few other jobs.

How are things now?

Police are being demoralized by low pay.

Police are being demoralized by contemptuous attitudes toward them in some politically minded courts.

Police are being demoralized by leniency in the penal system which turns hardened criminals back out on their beats almost as fast as they are arrested.

Police are being demoralized by adverse Monday-morning reviews of split-second decisions that they had to make on duty—often with their lives at stake.

Police are being demoralized by charges of "police brutality" aimed against them as a matter of course by criminals and criminal lawyers.

Police are being demoralized by planned and trumped-up charges of "police brutality" leveled at them by civilian organizations bent on creating public disorders—in which the police themselves are often the only ones "brutalized."

Police are being demoralized by published photographs and stories of violence and of vague charges against them which show their role in an untrue light—by selection and omission.

Police are being demoralized by court decisions which free criminals on highly technical grounds even when there is no question of guilt.

Police are being demoralized by new laws that make it even harder to convict the most blatantly guilty defendants, and that tie their hands ever tighter in their efforts to enforce the law.

Police are being demoralized by their increasing liability to physical assault on themselves—assault that is sometimes even excused by leaders of public thought and

morals, leaders who should bring moral pressure against it.

Let's zero in on some detail.

Considering the personal risk, the responsibility and the exacting nature of police work, the pay continues remarkably low. In the last decade, "moonlighting" (taking off-hours jobs) by police has attracted public attention. The national average of starting pay for city policemen is less than \$100 a week, before deductions. Many families on relief get more income. Omaha patrolmen put in four years to reach \$500 a month, and the chief reportedly makes less than 66 officials in the city school system.

In Asheville, N.C., a patrolman can work his way up to \$5,200 a year in seven years. Houston police chief Herman B. Short estimates that more than 75% of his men have to moonlight to support their families.

Such pay scales can hardly be rated as good for a job that entails rigorous qualifications, that sometimes calls for being spit on, cursed, used as a target for flying bottles or bullets; and which annually sees many policemen beaten and killed on the job, leaving widows and children on inadequate pensions.

The growing lack of support of police in more and more courts is virtually an invitation to our cops to look for some saner way to make a living. The definition of "illegal search and seizure" has been broadened; rules on confessions and interrogations have sharply curtailed the "rights" of policemen. The most ringing defense in the world of the rights of defendants fails to face the other question: Who wants to be a cop under such rules?

Los Angeles official Thad F. Brown recently said, "A 21-year-old policeman may have to make a snap decision in a situation that the Supreme Court will take weeks to study—then decide, five to four, that the policeman did the wrong thing." A Connecticut police chief adds: "We have excellent men, but they're getting discouraged. A cop makes an arrest and then finds that he is a bad guy in court." A recent New Yorker cartoon was hardly joking when it showed a burglar, caught red-handed rifling a safe, ordering the officer to stop stalling and inform him of his rights. "Cops today feel the cards are stacked against them," says a New York official. "We have a real morale problem," he pointed out.

In a Chicago Court, officer Frank Perry preferred charges against three punks who'd beaten him up. The judge put them on probation and told Perry he was a "cry baby." In another Chicago case, two off-duty officers, responding to a woman's screams, found one of two men creating a disturbance to be armed with a broken beer bottle. The officers announced themselves, drew their guns and ordered the man to drop his weapon. Instead, Patrolman Thomas A. DeSutter got the beer bottle in his face, and needed 27 stitches and 23 days in a hospital to recover. The judge dismissed the charges against the defendants on the grounds that the police had no right to draw their guns!

When hardened criminals are rapidly returned to society by the penal system, it may please advocates of prison reform, but the facts are that most of them go back to crime so fast that the cop's job is similar to running as hard as possible to stay in the same place. Every 15 minutes, around the clock, a convicted criminal is returned to the streets. California, for example, grants paroles and probations to 90% of its criminals. The fact is that 48% of all parolees repeat their crimes in less than two years. FBI figures for 1966 show that seven out of every ten major crimes involved previous offenders. If the parole system is to be put in balance with the law-enforcement problem, a lot more has to be done by those responsible for parole and probation to reduce the percentage of crime-repeaters turned loose.

Like the rest of us, policemen wish that every criminal could be rehabilitated. But unlike the rest of us, the cop has the often dangerous task of rearresting the same man time and time again. Needless to say, the predicament doesn't boost an already sagging morale.

The policeman's job has always involved risk of personal injury or death, but only in recent years has there been a tendency among many leaders of public thought to excuse or condone violence to police, and thus destroy the fabric of moral barriers against raising a hand against the police.

The result could have been predicted. Felonious assaults against Los Angeles police have increased 31.4%. Quite generally, especially in the big cities, there is a new and uglier face on the personal-risk side of police work. A cop can find himself in danger of being lynched if he tries to arrest a common drunk and a mob scene develops. In 1965, 53 police were murdered and 30 more died in line of duty. And in that year, 20,523 cops were assaulted. Of 278 policemen murdered in the last six years, 30% of them were killed while making arrests or transporting prisoners.

The allegation that any policeman doing his job in a tough situation is being "brutal" has become so commonplace that, if someone yells "police brutality," mobs can be turned against officers who are doing their best to do their duty. A young policeman who had that experience for the first time put it this way: "It makes you feel worse than an animal. You're out there doing the best you can, and somebody says it ['brutality'], and pretty soon everybody is screaming it until it's the only sound you can hear." This trial-by-mob of our police has gotten so bad in some crowded cities that cop-baiting is a gimmick favored by criminals. The trick is to aggravate the officer into any display that might be construed as "beyond reasonable force." Then the officer, if he isn't mobbed on the scene, is put on trial in court instead of the defendant. Legally, a policeman is empowered to use "reasonable force" to carry out his job. But the definition of "reasonable" has been stretched so that a cross look or a hard tone of voice has been branded as "brutality."

Organized cop-baiting by political demonstrators has become so familiar that it is obvious and commonplace. Demonstrators at the University of California at Berkeley have established "Police Brutality Committees" in advance of demonstrating. Students were primed to start yelling "brutality" when the first cop stepped out of a squad car at one of their planned public disturbances—and this is an old Communist tactic. Others were coached in advance to report to a hospital with "police inflicted disabilities." The police countered by bringing along cameras to photograph arrests. Not a single case of deliberate police brutality went on the record. But five highway patrolmen were treated for injuries, one being hospitalized for a week. Anti-Vietnam war demonstrators in Washington last year leaned out of paddy wagons to slug policemen, then posed as "brutality victims." The American press and TV have often gloried in showing photos of demonstrators being hauled about bodily by police. Many such media accept no responsibility for reporting what they actually know of the whole deal in such cases, however. They seldom report what they know full well, that such scenes are staged by demonstrators and that the police are deliberately baited. Communists at Congressional hearings often create disturbances, then resist arrest in front of the press cameras in a bit of vaudeville that the press too often plays straight (see "Congress Versus Extremists," American Legion Magazine, Jan. 1967).

The degree to which the downgrading of police is semiorganized in an unholy alliance among some intellectuals, political groups and criminals—and then glossed over as a

genuine grass roots antipolice movement in the press—is seldom realized.

Certainly any newspaper reader would feel that, in the Negro districts of our large cities, the police are genuinely hated as "anti-Negro brutes." And so would readers of some scholarly books on today's police. That is how some militant Negro and white political leaders, many criminals, scholars and hoodlum mobs tell it, and that's how it often comes through in the press. How surprising then to learn what the Louis Harris poll discovered when it polled city Negroes door-to-door to find their attitudes about police—instead of simply asking self-appointed spokesmen. The Harris report reads as if it came from another planet. The ordinary Negro citizens said they wanted more and better law-enforcement, a tougher clamp down on dope and crime, better police protection. Among workaday citizens, black or white, crime is a major worry—and the tougher the district the more all law-abiding citizens crave increased, not decreased, policing.

Former New York Deputy Police Commissioner Joseph G. Martin said: "The eager, dedicated young policeman starts out at a trot. Then this kind of thing [unsubstantiated charges of brutality] slows him down. Finally, he doesn't know where he stands, so you find him standing still."

Police departments generally resist the establishment of civilian review boards to hear citizens' charges against police overstepping the bounds of their authority. They say that they should discipline their own. Such boards are a two-edged sword, they note. The boards are subject to political appointments, political decisions and the pressures of self-appointed citizens' groups. They tend to discourage policemen on duty from acting courageously to protect the public in tough situations. The officer's hand is stayed by premonitions that a politically appointed board, pressed by those often hysterical citizens' groups that get so much attention these days, may second-guess him in the security of a meeting room. Better to do nothing and show no initiative.

The people of New York City appear to share the police view of civilian boards. Last fall they went to the polls, forgave the police all the traffic tickets they'd gotten, and voted overwhelmingly against a civilian review board.

There is police brutality, and there are other abuses of police authority. In Chicago, of 289 recent verbal complaints, seven charges of brutality were sustained. In Washington, D.C., where written complaints are required, only 11 were filed in the same period. Seven, again, were sustained. In Detroit, about ten complaints a year stand up under investigation. In three recent years, Rochester found cause for action in one case out of 23 complaints.

Supreme Court decisions over the years regarding proper evidence of crime and the proper way to get this evidence have, among other things, made law enforcement a game with as many arbitrary rules as contract bridge. In their zeal to protect defendants, courts have set up conditions whereby it is almost impossible for the police to collect evidence against the most blatantly guilty criminal without committing a technical error which entitles the criminal to go free.

Somehow this is a long remove from the idea of law enforcement. Wittingly or not, the courts have made crime a game in which guilt or innocence plays ever a smaller and smaller part. If the police pop an infield fly, the crooks have them out automatically, and neither the public interest in crime-suppression nor the law that was violated has much to do with it.

In a recent book belaboring police generally for their methods of collecting evidence, author Ed Cray suggests that the Supreme Court is often guided by the police

experience in Washington, D.C. There the ground rules for collecting evidence have been quite strict since 1914, and the crime rate is supposedly all right because it isn't worse than in other big cities. The crime rate in all our cities, including Washington, is bad and rising steadily, and there is another side of the coin in Washington. That's where there's a \$50 bonus to any officer who gets a recruit for the force. That's where they are looking as far away as Indiana to try to find qualified young men who want to wear the policeman's blue coat in the capital city of the nation—without too much success. And that's where women employees of the Supreme Court are provided with police escorts after dark when they work overtime.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been advised that the President's message in regard to the pending problems in the field of railway labor relations has been received. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. MORSE. This morning, the President, the Secretary of Labor, the Under Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, the Postmaster General, and other members of the President's administration, including White House aides, met with a group of Senators and a group of Representatives in the Cabinet Room. The Members of Congress consisted primarily of representatives of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the similar committee in the House.

The President, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, and other high administration officials who were called upon by the President, discussed at some length with Members of Congress the pending crisis in the railway industry of the country. The President told us of the contents of the message he was planning to send to the Hill momentarily, and he also discussed with us the contents of a proposed joint resolution.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, the joint resolution, which I introduce in behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 65) to extend the period for making no change of conditions under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the joint resolution. I shall read it for the RECORD, because my discussion will be based upon its contents.

