insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees and additional life insurance for retired Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8465. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8466. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the immediate retirement of Federal civilian personnel on oceangoing vessels upon separation from the service after attaining 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 8467. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to improve and expand the authority to conduct or assist research relating to air pollutants, to assist in the establishment of regional air quality commissions, to authorize establishment of standards applicable to emissions from establishments engaged in certain types of industry, to assist in establishment and maintenance of State programs for annual inspections of automobile emission control devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 8468. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a program of restoration and development of migratory waterfowl habitat in the Middle Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., in furtherance of the purposes of the Migratory Bird Treaties with Canada and Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 8469. A bill to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 8470. A bill to provide for a study of the feasibility of the establishment of a quasi-public corporation for oceanographic research and development; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 8471. A bill to reduce crime and improve criminal procedures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8472. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase to $30,000 the maximum servicemen's group life insurance which may be provided members of the uniformed services on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 8473. A bill to provide for an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8474. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the excused absence from duty, without loss of pay or reduction in annual or sick leave, of Federal employees in areas covered by official warnings of imminent danger of hurricanes or other inherently dangerous weather conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.J. Res. 500. Joint resolution to designate the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.J. Res. 501. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the third week in May of each year as National Credit Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 503. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 429. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of attempts to interfere with free competition in the sale of certain insurance coverage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANNA:

H. Res. 430. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of attempts to interfere with free competition in the sale of certain insurance coverage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Res. 431. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Res. 432. Resolution to print as a House document the eulogy proceedings on the late Christian Archibald Herter; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 433. Resolution extending the greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives to the citizens of Bethlehem, Pa., on the occasion of its dual anniversaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 8475. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Sciortino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 8476. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Alfred Sevenski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 8477. A bill for the relief of Gregorios Cantaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8478. A bill for the relief of Genovefa Coulafakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8479. A bill for the relief of Joeck Kuncek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 8480. A bill for the relief of Bock Corp. of Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 8481. A bill for the relief of Richard Belk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 8482. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Union, Jackson, and Winn Parishes, La.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 8483. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Czeslawa Niewiarowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8484. A bill for the relief of Carmela Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 8485. A bill for the relief of Eddie Garman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

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

O God, our Father—for this sacramental moment, closing the doors to a noisy world full of terror and alarm, we enter this pavilion of quietness and peace, to acknowledge our utter dependence upon Thee—Thou who hast made us in Thy image.

Forgive us for smug satisfaction with ourselves and for our cynical contempt of others. Purge our minds of prejudices out of which we make walls separating us from our fellow man. Cleanse our hearts of the uncleanness which blinds our eyes to the splendor of spiritual verities.

As work, and worry, and hopes deferred take their constant toll of our human strength, grant us as laborers together with Thee a sense of untapped spiritual resources and restore our souls with the joyous strength of Thy salvation.

As here we face the questions which confront us, and almost confound us, give us to know clearly the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of the world in righteousness and justice.

"That we may tell our sons who see the light
High in the heavens, their heritage to take,
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
I saw the morning break."

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

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BAKER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 11, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 11, 1967,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The Secretary of the Senate, on April 11, 1967, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled 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, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 11, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 2512) for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 2512) for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HATFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], is to be recognized before 11:30 if the morning business is concluded prior to that time, or, if not, at 11:30. Is my understanding correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's understanding is correct.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Improvements in the Judiciary Committee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

On request of Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, TEST, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, test, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 14 OF NATURAL GAS ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT, TO REQUIRE A CERTIFICATE IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act to require a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the acquisition of a controlling interest, through the ownership of securities or in any other manner, of any person engaged in the transportation of natural gas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO IMPROVE AND EXTEND THE ENFORCEMENT OF DUTIES OF SUPPORT (71 STAT. 285, D.C. CODE 30–308)

A letter from the president, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the act approved July 10, 1957, to improve and extend through reciprocal legislation the enforcement of duties of support (71 Stat. 285, D.C. Code 30–308) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on excess military assistance ammunition and weapons in Turkey (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 secret report on materiel readiness of Hawk missile systems in the 32d Artillery Brigade of the 7th U.S. Army in Germany (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANPOWER ACT OF 1967