S.J. RES. 65

Joint resolution to extend the period for making no change in conditions under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees

Whereas disputes exist between the carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers functioning through the Railway Employees' Department, AFL-CIO, labor organizations; and

Whereas the President of the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, by Executive Order No. 11324 of January 28, 1967, created an Emergency Board to investigate these disputes and report its findings; and

Whereas the Emergency Board has reported and the statutory period for making no change of conditions, as extended by agreement of the parties, is about to expire, without the parties having resolved the issues in dispute, thereby continuing to threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive the country of essential transportation services; and

Whereas it is essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that an emergency measure is essential to security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers; and

Whereas it is desirable to achieve the above objectives in a manner conducive to resolution of the disputes through collective bargaining; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the final paragraph of Section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) shall be extended for an additional period with respect to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 11324 of January 28, 1967, so that no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference, or by their employees, in the conditions out of which such disputes arose prior to 12:01 a.m. of May 3, 1967.

Mr. President, what this resolution does in effect, then, is to extend the operation of the Railway Labor Act for an additional 20 days, which will bring it up to 12:01 a.m., May 3.

Incidentally, as was pointed out by the President in the conference this morning, that means it will extend the 60-day period of the Railway Labor Act during which strikes cannot be held to a total period of 80 days, which would make it coincide with the length of period covered under the emergency disputes section of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, the controlling reason given by the President as to why he is sending up the resolution is that he leaves at midnight tonight for Punta del Este to attend a conference of the heads of state of Latin American countries. This is a conference to which he has been invited, a conference to which he has

committed himself for quite some time. Therefore, it is unthinkable that the President should cancel his trip. Such a cancellation would not be understood, particularly by the heads of state of Latin American countries.

Therefore, what the President is saying to the parties in this dispute in this time of crisis is, in effect, "I am asking that no strike action be taken for 20 days provided Congress passes the joint resolution which I am sending up to them forthwith."

I wish to say to the Senate that it is obvious that this is a reasonable request on the President's part. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances in which the President finds himself, it would be a reasonable request under any circumstances, for the reasons I now set forth:

As the Secretary of Defense pointed out in great detail, large quantities of material are essential for our men fighting in South Vietnam. Everyone in this body knows that I am opposed to that war, but everyone also knows that as long as we have boys over there fighting, we must see to it that they have the supplies with which to fight and with which to protect themselves. The Secretary of Defense left no room for doubt in my mind—and I heard no one at the White House conference express any doubt about it that a major railroad strike in this country at this time would create a most serious crisis in regard to the prosecution of the war effort. Bad as I think our involvement in that war effort is nevertheless all of us must see to it that there is no interruption in our railroad transportation system or for that matter any other segment of our transportation system.

In my judgment, as long as we are engaged in the war, the men who are there now must have the supplies necessary with which to fight and to protect themselves.

After I listened to the Secretary of Defense, I did not have the slightest doubt as to the need for reaching an amicable settlement through good faith collective bargaining of the pending railroad dispute.

The President made very clear that he had sought a voluntary agreement from the brotherhoods to postpone any strike until he returned from Punta del Este, in the hope that during the period he was gone, they could negotiate a settlement. I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that in the request being made on behalf of the President of the United States, it was also made clear that the administration feels—and I think rightly so—than in some way, somehow, this dispute must be settled around the conference table and not on the picket line. The immediate, serious, and disastrous effect a railroad strike in this country, at this critical hour, would have makes a mediated settlement essential in the public interest. I know something about the import of a nationwide railway strike. I happened to be chairman of the President's Emergency Board in 1941, when we settled the then pending threat of a nationwide railroad strike which was to take place the next day December 7, 1941. We settled that strike on December 6, 1941—a few hours before Pearl Harbor.

Comment was widespread at that time as to what the shocking effect on our country would have been if the railroad trains of America were bogged down in a nationwide strike at the very time of the Pearl Harbor calamity.

Let me say, Mr. President, that although there was not the slightest expectation of a Pearl Harbor during the Emergency Board hearings on the threatened nationwide railroad strike, the evidence was voluminous as to why it was so important that the dispute be settled without a strike. The world was a troubled world in December 1941. A great war was going on in Europe and it was not known how soon it would be before the United States would become involved in it. The evidence was voluminous as to why it was so important that an agreement be reached by way of the negotiating processes around the conference table rather than on the picket line.

I want to say this to the American people—and when I speak to the American people I speak to all of labor, as well as to all of management, and to all the other groups in this country—that in this time of national crisis, a railroad strike in this country is unthinkable. I care not how short the crisis caused by such a strike might be, or how long it might be. The dislocations caused by a nationwide railroad strike, or a strike that would not be nationwide but would involve large segments of the railway industry, would be so disruptive of the transportation system of this country and so disruptive of the need for war material to be shipped on its way to the war zone, that the unions and the carriers must settle this case around the negotiating table and not on the picket line. It is their clear patriotic duty.

These are not my words alone, Mr. President, but the plain meaning of the President of the United States when he urges that the parties to this dispute enter into a voluntary agreement to postpone a strike for 20 days and continue in a good faith attempt to mediate their differences.

In regard to the President's request for a voluntary agreement of strike postponement I am not privileged to say more than that it is my information there was not unanimity on the part of the brotherhoods involved in turning down the request of the President. But there is a rule of procedure that, when there is an objection in the brotherhoods bargaining group, then the entire group will stand together in voting against such a request. Therefore, so far as the record is concerned, the request of the President was rejected by the six craft unions involved in the dispute.

We discussed this matter with the President. Some of the members of the Senate Labor Committee were there. The chairman of the committee is on the floor, and I appreciate the courtesy of his attendance, because I wanted him to be my witness as I relate to the Senate what went on at the White House.

Following the conference with the President, there was an informal committee meeting called by our chairman, Senator HILL, in the Cabinet room. We discussed the resolution and the message. We thought it ought to be crystal clear that a request had been made to

the unions involved on the part of the President for a voluntary agreement to withhold the strike until his return from Punta del Este and for a total period of 20 days with the hope that a mediation settlement could be worked out in the meantime.

I was designated by the committee to go back to the President's Office and see the President and advise the President that the consensus of the committee was that it ought to be made crystal clear that the request was made at the request of the President himself for a voluntary agreement not to have a strike until he returned from Punta del Este and for an additional time totaling 20 days. The President advised me that the Secretary of Labor had made such a request in behalf of the President. The Secretary of Labor was there also and he assured me that he had made such a request in behalf of the President.

Nevertheless the President agreed to write a letter to the chairman of the Senate committee and to the chairman of the House committee, in which he would state—and we saw the letter before we left the White House—that the request was made to the union representatives and it was rejected by them. In fairness to the President, this should be said in order to keep the record straight.

In my judgment, the President has done everything that a President can do to seek to get this case settled by the peaceful procedures provided for by way of negotiations by the parties through collective bargaining, by mediation, by the appointment of a special emergency board, headed by Mr. Ginsberg, which has handed down recommendations. Of course, as Senators know, the brotherhoods have rejected the Emergency Board's report. The carriers have asserted them.

I want this history perfectly clear because what I have related is the situation that confronts the Senate. The administration, having done all it can do to reach a peaceful understanding in regard to this case, necessarily has to turn to Congress if there is to be an attempt to bring this dispute to peaceful negotiations without a strike. Such is the purpose of the resolution.

As the chairman of the committee would tell the Senate, at 2 o'clock this afternoon the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is going into a hearing at which we will hear the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, and the Under Secretary, Mr. Jim Reynolds, who was a great help to us at the White House this morning. We are going to listen to them, and then the committee will proceed to give such consideration to the merits of the resolution as, in its wisdom, it decides.

It may well be that we will not take final action until tomorrow morning. That is not certain. It may well be done this afternoon if what we hear this afternoon is completely satisfying and there is no reason for delay.

I want to make it clear that we are introducing the resolution because the President is entitled to have its introduction. The introduction of it does not mean that it is not subject to change and modification by the Congress acting

in its wisdom. This brings up another matter that we are going to have to wrestle with in the Congress in the weeks ahead. That is the possibility of new legislation that will deal with emergency disputes.

Let the RECORD show again, as my record for 22 years has shown, that I do not believe in legislation in the handling of emergency disputes that imposes upon labor and management compulsory arbitration. In my judgment, that is a step in the direction of economic totalitarianism of one form or another. It places arbiters sitting in compulsory arbitration courts or boards in a position, to all intents and purposes, to exercise control over the American economy. If they can fix wages, they can fix prices. If they can fix conditions of employment for workers, they can fix conditions for management in the operation of their plants and businesses.

I do not think that is ever justified, and it is not necessary today.

That was why I was one of the few Members in this body who voted against the only compulsory arbitration bill that has ever passed this body in my 22 years in the Senate. It, too, happened to involve the railroad industry. I do not intend to start voting for compulsory arbitration, because I do not think people understand the implications of compulsory arbitration in regard to the control of the economy of the country. A free economy is lost under compulsory arbitration.

But there should be a balancing of interests of both labor and management in the settling of so-called emergency disputes. I said in the Cabinet Room this morning we have a critical situation arising in regard to conditions in the trucking industry. The trucking industry in effect is saying, "We are going to stop the movement of all trucks because there are some wildcat strikes in a very de minimis number of cases." Thus in the Cabinet Room this morning I joined with another Member of Congress, who had raised the point that what is involved in the trucking dispute has many of the characteristics of a lockout. I do not think the Taft-Hartley law should be used in a lockout of the type that is arising in the trucking crisis, forcing men to go back to work."

In a lockout situation, the moving party is the employer. That is why, standing on the other side of the middle aisle in 1947, when I led the fight against the Taft-Hartley bill in the Senate, the Senator from Oregon then pointed out that the Taft-Hartley bill was not a balanced proposal as far as emergency disputes were concerned. If we are going to put men back to work presumably in an emergency dispute situation in which the union is apparently the major wrongdoer, then there must be a balancing provision in the law that makes it very clear that in another type of case in which the employer is the wrongdoer by forcing a lockout, then the employer should have nothing to gain by a continuation of the labor dispute. That is why I proposed in 1947 what I then called a "token seizure" of any business during the period necessary for settling an emergency dispute in a lockout situa-

tion. If the union is to be denied the right to strike in an emergency dispute for an 80-day period when the union is in the wrong, then the employer should be denied the right to lockout when he is found to be in the wrong.

I only mention this, as I did in the Cabinet room this morning, Mr. President: Let this be notice upon the trucking concerns of this country that as far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, that if it is their strategy to stop the trucks for the purpose of forcing the application of an 80-day provision, to send men back to work for 80 days then the senior Senator from Oregon will be proposing here on the floor of the Senate that their companies be seized, if it is found that they are the wrongdoers. They should not be allowed to lock out in order to force an application of the Taft-Hartley law against the drivers of their trucks. When we come to the consideration of emergency dispute legislation, if, as, and when we do, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon once again will be heard on the floor of the Senate arguing for a balanced law. The Taft-Hartley dispute section never was balanced; it was always slanted in favor of the employers against labor. I happen to be one who feels that there has to be impartial balance and fairness in the provisions of any law that deals with the problem of labor relations.

Coming back to the resolution pending before Congress as I said in the Cabinet room this morning we are at the point in this railroad case just about where I left the airline dispute last year. If Senators will remember, the Morse resolution was introduced in the Senate and was passed, by a vote of some 54 to 31. I was charged by some in labor with being a strikebreaker because I proposed to extend the Railway Labor Act in that case for a period of 180 days, with the guarantee to labor that any final settlement would be retroactive to January 1, 1966. How in the world could that be strikebreaking, after a national negotiating committee of the union involved had even entered into an agreement, through its representatives, with the President of the United States, to accept the mediation agreement that was agreed to?

I said then and repeat now, the rank and file of that union had a perfect right to reject the agreement, but I felt under the circumstances, after the President had even been called in as a party in the negotiations, that they should have agreed to stay at work, and given instructions to their national mediation committee to go back to mediation and seek to obtain a better agreement on certain specific points. That was the position I took then.

Mr. President, the situation in this railway case crisis has some of the same aspects. The extension recommended is not for 180 days; it is for a 20-day extension of the provisions of the Railway Labor Act for the purpose of further negotiations, in hopes that a peaceful settlement can be reached. What other course of action is there? We have only two alternatives: either to follow this course of action, in hopes a peaceful settlement can be obtained, or to permit a strike to go on.

Mr. President, if the public interest did not outweigh the interests of the parties, then I would say, "Let them strike." But as long as the statements and the evidence submitted by the Secretary of Defense this morning, and by Mr. Boyd of the Department of Transportation, another Cabinet officer, and by the Secretary of Labor as to the disastrous effect a nationwide railway strike would have upon the war effort and upon the economy of this country, I wish to say that as of now—and I emphasize this for the RECORD—it is the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon that a prima facie case exists in support of the President's resolution. The only recourse and the only remedy now to stop the strike is the passage of such a resolution for that period of time as required by the terms of the resolution. The only power which can accomplish that result is Congress. Senators may say, "You can let the strike proceed, and then you can make application, after the strike proceeds, for further action by the Congress."

But, Mr. President, look at our image. Certainly we do not want the President, to be in Punta del Este, when that kind of a domestic crisis develops in our country. Certainly, if it develops, the President cannot be at Punta del Este. Let us face up to that. We would not want him to be there. He would not want to be there.

I do not think it is unreasonable for Congress, in behalf of all of the people, to take the position that certainly this strike should not proceed while the President is out of the country. The President will be at Punta del Este on a foreign policy matter of vital concern to this Republic for years and years to come. I happen to believe that what may be proposed at Punta del Este, and tentatively agreed to, within the Presidential powers, subject to the review of Congress, will prove to be of great historic importance. Therefore, Mr. President, I think we are justified, under such circumstances, in passing a resolution that would have the effect at least of postponing a strike until the President returns from Punta del Este, and for the remainder of a 20-day period.

But the power, Mr. President, is limited now to Congress. It may be that after the 20-day period provided in the resolution has passed there may be a development of a set of operative facts that would call for the application of further congressional action. This is true because it is only Congress, under the interstate commerce clause, that has the authority to take jurisdiction of the subject matter.

I believe, Mr. President, knowing the labor leaders involved, and having great admiration for the heads of these unions—each and every one of them, Mr. President—that upon reflection, and as a result of further negotiations, an agreement will be reached and a strike will not be necessary, even if they wanted to follow the strike route.

But, Mr. President, it is the interstate commerce clause that gives to Congress the jurisdiction over labor disputes. That is the only section of the Constitu-

tion which gives us jurisdiction. Therefore, the President is not only within his prerogatives and his rights, but in keeping with his Executive duty, to lay this matter before representatives of Congress in consultation, as he did this morning, advising us of the message that he was sending up and of the resolution that I have just introduced.

I wanted to make this statement, Mr. President, before I go into the committee hearing at 2 o'clock.

I shall consider myself perfectly free to support any modification of the resolution that I become satisfied on the facts should help to accomplish the desired results. But the President is certainly entitled to have that resolution introduced, and I am proud and honored to be asked to introduce it, together with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I make this statement, Mr. President, knowing that many Senators are elsewhere, so that it will be available for their reading before breakfast tomorrow morning. I want them to understand the historical background of what has happened in this dispute.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] was with us this morning. I thank him for the honor that he has paid me by listening to my account and interpretation of what happened.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] advised me that he had to leave, but he joins me in the introduction of the resolution and agrees with my account of what happened in the conference with the President this morning.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, having been with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oregon, and others at the White House within the hour, I wish to state that I, too, came back with the feeling that it is necessary to support the President in this request, that we have no other choice, and that I believe we should approve a resolution extending for a period of 20 days the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

I point out—and I think perhaps the Senator from Oregon will agree with me—that this is a dramatic example of what I believe is an unfortunate inconsistency in our laws, because one act, the Railway Labor Act, applies to part of the transportation industry in this country—the airlines and the railroads—whereas the Taft-Hartley Act applies to the trucking industry.

Because this is the case, and because there are differences in periods of waiting and no-strike provisions, the public is confused. I think that many times the parties are confused and even Members of Congress are confused as to which of these two laws applies in this particular request by the President.

It happens that the 20 days will extend the provisions under the Railway Labor Act to make it conform to the 80-day waiting period that would apply if the Taft-Hartley Act were applicable.

While it is unfortunate, in my opinion, that Congress does not have proposals

and recommendations before it for revising the emergency strike provisions that we have under the several laws, I do hope that when we get around to making changes in our basic laws, we might try to bring the whole transportation industry under one of the laws, or at least make the laws consistent so that the whole transportation industry would be covered by the same rules of procedure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I agree with the observations of the Senator from Michigan. As the Senator recalls, there was some discussion of this with the President in the Cabinet room this morning when one of the Members of Congress raised with the President the matter of giving consideration to the imposition of the legislation.

The President pointed out that he has had a task force at work on this matter ever since 2 years ago. He made mention of it in his state of the Union message. The President states that the task force will have some recommendations to make very shortly, at which time the administration will proceed to give some consideration to them.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE A REPORT ON JOINT RESOLUTION DEALING WITH THE POSSIBLE RAILROAD STRIKE, UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT, TOGETHER WITH ANY INDIVIDUAL, MINORITY, OR SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to file its report on the joint resolution dealing with the possible railroad strike until midnight tonight, together with any individual, minority, or supplemental views, if desired. I might add that separate views of any kind are not anticipated at this time.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon if, on the basis of the law or laws as they now stand, that come midnight Wednesday next, the President will be absolutely powerless to function in this particular situation.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. That applies to all procedures available to him.

The Attorney General was in the Cabinet Room this morning, and the specific question was asked him. He gave the same answer, that once Wednesday midnight arrives, the executive branch of our Government will have done everything it can under existing law.

If the strike then occurs, the President can seek further congressional action, but the strike will be on and great dislocation will take place. Further, the President will be out of the country at that time.

In my judgment, we are going to put the President in a very awkward position and create a very bad national emer-

gency. Further we will put him in a position in which he will either have to come back, if he has gone. If we do not give him some reasonable answer that we will pass this resolution he may be forced to decide not to go at all to Punta del Este. I repeat that the best interests of our foreign relations with Latin America for years to come make it very essential that he go to Punta del Este.

I think the country is entitled to some action by Congress immediately on this resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, who is without question the best informed man in either body in the field of labor relations and one of the very best informed men in the country, if not the best.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is kind, but I deny his allegations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I repeat my statement and emphasize it.

I say also that the question of the President attending the Punta del Este conference came up this morning, and it was the unanimous viewpoint of all those present that because of the importance of this meeting, he should by all means honor his commitment to attend.

We are delighted that he has had this evidence of wholehearted support on the part of the Members in attendance at that meeting at the White House, because we all recognize the great significance attached to this particular meeting of the chiefs of state of the Western Hemisphere at this time.

It is well to remember that the President has completely fulfilled his responsibility with every means available.

I commend the President not only for referring the matter to us for our advice and counsel, as well as action, but also for keeping his commitment to meet with the chiefs of state of Latin America on Wednesday next.

I wish the President Godspeed and good luck.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join the majority leader in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs in highly commending the President of the United States for the program and procedure that he has followed in preparing the way for his attendance at this head-of-state conference in Punta del Este.

As the Senator knows, I thoroughly endorse the objectives of the resolution that the President sent to the Congress. The President did not send a resolution asking for no changes.

In order to satisfy some Senators that had concern, there could have been certain language which I recommended to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, language could have been added that would leave

no room for doubt that Congress was reserving its authority to exercise the constitutional processes of the Constitution, including the procedures of authorization and appropriation bills. That is the check. That is the test.

I made that recommendation in the Foreign Relations Committee. I said then, and I say now, that there would have been no opposition at all at the White House level. It was consistent with the intention of the President from the beginning.

With that language in the resolution, I thought that the resolution as sent by the President should have been passed.

I said a few minutes ago, and repeat in this context, that I happen to think this is a very important foreign policy conference for the whole future of the Western Hemisphere—and that means the United States as well as the Latin American countries.

I join the majority leader in wishing the President every possible success in this very important conference and pledge to him my support in carrying out the objectives that he outlined in his message when on March 10, 1967, he sent his message and the recommended resolution on the Punta del Este Conference to the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week the majority leader was tragically and unfortunately away from the Senate because of death in the family.

It was at that time that a number of proposals were submitted because of what was regarded as the inadequacy of the resolution reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

This was done notwithstanding the fact that the House had already acted on a resolution that was regarded as quite adequate.

Under the circumstances and in view of these various proposals that came to my attention I undertook to convene a meeting of the Republican membership of both the House and the Senate for further discussion of the matter.

There was at that time a proposal of circulating a roundrobin statement. After some considerable discussion the leadership approved a rather short, but I thought an all-inclusive statement, wishing the President Godspeed in his journey to Punta del Este, and also in his negotiations with the heads of state of the Latin American Republics. We desired to make it abundantly clear that we did not want him to go there with embarrassment and under any awkward circumstances; and I thought, brief as that statement was, it was adequate to the purpose.

I am glad now, after further consultation with the President, that he does not feel encumbered in any way. And so I wish him well in these negotiations. But the statement did enable us to go on the record so that all the world might know that we fully share his desire to achieve these objectives, if that can possibly be done, in the interest of the social and economic well-being of all the people in this hemisphere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the basis of the statements made this afternoon, I believe that as the President departs for Punta del Este tonight, he

knows that he has the full cooperation and approval of the Senate in his endeavors in meeting with the other chiefs of state.

Like my colleagues, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senate wishes the President Godspeed and good luck.

TROOP REDUCTIONS IN EUROPE— THE LATIN AMERICAN SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD statements which were issued by me over the weekend in connection with troop reductions in Europe and the President's trip to meet with the chiefs of state of Latin America at Punta del Este.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD,
APRIL 9, 1967

Press references indicate the reaching of an agreement by Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States on reductions of military forces stationed on the European continent under N.A.T.O. It is reported that the United States will recall two of the three brigades in one of the six divisions which we have in Western Europe. This means a reduction on the order of 12,000 men (and presumably their dependents) in a U.S. military establishment of well over 500,000 Americans which has been maintained for many years on the European continent.

It should also be noted that some weeks ago there were indications that the Defense Department intended to withdraw two U.S. divisions from Europe. It is not clear from the current report whether the 12,000 men now expected to be recalled would represent a first step in that larger reduction or whether the 12,000 men is to constitute the total cut.

It would be my hope that if there is to be a 12,000 man withdrawal, it would be but a first step and that further reductions of U.S. forces in Europe will follow promptly. Certainly if the 12,000 is the sum total of the contemplated reduction, it can only be regarded, in my judgment, as wholly inadequate.

I note with interest in this connection another press report which makes reference to a Soviet troop withdrawal from Eastern Europe. According to this report out of London, the Soviet Union has recalled from Hungary, three motorized Russian divisions totalling 30,000 men, a reduction which cuts in half the Soviet garrison in that country. I hope this report is accurate and reflects in Eastern Europe the same trend towards military deemphasis which exists in Western Europe.

Whether or not there is a parallelism, however, my own view remains disposed towards a substantial reduction of our forces in Europe. In my judgment, that reduction is called for in our own interests and in the light of current European attitudes and the realities of the situation on the continent.