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve intergovernmental cooperation and grant-in-aid program administration; to assist State and local governments in strengthening their staffs by improving personnel administration and extending merit principles and by providing support for training of public employees; to permit temporary assignments of personnel between Federal and State and local governments; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF DIVISION OF COAL MINE INSPECTION, BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 41 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1917

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the provisions of section 41 of the act of March 2, 1917, as amended, relating to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION OF CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS

A letter from the Speaker, House of Commons, Canada, expressing the appreciation of that House, for the enactment of the concurrent resolution extending the congratulations of the Congress on the occasion of the Centennial of Canadian Confederation; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES,
Ottawa, Canada, March 28, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My colleagues in the Canadian House of Commons have requested me, on their behalf, to write to you and convey through your kind offices to all members of the United States Senate, their

deepest appreciation for the Concurrent Resolution adopted on March 21st last. This Resolution, extending the congratulations of the United States Congress on the occasion of the Centennial of Canadian Confederation was received with warmth and gratitude by all Members of the House of Commons, characterizing as it did the closest friendship and affection that is always present in relations between our two countries.

Equally appreciated by our Members were the thoughtful remarks made by Senator George Aiken in introducing the Resolution. As a charter member of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, Senator Aiken has won the friendship and affection of all Canadians who have participated in our annual visits. We look forward with much pleasure to welcoming him to Canada once again as a Co-Chairman of our Tenth Meeting in a few weeks' time and expressing our gratitude to him in a more personal way.

I am, my dear Mr. President,

Sincerely yours,

LUCIEN LAMOUREUX,
Speaker.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas, the United States of America exercises administrative control of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands under the terms and provisions of the Japan-American peace treaty of World War II; and

"Whereas, there appears to be growing political unrest in the Ryukyu Islands and other areas of the Far East because of the military commitment of the United States in the Far East; and

"Whereas, such political unrest may be prevented through improved diplomatic, economic and social relations between the United States and the governments of the countries of the Far East, and specifically with the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; and

"Whereas, the United States has been providing economic assistance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands under the Price Act (PL–86–629), as amended; and

"Whereas, there has been a long standing ceiling of $12 million on the amount of economic assistance which could be rendered to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands under the Price Act; and

"Whereas, there exists a Long-Range Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the Ryukyu Islands jointly developed by the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and arm of the United States Government, and the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; and

"Whereas, increased American economic aid is urgently needed now to assist in the economic, educational and social growth of the Ryukyu Islands as provided in the Long-Range Plan for the Economic and Social Development of Ryukyus; and

"Whereas, Chief Executive Seiho Matsuoka of the Ryukyu Islands is speeding to Washington, D.C., to officially request the Congress of the United States to amend the Price Act to provide for increased United States economic aid to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, the Senate concurring, that the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to amend the Price Act (PL–86–629), as amended, to provide for increased economic assistance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands, thereby enhancing the economic, educational and social growth of the people of these islands; and

"Be it further resolved that certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Senator Hiram L. Fong, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga and Congresswoman Patsy T. Mink."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Assembly joint resolution—Urging an early military victory in Vietnam

"WHEREAS, The air, ground and naval power of the Armed Forces of the United States are wreaking havoc on the enemy in Vietnam by disrupting communications, transportation and industry; and

"WHEREAS, Successful military operations cannot be carried out by imposing artificial political restraints on the military commanders of such operations; and

"WHEREAS, There is a widespread political and psychological campaign in the United States and other parts of the world for the Government of the United States to renounce military victory in favor of the dubious values to be gained at the negotiating table; and

"WHEREAS, There is reason to believe that the premature negotiation of a cease-fire in the Korean War has led to the loss of strategic political and military position in Asia; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the legislature of the State of Nevada urges the Government of the United States of America to prosecute the Vietnam conflict with every conventional military means at its disposal, in order to bring the conflict to a successful military conclusion as early as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted by the legislative counsel to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the members of the Nevada congressional delegation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"S.F. No. 783

"A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to the States a portion of the income taxes collected in each such State

"Whereas, the federal income tax is imposed upon the salaries and wages of employees of the states and local governments, and, therefore, require the states and local governments to increase employees salaries in an amount sufficient to permit their employees to pay such federal income tax, which increase is actually obtained by levying increased taxes at the state and local level; and

"Whereas, the federal government is not permitted to levy taxes directly against any state or local government and the principles of good government should not permit the federal government to indirectly levy taxes upon the operation of state or loval government and thereby increase their costs; and

"Whereas, there are expanded demands in health, welfare, education, transportation, air pollution, water pollution, crime prevention, highway safety, and other areas; and

"Whereas, services in these areas are in the jurisdiction and concern of the states and can be rendered more efficiently, economically and expeditiously by state government and its political subdivisions; and

"Whereas, many federal grant-in-aid programs which require matching funds to be provided by the states tend to restrict the states in their efforts to develop budgets which are consonant with the needs of the states; and

"Whereas, limitation of tax sources seriously handicaps the states in properly carrying forward its function in these areas; and

"Whereas, the present federal income taxes seriously inhibit the imposition of additional taxes by state governments and the political subdivisions; and

"Whereas, the federal government could, without adversely affecting the economic or military power of the United States, contribute some share of the revenues derived from the taxation of income toward enabling the several states to meet their responsibilities to their citizens; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that the Congress of the United States be requested to enact legislation providing that the several District Directors of the Internal Revenue Service remit to each of the several states on or before October 1 of each year, five percent of the total of all income taxes paid by the individuals domiciled in each of the several states, for the fiscal year ended June 30 next preceding; that the total of income taxes paid by individuals in any year ending on June 30 shall be the total income taxes collected from individuals in such fiscal year less refunds of income taxes made to individuals; and that no restrictions, with respect to the disposition of the amounts so remitted, be imposed by the Congress of the United States upon the several states; and

"Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State furnish copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to all members of the Minnesota Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 59

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income tax law to permit a deduction for State income tax paid from the amount of income tax due the Federal Government

"Whereas, the federal income tax law permits the deduction of state income taxes paid in arriving at net taxable income; and

"Whereas, it has been advocated that the federal government establish a system of returning to the states a portion of the federal taxes; and

"Whereas, it is believed that the most equitable way of returning to the states taxes otherwise accruing to the federal government would be to permit the taxpayers to deduct the amount of their state income tax from the amount of taxes due the federal government, Now, therefore

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein:

"That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to amend the federal income tax law to permit a taxpayer to deduct from the amount of federal income taxes due the amount of any state income taxes paid by such taxpayer.

"Be it further resolved that upon adoption hereof a copy of this Resolution shall be furnished, by the Secretary of State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Arkansas Congressional Delegation."

A resolution of the General Court of the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE MONTHLY PAYMENTS UNDER THE FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO $200

"Whereas, The cost of the necessities of life in this country has risen to an all time high; and

"Whereas, A substantial portion of the people of this nation depend to a large extent if not entirely upon the monthly payments received by them under the Social Security program; and

"Whereas, The current monthly payments under said program have now become grossly inadequate for their needs; and

"Whereas, An increase of such maximum payments to two hundred dollars per month would tend to relieve such conditions; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the maximum monthly payments to persons under the federal Social Security Act to two hundred dollars; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, March 21, 1967.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 23, 1967.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
"Clerk.

"[SEAL]
"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE MEMORIAL NO. 3

"A memorial relating to the Enabling Act and urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Enabling Act to permit each township to allocate four additional sections of land for common school, high school and junior college purposes

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Section 24 of the Enabling Act, which enabled the people of the Territory of Arizona to form a Constitution and State Government, provides in part "That in addition to sections sixteen and thirty-six heretofore reserved for the Territory of Arizona, sections two and thirty-two in every township in said proposed State not otherwise appropriated at the date of the passage of this Act are hereby granted to said State for the support of common schools; * * *."

"During the past half-century the State of Arizona has grown at a rapid rate and its problems relating to education have grown proportionately. The allocation of four sections of land in each township for common school education, although adequate at the commencement of Statehood, is at this time inadequate.