That is the premise of the Senate Resolution of the 44 which has been referred to a joint group of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. I have asked the Members to meet with me on Thursday, April 13 for an organization-meeting. Since it seems possible that the only reduction of U.S. forces in Europe which is contemplated by Executive Branch officials may be the 12,000 reported in the press, it is all the more necessary that this special committee proceed

to a judicious examination of the resolutions on troop reductions and related European policy which have been referred by the Senate. It would be my hope that, pursuant to its mandate, the special Committee will be able to recommend to the Senate an appropriate course which will provide the President with the best possible advice and support on this question.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD,
APRIL 10, 1967

Today, the President of the United States will leave Washington en route to Punta del Este in Uruguay. He will confer there with the several Presidents of the American Republics. Among the questions which will be discussed at the meeting will be those relating to the rate of economic and social advance under the Alliance for Progress and the possibilities of expanding commerce and trade through a Hemispheric common market and other forms of inter-American cooperation.

There will be, at this Conference, an opportunity for an intense focus by the Heads of the American States on the current problems and prospects of the Western Hemisphere. There will also be occasion for affirmation of the mutuality of respect, concern, and obligation which it is to be hoped will infuse ever-increasingly the relations of the nations of the Americas.

I should like to note at this time that I happened to be among those Senators whom the President consulted on a proposed Congressional resolution which would have provided an endorsement of an expanded program for the Alliance for Progress. The proposal seemed to me to be a sound one and I was certainly prepared to support a resolution along those lines. I regret the events of the past week which apparently have inhibited the enactment of some formal expression of Senate sentiment on the matter. May I say that either the resolution proposed by the Executive Branch, or the substitute proposed by the Committee, or still another which the Senate itself might have devised out of these original forms could well have proved to be of some added usefulness at the Punta del Este meeting.

It has come to my attention since my return—I was not in the city last week—that the resolution reported by the Foreign Relations Committee was characterized by some unnamed source somewhere in the Executive Branch as "worse than useless." That statement was, to say the least, a gratuitous comment on the efforts of the distinguished members of the Committee to work out a way of accommodating the desires of the Executive Branch while sustaining the Constitutional responsibilities of the Senate. That the President himself is fully understanding of the situation was made clear by his press secretary who announced that:

"The President has made his position known to Congress, and the question of whether the Senate does or does not wish to express a view before the conference is held is their privilege. . . ."

I regret the irresponsible comment on the work of the committee from the unnamed Executive source. It appears to have had the effect last week of confusing the issue and impairing full Senate consideration of the matter. It is too late now to proceed judiciously to form a Congressional statement on the matter. Nevertheless, I think it ought to be clear and I know the Senate would wish it to be made clear that there is no question as to the sentiments of this body. To say the very least, we hold the other American Republics in the highest esteem. Resolution or not, we are prepared to give the most understanding attention to any measure of hemispheric cooperation and benefit which may emerge from the Conference and which may involve in some way

the Senate's constitutional functions. We join together, regardless of party, and with all Americans in full support of the President and in wishing him Godspeed as he leaves to represent us all at the Punta del Este meeting.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday.

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

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Truman administration was the subject of an address by the Honorable Charles S. Murphy, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, at the 10th annual board meeting of the Harry S. Truman Library Institute held in Independence, Mo., earlier this month.

Unfortunately Mr. Truman was unable to attend to hear the brilliant and affectionate remarks by his former Special Counsel. Mr. Murphy described how decisions were made during the Truman administration and stressed the President's ability to mobilize brains as well as facts. He noted our former President's unique gifts of simplification, diligence, orderliness, gentleness, dedication, learning, and the courage to do what he thought was right.

I ask unanimous consent that a report of Mr. Murphy's lecture, published in the Kansas City Star of April 2, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Kansas City Star Apr. 2, 1967]

A FORMER AID LAUDS TRUMAN—CHARLES MURPHY CITES DILIGENCE OF 33D PRESIDENT—AT LIBRARY MEETING—CAB CHAIRMAN SPEAKS BEFORE DIRECTORS OF INSTITUTE

It would be difficult to imagine a President who did his homework any more diligently than Harry S. Truman, a close associate of the 82-year-old former chief executive said yesterday in Independence.

Charles S. Murphy, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics board and former Truman assistant in the White House, added that Truman had a facility for "mobilizing brains as well as facts."

SPEAKS AT MEETING

Murphy, special counsel to President Truman, spoke on the Truman administration at the tenth annual board meeting of the Harry S. Truman Library Institute board of directors at the Truman library. Mr. Truman, closely confined to his Independence home since last August when he was ill with an abdominal ailment, did not attend.

However, other guests and members represented a wide segment of educators, lawmakers and administrators. The visiting group was headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren of the United States Supreme court, who presided at the lecture program.

Dr. Elmer Ellis, president emeritus of the University of Missouri, presided at the meeting of the board.

In his lecture, Murphy described Mr. Truman as a man who had a mind of his own and made it up for himself. Murphy said that, as President, Mr. Truman always called for help in decisions and in planning for the

future—relying on a distinguished civilian committee for advice, for example, before deciding to drop the atomic bomb that ended World War II.

TALKS ON KOREA

"The decision to resist aggression in Korea was reached over the course of two days and nights of most intensive discussions with the top civilian and military leaders of the government," Murphy continued.

"The order to relieve General Douglas MacArthur of his command was issued only after the President had discussed the matter for days with the secretary of defense and the joint chiefs of staff and had received their unanimous advice that the action was necessary."

"By his very example he was a great teacher," Murphy said, "and many of the lessons he taught are transferrable not only to other occupants of the White House, but to the whole spectrum of human affairs."

Murphy listed some of Truman's great gifts as simplification, diligence, orderliness, gentleness, dedication, courage and learning. "Truman described a speech," Murphy stated, "as a direct statement of facts without trimmings and without oratory."

"When speaking of the American presidency it may be asking too much to say keep it simple, but serious efforts in that direction are likely to be highly productive of good results."

EVERY WAKING MOMENT

"About this diligence I will simply record that for seven and three-quarters years he spent virtually every waking moment working at being President."

"The ways he showed consideration for his staff were countless. Mrs. Truman joined him in this and I am sure that on her part this was a natural manifestation of the nobility and generosity of her nature. I am sure, too, that this was the real motivating factor for him."

"The problems of the presidency are so complicated," Murphy said of his dedication, "that for all of his wisdom and talent for simplification, it was difficult to tell what action was right and what was wrong in any particular situation, but what he thought was right was what he did."

"So far as I was able to tell, Truman was never afraid of anything. So that leaves me with the philosophical question of how courageous a man can be if fear is absent from his makeup."

Truman was described as a man who never stopped learning. He was 61 years old when he came to the presidency, almost 69 when he left it. But few men at any age have had such an intensive, productive and successful learning period, Murphy said.

MADE MAJOR CHANGES

During the Truman administration, Murphy recalled, there were major changes among the President's staff, members who are housed in the executive office building, although not in the White House itself. Notably, these included the establishment of the Council of Economic Advisers in 1946 and the National Security Council and the National Security Resources board in 1947. The latter was superseded by the Office of Defense Mobilization to meet the exigencies of the Korean war.

"Truman persisted in doing the right thing all the way to the end of his term," Murphy said in closing. "This included orderly turnover."

Murphy related that on the train returning to Washington from Independence after the 1952 election Truman instructed him to prepare the "orderly turnover" to the Republicans. He said that he was not happy about the assignment but admitted that Truman was right.

He said a few days later he was told to gather information on statements by sundry

persons in the campaign with a final instruction to "analyze Trumanism."

"I have not and probably never will be able to comply with that directive," Murphy said, "but I hope these remarks today may be regarded as partial compliance."

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF SURRENDER ON BATAAN PENINSULA

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, although a quarter century has passed the surrender of American and Filipino forces on the Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines on April 9, 1942, remains a bitter memory in the minds of millions of Americans.

Still reeling from the devastation wrought by attacking Japanese forces at Pearl Harbor, our Nation was driven to its knees when the gallant defenders of Bataan struck their colors after a desperate 3-month siege.

Yet even in this darkest hour, the American people looked upon their Filipino allies with a new-found respect and admiration. Of the 78,100 men in the American fighting force on Luzon, 66,304 were Filipinos.

Bataan marked the beginning of a totally new relationship between the United States and Asia. Many years later it was to lead to another great test of courage and convictions in a place called Vietnam.

The Japanese began their invasion of the Philippines simultaneously with the attack on Pearl Harbor. By mid-December they had some 200,000 troops ashore and Gen. Douglas MacArthur declared Manila an open city on the day after Christmas. The siege of Bataan began January 3, 1942.

Malaria, diarrhea, malnutrition, and beriberi soon weakened the pitifully inadequate defenses. By March 1 the troops were on one-third rations.

When Bataan fell, Lt. Norman Reyes, now public relations director of the Dillingham Corp., in Honolulu, broadcast these words from the tunnel of another similarly fated bastion, Corregidor:

Bataan has fallen, but the spirit that made it stand—a beacon to all liberty-loving peoples of the world—cannot fall!

Frank Hewlett, the veteran Washington correspondent for the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, covered the Bataan campaign from beginning to end as a United Press correspondent. He reported that before the men of Bataan gave up, they had butchered Bataan's 600 water buffaloes, the 250 horses of the 26th Cavalry Regiment, and 48 pack mules. The defenders also tried to survive on iguana and monkey meat.

Corregidor was to fall May 6, 1942. The stirring words of General MacArthur vividly recalls that fateful day:

Corregidor needs no comment from me. It has sounded its own story at the mouth of its guns. It has scrolled its own epitaph on enemy tablets, but through the bloody haze of its last reverberating shots, I shall always seem to see the vision of its grim, gaunt and ghostly men, still unafraid.

The Philippines achieved independence on July 4, 1946. Today her people stand by our side, as they did at Bataan and Corregidor, determined that democracy shall survive in a free Asia.

NEED FOR A "BUGGING" LAW

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am in complete concurrence with the views expressed by the editor of the Washington Daily News in the issue of Friday, April 7, under the title "Why a 'Bugging' Law Is Needed."

The editor states among other things:

The only remedy is a tough law; a law which permits official wiretapping only under judicial supervision for limited and specific cause. And imposes heavy penalties on wiretapping by anyone else, bureaucrats, pranksters, business spies or hoodlums.

It is time for Congress to stop being merely horrified by these revelations and start writing a law to control these insidious operations.

I am in complete concurrence that the time is at hand "for Congress to stop being merely horrified by these revelations" but to "start writing a law to control these insidious operations."

The committee dealing with this subject has been in existence for several years; much discussion has been had about the evils perpetrated by the bugging system; however, nothing constructive has resulted from these hearings by way of an adequate law that will stop the bugging and stop Congressmen from being shocked by the revelations of what is being perpetrated.

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:

WHY A "BUGGING" LAW IS NEEDED

After hearing testimony of how Internal Revenue Service employees had "bugged" a judge's chambers and a grand jury room, Sen. Edward V. Long of Missouri said he was "shocked."

He also must have been shocked by other testimony on the same day relating the extensive use of wiretaps and similar electronic "snoops" by professional racketeers.

It all suggests again that anybody—anybody at all—can use the gadgets of modern invention to eavesdrop on anybody else for whatever purpose he has in mind.

And however "shocking" it is to learn that tax agents, willy-nilly, have been bugging grand jurors and judges, or anyone else, it is equally shocking—or more so—to know that any of us may be subjected to such snooping by organized criminals.

One of Sen. Long's witnesses even swore that the telephone lines into Federal offices were tapped.

The only remedy is a tough law—a law which permits official wiretapping only under judicial supervision for limited and specific cause. And imposes heavy penalties on wiretapping by anyone else, bureaucrats, pranksters, business spies or hoodlums.

It is time for Congress to stop being merely horrified by these revelations, and start writing a law to control these insidious operations.

GOVERNOR ROMNEY ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on April 7, in Hartford, Conn., Michigan's Gov. George Romney delivered a highly significant address on a most important subject—the conflict in Vietnam.

I believe Governor Romney's speech gives voice to the Nation's concern that the Vietnam conflict must be resolved justly and with honor.

In his remarks, Governor Romney has drawn on the lessons of the past, not only

for understanding of the present, but also to plan a bridge to the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this important address be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY OF MICHIGAN AT THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER, THE HARTFORD TIMES, HARTFORD, CONN., APRIL 7, 1967

In the rip tide of today's heated debate on the paramount issue confronting our nation, there is one incontestable truth: It is unthinkable that the United States withdraw from Vietnam.

It is not my purpose tonight either to catalog past mistakes or to prescribe what ought to be done in the next four days, four weeks, or four months in that embattled corner of Southeast Asia that so drastically affects every American hearthstone.

Vietnam is a name that boxes the compass. It presents problems that cannot be resolved by crafty political gamesmanship that seeks to homestead the inside track on an issue that will win the American Presidency.

Vietnam is not just foreign affairs as it might have been called a generation behind us. It cuts across every vital sector of national life—urban and rural modernization, economic and social welfare, campus environments, church affairs, and the all-encompassing public morality. It affects most poignantly those American boys who are fighting and their families and loved ones at home.

Moreover, every nation around the globe judges what we are doing in Vietnam against the way in which we comport ourselves on this issue at home.

And it is not a test of wills to see which Party will be the peace party—which candidate will be the hawk or dove.

Too often the complex policies involved in South Vietnam are reduced to, "do we bomb" or "do we withdraw." It's not that simple.

Problem is piled on problem in a tangled heap that challenges our intelligence, our stamina and our faith.

When people become frustrated and confusion reigns, the desire for a simple answer increases. We cannot let this desire cloud our thinking or misguide our action.

Although efforts to induce negotiations have not worked up to this point, they should be pursued vigorously. But since they haven't worked yet, demands for a sharp change of course will undoubtedly be intensified.

That change could take the direction of massive military escalation.

Many thoughtful and responsible American leaders are beginning to speak in this vein. Indeed, among the general public there appears a visible groundswell of impatience leading to a mood of "Let's get it over with; let's crush them once and for all."

This simplistic reaction is tempting but wrong.

First, by actions approaching devastation of a non-white Asian people, we would play into the hands of the Communists. They would use this effectively to paint us in their propaganda as ruthless oppressors and militarists—the very opposite of our true role in the world.

Second, from the point of view of stopping the expansion of Communism, we must remember that a devastated Vietnam would not be a buffer. It would be a vacuum.

Third, we must never forget that substantial escalation is still possible on both sides.

Vietnam does not stand by itself in international affairs.

Others who watch the world frontiers of

freedom fear a bogdown in Vietnam may make us vulnerable to Communist pressure, intrigue and subversion in Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, Africa and elsewhere. They wonder if America can use effectively our principles, purpose and power for peace and progress around the world.

Before us stretch grief-laden straits that must be navigated with resolute will and genuine—and I repeat genuine—willingness to reach that solution that will lead to a just peace.

Failure to recite a catalog of past mistakes does not mean that the past cannot instruct the present and the future. It is a useful exercise to ask ourselves what are the lessons that emerge from Vietnam.

One lesson surely is that a commitment of the character and massiveness of ours in a country the size of Vietnam has the inevitable result of turning it into an American dependency.

This is as unconscionable to our tradition as it is resented by other free nations. We can hardly be happy when our every decision not merely affects but largely directs the intimate daily life of a sister nation.

We must avoid such future entrapments.

Another—and I hope well-learned—lesson is that we must avoid commitments that grow like Topsy. There has been a failure to decide what the scope and nature of our Vietnam commitments ought to be.

We now must acknowledge the wisdom of President Eisenhower's decision thirteen years ago not to deploy ground troops in Vietnam. Starting with a decision in 1954 to afford modest economic support and limited military advice, we now find ourselves totally committed—with a current force in being approaching half a million men and a direct budgetary outlay of at least \$24 billion yearly, almost one fifth of our national budget.

Our interest has been defined largely by the commitment, rather than the commitment by the interest.

The final major lesson is that any administration must be frank, open, and straightforward in counseling with the American people. Vietnam has given rise to a rupture of trust between governors and governed for which it is difficult to find a parallel in American history.

Not only has the public thus been largely excluded from its direct sovereign role in decision-making but Congress has been bypassed. There is no excuse here of lack of time, or of the small nature of the emergency. This is the fourth largest war in our history.

On this point, I am going to let Abraham Lincoln speak for all Americans who feel that there is something terribly wrong about this.

Lincoln, confronted with this precise issue, when in Congress, wrote to his law partner, William Herndon:

"Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose, and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect, after having given him so much as you propose. If today he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us;' but he will say to you, 'Be silent: I see it, if you don't.'"

Lincoln continued:

"The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most op-

pressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where kings have always stood."

Adhering to the Constitutional process could prevent similar entrapments in the future.

But where do we stand now?

It is patently clear that the massive build-up in America and allied might has not only made defeat unthinkable, but makes possible the breaking of the spine of enemy main force battalions.

Our military effort must succeed. I believe that we must use military force as necessary to reduce or cut off the flow of men and supplies from North Vietnam, to knock out enemy main force units, and to provide a military shield for the South. We must give our gallant fighting men our full support.

Action in the South holds out the promise of a series of conventional military victories.

Obviously this does not mean cessation of guerrilla activity. Nor does it portend a significant breakthrough in that "other war"—the pacification program. But it does mean that, with the achievement of military dominance in the traditional sense, we will have reached a decisive moment in the course of the war.

But before that moment is reached, we must ask ourselves once again what is the shape of the peace we seek in Vietnam? What do we hope to leave behind when our task there is done?

We must recognize the danger that substantial military victories could inflate our peace aims. I find this prospect extremely disquieting.

Too often in the tides of history, men have sought to rationalize sacrifices already made by seeking wider goals. We must guard against falling into this pattern in Vietnam.

We must stand immovably against all pressures which would preclude a just peace.

Hopefully, when the time of military dominance arrives, the government of South Vietnam would be willing to negotiate a "peace with amnesty."

In a "peace with amnesty" in South Vietnam, all citizens would be allowed to participate in the political process, provided they abide by the ground rules.

Specifically, individual members of the National Liberation Front would be permitted to participate freely in the political life of South Vietnam, on condition that it abandon its use of political terrorism, its subservience to any foreign communist organization, and then disband.

This would not mean that a coalition government involving the National Liberation Front would be forced upon the people of South Vietnam. I am opposed to any such coalition government.

It would mean that all the people of South Vietnam would be given an equal opportunity, as individuals, for peaceful participation in shaping the future of their country.

Unless we pursue this proposition or some similar solution, we will face a very lengthy and brutal struggle in winning the "other war."

It would be far wiser and more compassionate to include today's enemies in tomorrow's peace than to court the human suffering to both the South Vietnamese and our own fighting men that a drawn-out "other war" struggle would demand.

Unless "peace with amnesty" can be achieved in South Vietnam, then it would be necessary to break the spine not only of the main force battalions but of the Viet Cong guerrillas as well in order to win the "other war."

The United States is the most powerful nation the world has ever seen. But we are not omnipotent.

While there are no limits to what we can

destroy, there are limits to what we can build.

The ultimate outcome of this fateful struggle depends on what the South Vietnamese do in rebuilding their own society and communities as well as on what we do in helping them.

The "other war" is primarily their war. It combines anti-guerrilla warfare, political and psychological warfare, social and economic weapons, pacification and civil action programs, and reconciliation programs to win back those Viet Cong members who are more nationalists than communists.

The villages and hamlets, where the majority of the people live, are the very base of South Vietnamese existence, and thus the base for South Vietnam's future—either Communist or free. The Viet Cong, recognizing this, directs its primary campaign of terror and assassination against them—not against Saigon.

Our fighting men, not only in battle but in countless individual acts of consideration and concern for the suffering people of Vietnam, have proved they are truly magnificent Americans.

But it would be a tragic error to ask them to take over the "other war" as some have proposed.

Taking on the responsibility for the "other war" would tie down hundreds of thousands of American troops for many years. It would undermine the initiative and capacity of the South Vietnamese to help themselves. It would transform South Vietnam into an American military colony which America neither wants nor needs.

We have already Americanized the shooting war. We should not Americanize the "other war."

The Hanoi leaders may be holding out in the desperate hope that America will tire of the struggle, that our purpose will falter, that disillusionment and discord here at home will somehow induce us to abandon our friends and dishonor our commitments by pulling back or pulling out.

That is a false hope—and I for one will not contribute to it. I have repeatedly said that I will neither give encouragement to Hanoi's aggressive course, nor undermine our President in sincere efforts to bring peace to Vietnam.

I have even heard that the leaders in Hanoi think a Republican administration might come into power that would settle on their terms.

For what it is worth, I would like to tell them right now that here is one Republican I can speak for who will not settle on their terms under any circumstances!

Let me summarize my position on Vietnam:

1. It is unthinkable that the United States withdraw from Vietnam.

2. We must not over-simplify this conflict by talking only in terms of bombing or withdrawing.

3. The failure to induce negotiations at this time should not result in massive military escalation. We should continue to seek meaningful negotiations.

4. We must learn from the lessons of this tragic war to avoid similar involvements in the future.

5. We must give our gallant fighting men our full support. We must use military force as necessary to reduce or cut off the flow of men and supplies from North Vietnam, to knock out enemy main forces, to provide a military shield for the south, and to establish military dominance.

6. We should help South Vietnam to get an effective program underway to win the "other war", which because of its inherent nature is primarily their war.

7. At the point of achieving military dominance, we should encourage the Government of South Vietnam to achieve "peace with

amnesty" to avoid a very long and brutal "other war".

8. If "peace with amnesty" or some similar negotiated solution fails, we should continue to help the South Vietnamese win their "other war" but keep from Americanizing it as we have done the military conflict.

With our help, the South Vietnamese have made a start toward building a stable, representative, civilian government at the national level. This is encouraging.

America's major objective and contribution must be a just peace.

The political, social and economic development of South Vietnam and of all Southeast Asia cannot really start or eventually take off without peace.

So much remains to be done—and patiently so.

Let us build stone by stone upon the dreams and concepts that have served this nation from its birth.

Let us get on with the task. Let us be ready to move our dreams and our beliefs in freedom from the drawing boards to the conference table.

Let us pursue with strength the just peace in South Vietnam that our prayers should so earnestly seek, and that may yet be within our grasp.

So doing, we can fulfill our role as "the last, best hope of earth . . . The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just."

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS SUPPORTS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, we are all well acquainted with the excellent work done by the League of Women Voters. The consistent high quality of their carefully reasoned statements compels us to give weight and consideration to their arguments.

The League of Women Voters of the United States has, through its membership in local units across the country, just completed a 2-year study of human resource development. I have received a number of letters from organizations in Connecticut which, as a result of this study, indicate their strong support for equal opportunity in employment and education. These letters also offer an excellent evaluation of the actual operation of some of the economic opportunity programs.