"With the influx of population and the commensurate requirements of education, the need for additional land for common schools, high schools and junior colleges becomes a necessity.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States of America enact legislation amending section 24 of the Enabling Act of June 20, 1910, for the purpose of permitting the State of Arizona to allocate an additional four sections of land in each township, or if unavailable the selection of other lands in lieu thereof, for common school, high school and junior college purposes.

"2. That the Secretary of State of Arizona is directed to transmit a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Arizona Congressional delegation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1012

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide Federal financial assistance for domestic gold producers

"Whereas, Since 1934, domestic gold producers have been required to sell their product only to the federal government at the established price of thirty-five dollars per ounce; and

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

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

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

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

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

"Whereas, Such legislation to stimulate domestic gold production is definitely in the national interest; now, therefore,

"Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

"That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact necessary legislation to provide federal financial assistance payments to domestic gold producers, in order to aid in stabilizing the few existing United States gold properties, to reopen dormant gold mines, and to encourage aggressive exploration for new gold ore reserves in this country; and

"Be It Further Resolved, That a copy of this Memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the members of the Congress from the State of Colorado.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"HENRY C. KIMBROUGH,
"Chief Clerk of the House, of Representatives.

"MARK A. HOGAN,
"President of the Senate.

"COMFORT W. SHAW,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1011

"(A joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide Federal financial assistance for domestic lead and zinc producers)

"Whereas, The development and utilization of Colorado's abundant mineral resources has always been and must continue to be one of the major components of the state's economic structure, providing not only a source of employment and income, but also a sound base for tax revenues and a substantial market outlet of agricultural and manufactured products in mining areas; and

"Whereas, This basic and essential mining industry has for many years been struggling under adverse economic conditions so severe that many major metal mining enterprises in the state, involving the production of antimony, tungsten, cobalt, mercury and other strategic metals, as well as most of our small lead and zinc producers, have been forced out of business, and even our large, nationally-important lead and zinc mines were reduced to the status of marginal operations prior to the 1965–1966 period of improved business conditions; and

"Whereas, This serious predicament of our mining industry is directly attributable to policies of the federal government which and exploitation of foreign mineral re· encourage and stimulate the development sources, and, through tariff concessions, permit the resultant low-cost foreign production relatively free access to United States markets; and

"Whereas, These policies, if continued, will not only threaten the economic survival of Colorado's metal mining industry, but will also impose a serious handicap on our nation's capacity to provide from domestic sources the basic requirements for national defense; and

"Whereas, The executive department of the federal government and both major political parties, as well as the Conference of Western Governors, as officially recognized the necessity for mainining a domestic mining industry that is sufficiently vigorous and proficient to assure a minerals mobilization base adequate to national preparedness and security; and

"Whereas, Past efforts by the federal government to alleviate the depressed conditions which prevail in various segments of the domestic mining industry by means of short-range programs and temporary expedients, such as stockpiling, subsidies, and inflexible quota limitations, have not only proven ineffective and inadequate but have also resulted in the accumulation of substantial government stockpiles of some metals, including lead and zinc; and

"Whereas, Some of these stockpiles, including lead and zinc, now loom as an additional market threat to producers, because, under revised government stockpile objectives, they have been declared to be excessive and it is the intent and purpose of the responsible executive officials to dispose of the surpluses through market channels to obtain funds for use in balancing the national budget, contrary to all legislative intent; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate Concurring herein That this General Assembly respectfully urges the Congress of the United States and the executive department of the federal government to formulate and put into effect with all deliberate haste a national minerals policy that will assure the preservation of a sound and stable domestic mining industry by reserving to domestic producers a fair and equitable share of domestic metal markets.

"We recommend that the implementation of this policy include as a minimum:

"1. Retention of Congressional control over national stockpiles so as to minimize, if not completely avoid, the adverse market impact of surplus disposal.

"2. Provision for adequate limitations on ore and metal imports when required, with import quotas to be applied when metal stocks of domestic producers exceed normal inventories needed to service domestic consumers, and the stabilization of these inventories at reasonable levels, thereby encouraging the maintenance of a strong and healthy mining industry.