In order that Senators may have the benefit of these excellent reports, I ask unanimous consent that correspondence I have received from Mrs. Sidney E. Sweet, Jr., president, League of Women Voters of Connecticut; Mrs. Benjamin Radding, president, League of Women Voters, Simsbury, Conn.; Mrs. Michael Erlanger, president, League of Women Voters, of Redding, Conn.; Mrs. E. Bowman Stratton, Jr., president, League of Women Voters of Fairfield, Conn.; and Mrs. Hollis Fait, president, League of Women Voters, Mansfield, Conn., be printed in the RECORD.

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

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF MANSFIELD, CONN.,
March 13, 1967.

Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RIBICOFF: The members of the Mansfield League of Women Voters wish to remind you of our intense interest in programs to provide equality of opportunity

in education and employment for all Americans.

We are concerned that the pressures of military spending and discouragement with the complexities of eliminating poverty and discrimination seem to be weakening Congressional determination to tackle the urgent problems of our society. We were disturbed, for example, by the failure of the Eighty-Ninth Congress to appropriate adequate funds to the Office of Education for enforcement of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and by the defeat of civil-rights legislation in 1966.

Of greater impact locally was the failure of Congress to appropriate all the funds authorized by the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. Although concern with proper administration of anti-poverty funds is certainly necessary, we have seen no evidence of abuse in our local programs, and we regret the restrictions placed on local initiative, especially in the Community Action Program. This is of direct concern to the League because we were the original sponsors of the Mansfield Community Council.

The curtailment of funds has forced the abandonment here of important projects such as a Neighborhood Youth Corps. Another victim was an imaginative scheme to pay senior citizens to act as foster parents to children at the Mansfield Training School.

In general we are anxious that the hopes raised by these many new programs not be disappointed lest the problems become worse than they were before. Experience with the Head Start Program, for example, has shown that the effects may be actually damaging unless the expectations aroused are met with follow-through programs in the primary schools.

The League members appreciate the efforts you have made thus far in the War on Poverty, and we hope that you will vigorously support additional legislation to make significant progress towards equality of opportunity in education and employment.

Sincerely yours,

CLADENE FAIT
Mrs. Hollis Fait,
President, Mansfield League of Women
Voters

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN
VOTERS OF FAIRFIELD,
March 9, 1967.

The Honorable ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RIBICOFF: We would like to take this opportunity to acquaint you with the League's position in the field of national human resources. We 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.

To be more specific, the types of programs the League supports include:

1. Programs in basic education, occupational education and retraining when necessary.
2. Expanded opportunities in apprenticeship and on-job training.
3. Day care centers for disadvantaged preschool children to give their parents the opportunity for employment.
4. Compensatory programs for disadvantaged groups beginning at the preschool level and extending through secondary education.
5. Federal financial aid to help needy students remain in secondary school and to take advantage of post high school training and education.

We recognize that this is a massive program. All cannot be accomplished in a year, or even two, five or more years. There has

already been a start along the road. Many missteps have been made. We feel that the program needed and needs very careful planning before proceeding with expansion and with the expenditure of huge sums of money.

We will in the near future continue to communicate with you our position in this important field of endeavor. We ask for your thoughtful consideration and thank you for your efforts directed toward the support of these worthwhile programs.

Sincerely yours,
KEARSLEY C. STRATTON
Mrs. E. Bowman Stratton, Jr.,
President.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF REDDING, CONN.,
March 1, 1967.

The Honorable ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RIBICOFF: In 1964 the League of Women Voters of the United States, out of deep concern about the gap in opportunities in this country, adopted the Development of Human Resources as a study item. After two years of work, study and discussion a strong consensus emerged, allowing Leagues, including our Redding League, to act in support of programs providing equality of opportunity for education and employment.

I am sure you are aware of the kinds of programs the League supports: basic education for adults; compensatory education for the disadvantaged; occupational training or retraining of various sorts; day care centers for children to allow parents to work; school integration programs; effective fair employment practices laws. The ultimate aim, of course, is practical as well as moral—to assist people to become self-supporting, self-respecting contributors to society.

Our League is interested in the problems and programs in Danbury, our urban neighbor. In Danbury and vicinity, as in countless communities across the nation, outmoded ideas, lack of initiative and money have in the past precluded action on the problems of the disadvantaged. Also, Danbury is now inheriting through immigration the results of years of inequities in the South. However, in the past two years things have begun to change in Danbury because of Federally and State sponsored programs and some fine local leaders. Head Start, Upward Bound, Neighborhood Youth Corps, job training, work study, adult basic and vocational education programs have been run effectively. There is a young but well-organized Community Action Committee which oversees the area anti-poverty programs and which has a well-qualified director. Government and private social agencies are now working together. Minority needs are being pinpointed and action planned. Through the Community Action Committee, funds have been appropriated or requested for a Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program, four summer Head Start programs and one year-round Head Start program. Funds will be requested for day care and job training programs. Funds have also been appropriated or requested for adult basic education, vocational-occupational education, an outdoor education program and five centers for supplementary arts education.

Our League urges that Federal funds be continued and increased for these programs. We also urge more flexibility in funding.

Earmarking of Federal money tends to hinder the solution of unique problems of areas that differ in make-up. Also, since the cost-of-living varies from area to area, the poverty level criteria used to determine who gets help need to be adjusted or made more flexible to fit the realities of each area.

We feel strongly that so much has already been spent on the anti-poverty programs in our area that to curtail them now when the benefits are just being realized would be

wasteful—as well as unfair to Danbury's disadvantaged citizens. We are well aware that there will be attempts to cut and emasculate many of the programs, and hope that you will give your full support to preserving them.

Sincerely,
MARY A. ERLANGER
Mrs. Michael Erlanger,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Simsbury, Conn., February 27, 1967.

DEAR SENATOR RIBICOFF: The members of the Simsbury League of Women Voters are greatly concerned that programs to provide equality of opportunity for all persons in education and employment should continue. As you are probably aware, members of Leagues all over the nation studied the subject of Human Resources for two years and reached a position in 1966 in support of programs and policies to provide equality of opportunity in the areas of education and employment.

Our position includes the conviction that the federal government shares this responsibility with other levels of government; and we are particularly concerned for compensatory educational programs for disadvantaged people and for the removal of discrimination in both education and employment.

At a general membership meeting, the Simsbury League heard first-hand from Mr. David Holmes, Executive Director of Hartford's Community Renewal Team, about the fine work being done there with the assistance of federal funds. We feel that community action programs such as this are very valuable and should continue.

We are supporting, along with other Leagues in Connecticut, various bills currently before our General Assembly concerning state aid to the disadvantaged. As previously stated, we feel that all levels of government share this responsibility, and we urge that you give favorable consideration during the current congressional session to federal proposals that will work toward equality of opportunity in education and employment.

Very truly yours,
DOROTHY L. RADDING
Mrs. Benjamin Radding,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
CONNECTICUT,
Hamden, Conn., March 2, 1967.

The Honorable ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RIBICOFF: The League of Women Voters of the United States has through its membership adopted firm positions in support of equality of opportunity in education and employment. These positions have been reached after two years of study by League members of the problems of human resource development. We believe that it is the responsibility of all levels of government to provide equality of opportunity and that programs to increase the education and training of disadvantaged people, programs to prevent and/or remove discrimination, and programs that will bring about racial integration of the schools will do the most to achieve the ends we seek.

To be more specific, the League supports such things as greatly increased educational opportunity through compensatory programs for disadvantaged groups, expanded opportunities in apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs; a regional approach to problems of economically depressed areas; programs to bring about effective integration of schools through federal technical assistance such as training programs and institutes for teachers and school administrators; the withholding of 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, and an effective federal fair employment practices agency.

The League also supports community action programs which are carefully tailored to the educational and employment needs of the people they are intended to reach, which involve in the planning and implementation of the programs the people for whom the programs are designed, which are competently and efficiently administered and continually evaluated as to their effectiveness.

Although we in Connecticut are fortunate in having long been in the forefront on human rights legislation, we realize that we have a responsibility to continue our efforts and also to do what we can to promote equality of opportunity in education and employment nationwide.

We as the League of Women Voters of Connecticut are presently talking to our representatives in the Connecticut General Assembly about programs for the disadvantaged and increasing state support of projects, appearing before appropriate committees of the Assembly and working with the Planning Council and various committees of the Governor's Conference on Human Rights, and Opportunities. Local Leagues within the state are doing what they can to create a climate in their cities and towns which will be receptive to fresh ideas and stimulate new initiatives in this area of concern—equality of opportunity for all.

This letter is to inform you of our convictions and efforts along the lines mentioned above and to urge you to support in the Senate of the United States legislation designed to achieve the ends we seek. You no doubt will be hearing from us further on specific legislative proposals but we wanted you surely to be aware of our general concern.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA S. SWEET

Mrs. Sidney E. Sweet, Jr.,

President, League of Women Voters of Connecticut.

JACKSON HOLE, WYO., BIDS FOR 1970 ISF WORLD SKI CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the U.S. Ski Association and those splendid western centers of hospitality contiguous to Wyoming have thrown their support behind the Equality State as the proposed site for the 1970 World Ski Championships of the International Ski Federation. Wyoming, accordingly, is the official American choice—that is to say, the official choice of the U.S. Ski Association—for this world series of skiing competition, which attracts the best skiers and the most eager spectators the world has to offer.

For the honor of hosting the 1970 ski championships, the huge Jackson Hole ski area in Wyoming's Teton Mountains is in competition with ski areas in Japan, Italy, West Germany, Austria, Canada, Switzerland, and Czechoslovakia. Wyoming cut her teeth earlier this year when an international ski meet, the Wild West Classic, was staged at Jackson. The meet was used as a testing ground by the International Ski Federation officials to see how well the ski area handled large, international ski competition. The area passed the inspection with flying colors and was soon after selected as the official U.S. entry.

Mr. President, it goes without saying that the Congress would like to see the

United States play host to the world's largest and most illustrious event in skiing competition, but I think that added impetus could be given to the U.S. application which will be considered in May of this year when the International Ski Federation World Council meets at Beirut, Lebanon.

Accordingly, Mr. President, tomorrow I should like to submit for the consideration of Senators a concurrent resolution which would express the sense of the Congress of the United States that the 1970 World Ski Championships be held at the Jackson Hole ski area in Jackson, Wyo.

It is regrettable, Mr. President, that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not carry photographs—particularly color photographs—so that I could better show Senators and other readers of the RECORD the wonders of the Jackson Hole country. The American Alps, the magnificent Teton Range, borders Jackson on its western perimeter and it is on the eastern slope of these mountains down which the world's skiers will be speeding if the American entry for competition is approved.

The mountains of Jackson Hole and Teton National Forest offer new heights in American skiing. They are lofty, they are broad, and they are varied. They have a 4,135-foot vertical rise, a virtually limitless timber-free bowl, and countless miles of trails and slopes for every degree of skiing skill. Twenty-four runs and trails are indexed in the Jackson Hole literature, ranging from easy to difficult. Completed recently is the 65-passenger tram running from the ski area's headquarters up the slope of Rendezvous Peak. In terms of accommodations for spectators and competitors in a ski meet, Teton Village at the foot of Rendezvous Peak offers approximately 300 rooms while an additional 4,000 beds are available in the town of Jackson, just 15 minutes away.

Mr. President, I sincerely feel that the U.S. Ski Association made a splendid and commendable choice when it picked the Jackson Hole Ski Area as the American entry in competition for the 1970 World Ski Championships of the International Ski Federation and I ask the Senate to act upon the resolution I will introduce with enthusiasm and dispatch.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the concurrent resolution which I intend to submit tomorrow.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION —

Whereas, the United States Ski Association, in cooperation with the Jackson Hole Ski Area, has formally submitted its bid to the International Ski Federation to hold the 1970 World Ski Championships at the Jackson Hole Ski Area in Wyoming; and

Whereas the staging of the 1970 World Ski Championships at Jackson Hole would be a great benefit to the United States and to the State of Wyoming; and

Whereas guarantees have been made to the FIS that sufficient and adequate facilities for competition, housing, accommodations and communications exist or will be provided by the State of Wyoming, the Jackson Hole Ski

Area, and the local community: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its approval of the selection of the United States Ski Association and supports its recommendation to the International Ski Federation World Council meeting in May of this year in Beirut, Lebanon, that Jackson Hole in the State of Wyoming be designated as the site for the 1970 FIS World Ski Championships.

VIETNAM—THE STRUGGLE TO RESCUE THE PEOPLE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, further with respect to the article entitled "The Struggle To Rescue The People," published in Fortune, this article accurately portrays my views resulting from my trips to Vietnam.

Members of the Senate want to know the truth about all sides of this operation; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that additional excerpts from that article be printed in the RECORD.

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

In response to an American suggestion, the Ky government has agreed to assign at least half of the 321,000 men of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN, pronounced to rhyme with Marvin) to the job of pacification. These first-line troops will undertake the critical task, previously left to regional forces, of providing millions of peasants with true protection against Communist guerrilla bands. If the plan works, it will be safer than ever before for the peasants to take the first steps toward rallying to the government side. At the same time, Premier Ky has created a new Vietnamese Government counterpart of the U.S. operation and has placed in charge an exceptionally promising man: Major General Nguyen Duc Thang, thirty-seven. An aggressive, imposing leader, Thang is training thousands of young men and women "cadres" (civilian political workers) to work on pacification in the hamlets, giving the program new zing and momentum.

None of this alters the grim reality that the pacification job in Vietnam ranks as one of the most difficult the U.S. has ever undertaken. The magnitude of the task, only now being recognized in Saigon, is much less appreciated in the U.S. "We don't really understand even now," said one top-ranking U.S. official, "how to go at this." There is experience only in failure. If pacification should succeed this time—and the odds are certainly no better than even—the effort will take years, perhaps as much as a decade, of persistence and patience. And ultimate success will depend, in large measure, upon an element that the U.S. cannot control: performance by the South Vietnamese in carrying out the program. There is, to be sure, the difference that the effort this time begins under more favorable conditions than any that have existed in the past, mainly because the Communist main forces have been bottled up by American troops. Even so, success in pacification represents the only visible way for the U.S. to escape from Vietnam, except in defeat. For as long as the Vietcong retain control of the countryside, withdrawal of U.S. forces would simply remove the last obstacle to Communist strangulation of the rest of the country. Nor would recourse to escalated bombing of the North offer an alternative solution; aside from other possible effects, it would be irrelevant to the control the Communists exercise in the South. Success of pacification, in short, has become an imperative for the U.S. and South Vietnam.

WEAPONS CONTROL

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last Sunday, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], "unarmed, save with the armor of reason and conviction," in the words of the Washington Post, argued the case for weapons control before the group which most strongly opposes such controls, the National Rifle Association. As a cosponsor of S. 1, the administration firearms bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], I agree with Senator KENNEDY, who is also a cosponsor of the bill, that the 90th Congress will pass effective weapons control legislation. I share his view that there is a community of interest between those who would prevent wrongful uses of firearms and those who wish to promote proper uses, and thus that the National Rifle Association should cooperate in the design and enactment of the proposed State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1967. The visit by the Senator from Massachusetts to the association could be the first step in such a constructive relationship.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of his remarks and the editorials regarding his appearance, published in the Washington Post of April 4, 1967, and the New York Times of April 5, 1967.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I welcome this opportunity to meet with you today to discuss the kind of legislation I consider absolutely essential to control the sale and movement of guns in our nation. I had looked forward to the chance to meet with your membership at a general session on legislation. Since that was not possible, I shall attempt to bring my thoughts to you, in the hope that what is said here will eventually be communicated to your membership, and to the public.

I asked to meet with you to discuss the clear and compelling need to legislate against the uncontrolled sale and shipment of guns. This need is now well-understood by the general public—weapons are available in this country to the demented, the criminal, the child, the addict, and all others who would abuse these instruments of death. Your organization has stated that the person, not the gun, creates this national problem. I agree that the gun cannot cause harm without the person, and the intent of the legislation I support is to see to it that those persons bent on violence and crime be deprived of the weapons that in their hands horrify the public.

The National Rifle Association is fully aware of the tragic statistics:

In this century the number of Americans killed within our borders by bullets exceeds the number of N.R.A. members.

In this decade the number of Americans killed by firearms at home is many times the number of boys we have lost in Vietnam.

In 1965 alone, 5,600 murders, 34,700 assaults, and most of the 68,400 armed robberies were committed with guns.

In a recent three year period, of the 4000 people who ordered guns from only two of the mail order dealers in the city of Chicago, one-fourth—or 1,000—of them had criminal records.

These figures tell only a part of the unbelievable story of gun abuse, but they

should be enough to cause concern among men of reason in 1967.

Let us look at the response of our nation's leadership to this growing national emergency. The President of the United States, and the President who preceded him, both called for strong legislation to curb the flow of weapons to those in our society who should not have them. This call has been supported by their Attorneys General, by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, by the American Bar Association, by the National Crime Commission, by the country's best police chiefs and prosecutors, and, I believe, by the vast majority of our citizens.

And let us examine the response of some of those who disagree—citizens who are supposedly intelligent, patriotic and upstanding members of their communities. They have said, "Register Communists, not firearms;" "Move to Russia if you want to live under gun control legislation;" or, "Register your firearms, those who want a police state will appreciate it."

And what has been the response of the National Rifle Association? Your stated policy has been that . . . "Firearms legislation is of insufficient value in the prevention of crime to justify the inevitable restrictions which such legislation places upon law-abiding citizens." That statement does not differentiate between various kinds of legislation. It does not admit that there are any merits to the arguments of law enforcement officials, public officials, the general public or the President of the United States. That statement represents to me a negative response in the face of a majority opinion that something must be done, some step must be taken, to reduce the chance of death and injury by guns in the hands of the young, the unstable or the lawless.

As the result of your efforts, we in Congress have been flooded by mail, wires, and telephone calls. All too often these communications are abusive and irrational. We have been labeled un-American, Socialistic, and unconcerned with the true causes of crime. We have been described as opposed to the legitimate use of guns for sport and hobby. At worst these charges are ridiculous and cruel, at best they are simply wrong. And in almost every case, it is apparent that nothing is being done by opponents of gun legislation to foster understanding, intelligent debate, and compromise.

But regardless of the efforts of the opponents of gun legislation, we in Congress have our responsibilities to the people. We intend to meet them. And the choice is yours whether we will meet these responsibilities with the assistance of your members, or in spite of them.

Let me state the case for this year's legislation, legislation which I believe will pass. The State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1967 has neither the purpose nor the effect of restricting the hunting pleasures of any members of this Association. It will not make it impossible, or even difficult, to purchase, carry, or use a gun for sporting purposes. This law, S. 1, will not prevent a firearms competitor from traveling from state to state to a match of shooting skill, and it will not preclude the legitimate gun user from buying a rifle or a shotgun while he is away from home.

It is certainly not the intention of any member of Congress to deprive, or even interfere with, the American sportsman or his right to take to the field to hunt or match his skills against others. The true sportsman, the hunter, or the collector of weapons is well-represented in the Congress and the government. His love of the outdoors and his competitive spirit are shared and admired by all.

The State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1967 was constructed with full recogni-

tion of the diversities among states, their geography, their histories, and their experiences with crime and guns. It seeks, after laying down basic Federal standards, to allow each state to decide for itself how to prevent the misuse of firearms.

No state can now make such decisions and make them stick. My state of Massachusetts, for example, has fairly stringent gun laws. Hunters and competitors and collectors have no difficulty in complying with them and do so willingly. Yet under present conditions these laws constitute only a minor nuisance to the criminal, the addict, the juvenile, or the incompetent who wants to avoid the Massachusetts regulations. Those who my state says cannot buy weapons can order them by mail from out of state. Those whom the laws of Massachusetts seek to keep away from guns can go to Maine or New Hampshire or Vermont, which have few restrictions, and buy their weapons. In fact a survey by the Massachusetts State Police showed that 87 per cent of the guns used in crimes in the Commonwealth were purchased over-the-counter in these neighboring three states.

Is this fair to the citizens of Massachusetts, who, after weighing the costs of strict gun controls against the benefits, have decided in favor of controls? Is this fair to the law-abiding gun owners of Massachusetts who see others evading the state's laws?

It is the essence of our Federal system that the states be given as much authority as possible in determining their own legal environment. This principle is especially appropriate in the case of firearms use, which varies so greatly from region to region, from state to state. Yet where firearms are concerned, diversities cannot be protected unless the states have Federal assistance to prevent their laws from being circumvented. This is the essence, the basic thrust, of the legislation before Congress. Under this legislation:

There will be no Federal restrictions on purchasing a gun in one's own state for a person who complies with state and local law, is of the proper age (18 for long guns, 21 for others), and is not a convicted felon, or currently under indictment, or a fugitive from justice. Purchase of rifles and shotguns can be made by nonresidents in person from dealers in other states, and the arms can be shipped home, if the transaction and the delivery comply with the laws of both places. Other purchases of rifles and shotguns, and all purchases of hand guns originating out of state, can be made from or through dealers in one's own state, just as a local purchase is made.

This in sum is the bill. It sets only two national, and unobjectionable, standards for the purchase of guns. It sets no standards for the use of guns. The standards of this bill prevent criminals and juveniles from buying guns from licensed dealers. The rest is up to the states. They can, for example, make their own rules on the use of guns by juveniles. They can make whatever other rules they want regarding the purchase of weapons and they can promulgate these rules secure in the knowledge that their laws cannot be eroded by less stringent laws in neighboring states.

What is the harm in this? It is true that the ads in the Rifleman will have to add the words "Order through your local dealer," and the out-of-state dealer will have to yield some of his profit to the local dealer, who relieves him of the state and Federal compliance obligations. If you want a handgun, you will have to buy it in your own state. If you want a rifle, you will have to buy it from a dealer in your own state, or buy it in person in another state. I venture to say that the bulk of your purchases already comply with those rules.

So the question before us is a simple one.

Are the possible minor inconveniences too great for the sportsman to bear if they can prevent children, convicted felons, and the mentally ill from malingering away for guns whenever the spirit moves them? Are they too high a price to pay to keep surrounding states from depriving Massachusetts of the benefit of her own gun laws? Is it not worth these minor inconveniences if we can avoid one murder, one suicide, one accident, or ten, or a hundred, or a thousand?

The American public does not feel that gun control laws are too great an inconvenience, or that they will exact too high a price in restrictions for the law-abiding citizen to pay. The American public feels that whatever minor disruptions gun users will experience should not override the benefits that gun control legislation will bring to the people as a whole.

In a poll conducted by the Gallup Organization this past January, we can find some measure of the public view:

73 per cent of those polled favored a law which would require the registration of a rifle or a shotgun.