"3. Provision for effective enforcement of anti-dumping and countervailing duty rules and regulations; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this Memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"HENRY C. KIMBROUGH,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"MARK A. HOGAN,
"President of the Senate.
"COMFORT W. SHAW,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, Your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas, The principles of a democratic society include the right of people to cooperate and organize for promotion of their common interests; and

"Whereas, There is an increasing concern for the civil and political rights of all citizens of the country; and

"Whereas, The Indians of our republic have for many years been subjected to the control and direction of government agencies with a minimum of representation by the general members of the various tribes; and

"Whereas, It is essential that members of the various tribes have access to their tribal rolls and mailing lists in order to communicate and promote more readily political and social programs for the benefit of Indians; and

"Whereas, In order that all enrolled members of Indian tribes have the right to vote, it is necessary that provision be made by Congress that the secret ballot and absentee voting be required in Indian tribal elections;

"Now, therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress enact legislation making the tribal rolls and mailing lists of the various tribes available to the enrolled members of the particular tribe; be it

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the Senate March 14, 1967.
"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"President of the Senate.
"Passed the House March 17, 1967.
"DON ELDRIDGE,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1010

"(A joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact laws necessary to implement and execute the oil shale development program of the Department of the Interior)

"Whereas, On January 27, 1967, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States announced a five-point action program to promote economic recovery of shale oil and associated minerals from the rich oil shale resources of the Green River Formation in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah; and

"Whereas, The welfare of the nation requires that this vast dormant energy reserve be developed to contribute to the energy and raw material demands of the United States; and

"Whereas, The well-being of the people of the State of Colorado and the economy of many communities and counties in the State will be directly and substantially affected by development of the oil shale reserves of this State; and

"Whereas, Many technological, legal, and economic problems remain to be resolved between the date of the announced development policy and its fruition; and

"Whereas, The development of oil shale reserves will be expedited by cooperation between the United States government, local government, and private industry; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

"1. That this General Assembly petitions the members of Congress of the United States to enact promptly such laws as will promote and enable the immediate and orderly development of the oil shale reserves of the Green River Formation, including specifically the leasing of the reserves and the change of the point of application for purposes of depletion under the federal tax laws;

"2. That this General Assembly commends the Secretary of the Interior of the United States for the announced action program of the Department of the Interior to promote the development of the oil shale reserves of the Green River Formation;

"3. That this General Assembly petitions the Department of the Interior to adopt promptly such regulations as may be necessary to permit the orderly and equitable leasing of the said oil shale reserves and to clarify the existing oil imports quotas rules so as not to discriminate against oil shale producers; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this Memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the members of Congress from the State of Colorado, the Chairmen of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"HENRY C. KIMBROUGH,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"MARK A. HOGAN,
"President of the Senate.
"COMFORT W. SHAW,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A law enacted by the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H.B. 22.

"An act ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, relating to succession to the presidency and vice presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Whereas, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), propose the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, to become valid as part of the said Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several states, in words as follows, to-wit:

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following Article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"' "ARTICLE

"' "SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"' "SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"' "SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"' "SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"' "Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as the Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.' ': Now, therefore,

"The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

"'SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the

United States of America set out in the preamble to this Act be, and the same is, hereby ratified by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina.

"'SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and Act be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"'SEC. 3. That this Act shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.'

"In the General Assembly read three times and ratified, this the 22nd day of March, 1967.

"ROBERT W. SCOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"D. M. BRITT,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"Examined and found correct,
"HUGH L. MERRITT,
"For Committee."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 6

"A memorial urging the Congress of the United States to oppose the Dodd bill or any other Federal legislation relating to regulation and registration of mail order firearms sales

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas, since the unfortunate and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy, considerable impetus has occurred for the passage of the Dodd Bill relating to regulation and registration of mail order firearms sales; and

"Whereas, the Dodd Bill (S. 1), if enacted, will prohibit citizens from purchasing firearms by mail, and give the United States Treasury Department such broad regulatory powers it could subject such citizens to police investigation and harassment and lead to registration of said firearms; and

"Whereas, such requirements will cause an inconvenience, and an undue burden on, law abiding people of this Country, particularly in rural areas, and such legislation will open the door for the Treasury Department to regulate who may buy firearms; and

"Whereas, the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States and Article 2, Section 26 of the Constitution of the State of Arizona guarantee to its citizens the right to keep and bear arms, and the Dodd Bill, if enacted, will be in direct violation of such guaranteed rights; and