85 per cent favored a law requiring registration of pistols.

75 percent favored doing away with all mail order buying of guns.

84 per cent felt there should be restrictions on who is allowed to buy a gun.

Only 12 per cent, less than one-eighth of those polled, believed that anyone who wants a gun should be allowed to buy one with no questions asked.

In the face of this expression of public opinion, an opinion that clearly states that the American people want even more protection than we find in the current proposal before Congress, we must act, and we will act.

And I believe that your organization, confronted with the case, the statistics, and the public outcry, must also act—but act positively. The National Rifle Association has a history of opposition to gun control legislation. But there have been occasions when you have shown a recognition that there can be forthright and constructive proposals for weapons control.

In a statement of policy in the September 1966 issue of the Rifleman, you said, "The NRA strongly supports ownership controls directed at those individuals who, as a class, should not possess firearms—convicted felons, drug addicts, habitual drunkards, mental incompetents, and unsupervised juveniles." I could not have stated my goal, and the ultimate goal of S. 1, more distinctly. Moreover, as shown by the Association's testimony before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee as the 89th Congress, you agree that, "Controls on the interstate shipment of firearms are definitely needed."

And I am pleased to remind the Association that in 1963 the Board of Directors of the NRA supported that year's firearms control legislation, and an NRA official testified in favor of it. I might add that the proposal, numbered S. 1975, might in certain respects be considered more onerous and more inconvenient for the purchasers of weapons than this year's bill. The 1963 bill called for the filing of a sworn and notarized affidavit for every interstate mail order purchase. It required a copy of that affidavit to go to the police chief in the buyer's home town, regardless of whether that jurisdiction required registration.

I think that this year's proposal is more effective, more efficient, and in some ways less burdensome for the legitimate sportsman or collector. Yet, despite your support of the 1963 bill, and despite the existence of a reasonable proposal today, the NRA has called instead for a three-point legislative program taking an entirely different approach from the one developed by experts from the Executive and legislative branches after years of painstaking efforts. I must say that I wonder whether you think your proposals would meet the goal you yourselves have put

forth, the goal of keeping guns away from those who should not have them. I am sure that you have heard from many who are experts, about the problems with your proposals, so I will deal with them very briefly.

The first NRA proposal would make most local crimes of violence involving firearms into Federal crimes with mandatory minimum sentences. Would this measure keep a weapon out of the hands of any criminal, any child, any alcoholic, addict, or incompetent? Of course not. Would it deter a criminal who is not deterred by the severe state penalties for murder, for assault with a deadly weapon, or for armed robbery? Of course not. What it would do would be to make vast numbers of local offenses into Federal offenses. It would require a national police force if it were to be enforced. And it would intrude the Federal Government into the proper police function of the states, cities, and local communities.

Your second proposal is for a statute which would merely prohibit shipment of a firearm to anyone who could not legally receive it in his own state. Even putting aside a serious problem of wording, this measure could not possibly be effective, for it does not provide machinery, such as that in the 1963 bill, for the shipper to determine whether the buyer is in fact eligible to receive a firearm. Nor does it prevent an ineligible purchaser from merely going across a border into the next state to buy a gun which he could not buy in his own state. Thus the proposal would be nearly impossible to enforce and ineffective even if enforceable.

Your third proposal, dealing with "destructive devices," differs only on technical points with the related provisions of the Administration proposal, and I believe that the prior differences have been compromised very much in your favor. It is fine as far as it goes, and should be part of any Federal legislation. But this measure does not even attempt to address the central problems of weapons transactions dealt with both by S. 1 and the 1963 bill.

If you had come up with an effective alternative to the approach of S. 1, we would now be considering it. But I don't believe you have. And the American people, and their representatives in Congress, are, therefore, considering S. 1.

The bill before us is not a panacea. It will not prevent all crime, all suicides, or all gun accidents. But after many years of study it is the best measure anyone has devised. There has been too much delay already. The American people do not want to wait any longer, and neither does Congress.

Yet it is not too late for you to assume a new role of cooperation, a role consistent with the public-spirited attitudes which marked the founding of your organization. Throughout the nation's history, there have been other times when groups striving for what they considered to be right, strongly opposed legislation later enacted. But it is also true in our history that the forces that unite us have been stronger than those which divide us. And from this strength has come some of our most important legislation. The labor laws, Social Security laws, civil rights laws, and Medicare were vehemently opposed by some people, yet they were passed, implemented, and now benefit millions upon millions of Americans.

Now it is up to you. Millions of Americans want the benefits of S. 1. If it is passed, you are the ones who will have to bear some slight inconvenience to pursue your hobbies. Is this not a reasonable burden to bear in the public interest? Is this not the true meaning of patriotism and love of country? You are riflemen and pistol shooters and collectors and competitors and hunters, of course. *But you are citizens first*, and if your fellow citizens ask you to make these minor concessions, *can you really refuse?*

I do not think you can. I do not think you want to. I believe that no one has a greater interest in the reduction of illegitimate and harmful uses of firearms than you who seek protection of legitimate and safe uses. Our mutual interests and our common purposes should enable us to work together to enact appropriate firearms legislation.

I am hopeful that perhaps even in the few days remaining of this annual meeting you will have an opportunity to consider ways you can foster a new spirit of constructive cooperation, in the name of progress and the national welfare.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 4, 1967]

IN THE LIONS' LAIR

Unarmed save with the armor of reason and conviction, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy appeared on Sunday at his own request before assembled officials of the National Rifle Association at their annual meeting and told them some of the facts of life about gun casualties. He had sought to address the NRA membership in an open session; but the Association did not choose to run that sort of risk.

"In this decade," the Senator told his audience, "the number of Americans killed by firearms at home is many times the number of boys we have lost in Vietnam. In 1965 alone, 5600 murders, 34,700 assaults, and most of the 68,400 armed robberies were committed with guns." As though to lend point and poignancy to these stark statistics, a UPI story from New York on Monday reports that "Marine Sgt. Michael Kroll, a Vietnam veteran from New York who was decorated for heroism in battle, was shot and killed today when he attempted to break up a brawl in Greenwich Village. Kroll, who held the Purple Heart, was slain by a single blast from a shotgun fired point-blank into his face."

After outlining the reasonable and moderate terms of the current Administration firearms control legislation, Senator Kennedy put the issue squarely to the NRA officers: "Now it is up to you," he said. "Millions of Americans want the benefits of S. 1. If it is passed, you are the ones who will have to bear some slight inconvenience to pursue your hobbies. Is this not a reasonable burden to bear in the public interest? Is this not the true meaning of patriotism and love of country? You are riflemen and pistol shooters and collectors and competitors and hunters, of course. *But you are citizens first*, and if your fellow-citizens ask you to make these minor concessions, *can you really refuse?*"

The question is not merely rhetorical. It awaits an answer.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1967]

GUN CONTROL NEEDED

The leadership of the National Rifle Association showed something less than robust confidence in its position on gun control when it refused the other day to permit Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts to address the delegates to its annual convention. He was only allowed to speak to a closed meeting of the association's board of directors.

The sad truth is that although the N.R.A. presents itself as an organization of rank-and-file sportsmen, it is heavily dependent upon gun manufacturers and dealers for advertising revenue in its journal and is opposing anything that might interfere with their profitable business.

In his remarks, Senator Kennedy had much the better of the argument, which is not surprising since his case is irrefutable. He pointed out that in this decade the number of civilians killed by firearms at home is many times the number of soldiers killed in Vietnam. In 1965 alone, 5,600 murders, 34,000

assaults and most of the 68,000 armed robberies were committed with guns.

It is easy to argue that these crimes could have been carried out by other means. But advocates of gun-control legislation are making an effort to reduce the toll of death and suffering; they are not offering a panacea. Because a gun is easily concealed, readily available, and achieves its purpose immediately, it is the favorite weapon of the jealous lover, the excitable adolescent and the demented crank. No other weapon can make that claim.

The needless slaughter from misused guns makes it imperative to ban the sale of firearms through the malls and to require the registration of guns with the police. This would be no greater hardship for sportsmen than a driver's license is for automobile owners. We trust that Congress will enact gun-control legislation this year with or without the cooperation of the National Rifle Association.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 11, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 10 (legislative day of April 6), 1967:

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

William L. Porter, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1970 (reappointment).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Pete Holman, Titus, Ala., in place of W. C. Gantt, retired.

COLORADO

Beryl E. Lambert, Yuma, Colo., in place of H. L. Grauerholz, deceased.

HAWAII

Hon Chung Chee, Honolulu, Hawaii, in place of G. T. Hara, retired.

ILLINOIS

Floyd E. Garrett, Kinmundy, Ill., in place of R. R. Atkins, deceased.

Estle D. Rogers, Xenia, Ill., in place of N. G. Lee, retired.

IOWA

Opal A. Bonyng, Lester, Iowa, in place of C. G. Bigelow, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Frank Leone, Oakland, N.J., in place of H. J. Bowitz, deceased.

NEW YORK

Gerald J. Mulderig, Medford Station, N.Y., in place of J. F. Schleyer, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert W. Anthony, Altoona, Pa., in place of Bruce Crumm, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Luz Piazza, Adjuntas, P.R., in place of Angel Ramirez, deceased.

TEXAS

Joyce L. Beasley, Enochs, Tex., in place of M. B. Robinson, retired.

WASHINGTON

Helen M. Scott, Langley, Wash., in place of A. W. Graham, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 10 (legislative day of April 6), 1967:

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Endicott Peabody, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be generals

Gen. Paul Lamar Freeman, Jr., **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Daniel H. Daley, to be a permanent professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, and ending Donald L. Wasson, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on March 20, 1967; and

The nominations beginning Peter B. Carter, to be a permanent professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, and ending Peter R. Zook, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 23, 1967.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning George L. Darley, to be colonel, and ending Kenneth A. Zych, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 23, 1967.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Strasburg High School Basketball Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1967

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon, March 18, the Strasburg High School basketball team won the Ohio high school class A basketball championship in St. John Arena, Columbus. Ending the year with a record of 27 wins and no losses, Strasburg became the only high school team in the State to go through the season undefeated. I should like to add my congratulations to the many which have already been received by the members of this outstanding team and their coach, Charles Huggins.

Fuzz Phrase Computer (Mark II)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I made disclosure of the existence of a device known as the Fuzz Phrase Computer. My statement at that time is reproduced at the conclusion of these remarks. Subsequently it was brought to my attention that the computer was earlier stolen by someone from the Canadian Defense Department and published at a prior date in Canada. Upon investigation, I find simply that the Canadians stole it from the Pentagon before I did and then were careless enough to let it be stolen from them. Obviously a device such as this only could spring

from the minds of American whiz-kids. In the intervening weeks thereafter I was able to steal from the Pentagon its improved version of the Fuzz Phrase Computer designated Mark II. The Mark II, reproduced here as a table, differs from the Mark I by the addition of an entire new column, column D, and therefore requires use of a random four-digit rather than three-digit number.

PENTAGON SECRET SPILLED

"Total Reciprocal Mobility?"—"Synchronized Digital Projection?"—"Systematized Third-Generation Programming?"—"Parallel Reciprocal Options?"

Since Robert S. McNamara, his computers and his whiz-kids commandeered the Pentagon in 1961 the public has been bombarded with speeches, statements and press releases replete with such unintelligible gobbledegook which reveals little of what goes on there.

Foreign secret agents have the skill, training and electronic snooping devices to get around these semantic land mines and search for hard intelligence. Just plain domestic patriots do not. John Q. Taxpayer wonders