"Whereas, responsible organizations such as the National Rifle Association, National Wildlife Federation and others have no objection to workable laws that will prevent the misuse of firearms by increasing penalties for crimes committed with firearms; and

"Whereas, responsible organizations, such as the National Rifle Association, National Wildlife Federation and others, strongly urge laws to prohibit the sale by the Federal government and distribution to the public of military ordnance, such as bombs, handgrenades, bazookas and all types of crewserved machine guns; and

"Whereas, the Dodd Bill, if enacted, will seriously hamper small industries that build fine custom rifles for mail order trade throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas, any restrictive legislation should be directed to merely requiring that shipments of firearms in interstate commerce be made in compliance with the laws of the State of destination; and

"Whereas, since practically all States have laws regulating sale of firearms to juveniles, convicted felons, and incompetents and against carrying concealed weapons, and since there are already Federal laws which make it a crime for a convicted felon to transport firearms across State lines, no Federal law for regulation and registration of mail order sales of firearms is necessary.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States take positive action leading to the defeat of the Dodd Bill (S 1).

"2. That the Congress of the United States carefully examine and oppose any other Federal legislation relating to registration and regulation of firearms which restricts the rights of law abiding citizens and usurps the police power of the States to control firearms, and that it urge the State Department to exercise more control under the Munitions Control Act of imports of cheap foreign pistols and military surplus.

"3. That the Honorable Wesley Bolin, Secretary of State of the State of Arizona, is directed to transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Arizona Congressional delegation.

"Passed the Senate March 8, 1967 by the following vote: 28 Ayes, 1 Nay, 1 Not Voting.

"Approved by the Governor, March 9, 1967.

"Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, March 9, 1967."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency; disability of the President

"Whereas the Eighty-ninth Congress of the United States of America in both houses by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency; disability of the President.

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"'"SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"'"SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"'"SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"'"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."

"'Be it resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, both Houses thereof concurring, That (1) The proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America as herein shown be and the same is hereby ratified; (2) Duly authenticated copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.'

"_____ _____,
"President and Presiding Officer of the Senate.
"_____ _____,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"Resolution memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States for issuance of a commemorative postage stamp

"Whereas, Phoebe Apperson Hearst was a great American woman humanitarian and philanthropist who is noted as the cofounder of the Parent Teachers Association and the organizer of the Travelers Aid Society and as being instrumental in the restoring of Mount Vernon; and

"Whereas, by her generosity and consciousness of the tremendous requirements of education today, Mrs. Hearst gave millions of dollars to education and has properly become known as the greatest single benefactor of the University of California; and

"Whereas, it is only fitting and proper that recognition in the form of a commemorative postage stamp be given to Phoebe Apperson Hearst for her multitudinous projects and activities;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring therein that the General Assembly of the State of Missouri memorialize the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring Phoebe Apperson Hearst; and

"Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Missouri in the Congress of the United States.

"Offered by Senator Owens.

"JOSEPH A. BAUER,
"Secretary of the Senate,
"Seventy-fourth General Assembly."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1967-EX. 30

"Whereas, The Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate adopted on September 9, 1963, a resolution requesting the board of engineers for rivers and harbors to review the report of the chief of engineers on the Columbia River and tributaries, published as House Document No. 403, 76th Congress, 2nd session; and

"Whereas, The above-mentioned resolution requests the corps of engineers to determine whether the extension of navigation from the pool of McNary Dam through Rock Island Dam on the Columbia River, Washington is feasible; and

"Whereas, The proposed extension of navigation on the upper Columbia River above McNary pool is essential to the economic and industrial growth and prosperity of the immediate area affected and to the Pacific Northwest in general, and to the full and comprehensive development of our water resources; and

"Whereas, This extension would have great benefit in providing a comprehensive system of transportation where all forms of transport are available to the shipping public for the movement of its commodities;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, By the Senate of the Washington State Legislature, that it support extension of navigation on the upper Columbia River as an important link in providing the state with full and complete transportation service.

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 67-59

"Whereas, The Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate adopted on September 9, 1963, a resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Columbia River and tributaries, published as House Document No. 403, 76th Congress, 2nd Session; and

"Whereas, The above-mentioned resolution requests the Corps of Engineers to determine whether the extension of navigation from the pool of McNary Dam through Rock Island Dam on the Columbia River, Washington is feasible; and

"Whereas, The proposed extension of navigation on the upper Columbia River above McNary pool is essential to the economic and industrial growth and prosperity of the immediate area affected and to the Pacific Northwest in general, and to the full and comprehensive development of our water resources; and

"Whereas, This extension would have great benefit in providing a comprehensive system of transportation where all forms of transport are available to the shipping public for the movement of its commodities;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, By the House of Representatives, That we do hereby support the extension of navigation on the upper Columbia River as an important link in providing the state with full and complete transportation service;

"And be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"MALCOLM MCBEATH,
"Chief Clerk,
"House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Works:

"H.P. 1080

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress recommending full development of electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper Saint John River

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the One Hundred and Third Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your Honorable Body as follows:

" 'Whereas, the people of Maine throughout the years have supported the concept of developing Passamaquoddy Bay for electric power purposes as indicated by a great number of favorable and sometimes unanimous Acts of the State Legislature, and earlier by a state-wide referendum that favored Quoddy by nearly ten to one; and

" 'Whereas, the need for vast quantities of reasonably priced power to satisfy the future needs of Maine, the Northeastern States and the Eastern Provinces of Canada has been established without question; and

" 'Whereas, development of electric power from the Upper Saint John River and Passamaquoddy Bay can be very valuable as peaking power and for base load power; and

" 'Whereas, other substantial benefits such as increased numbers of tourists, increased recreational uses of the Bay and River, down stream power benefits on the Saint John River, flood control benefits and much needed construction job opportunities in the site areas will result; and

" 'Whereas, the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties of Maine advocate the development of the electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper Saint John River, now therefore, be it

" 'Resolved: That the 103rd Legislature recommends the full development of the electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and such supplemental development of the electric power potential of the Upper Saint John River as may be recommended as economically feasible by studies now under way by the Department of the Interior without substantial destruction of the recreational and industrial advantages now recognized as existing in the Saint John River area, and that necessary interconnecting transmission facilities be provided between the projects and the load centers of the Northeast to provide the optimum benefits to the United States and Canada; and be it further

" 'Resolved: That this 103rd Legislature respectfully asks that required action be taken to start the projects at the earliest possible time in the most economic and practical sequence of development; and be it further

" 'Resolved: That a copy of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.'

"JERROLD B. SPEERS,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"BERTHA W. JOHNSON,
"Clerk, House of Representatives.
"[SEAL] JOSEPH T. EDGAR,
"Secretary of State."

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Lane County, Oreg., favoring appropriations for the port of Portland project and the port of Siuslaw project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Beltrami County Welfare Board, of Bemidji, Minn., relating to the extension and improvement of the Federal-State program of child welfare service; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., endorsing the recommendations on aviation law and space law; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and myself, I send to the desk a certified copy of a resolution from the Massachusetts House of Representatives memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to limit the quantity of cotton-rayon textile imports and to increase the tariffs thereon.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE SUCH ACTION AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO LIMIT THE QUANTITY OF COTTON-RAYON TEXTILE IMPORTS AND TO INCREASE THE TARIFFS THEREON

Whereas, In recent years there has been a tremendous increase in the quantity of cotton-rayon textile imports, which, if allowed to continue, will result in the unemployment of thousands of skilled workers; and

Whereas, This resulting unemployment will seriously affect the economy of the commonwealth; and

Whereas, The continued existence of the textile industry, with its thousands of skilled workers, will be of vital importance in maintaining the position of the United States in the world market during the years ahead; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to limit the quantity of cotton-rayon textile imports and to increase the tariffs thereon; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Commerce, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, February 27, 1967.

[SEAL] WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 965. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to enable Federal Reserve banks to invest in certain obligations of foreign governments (Rept. No. 163); and

S. 966. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current

economic conditions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 164).

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 714. A bill to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve system, and to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions (Rept. No. 165).

REPORT ENTITLED "CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 166)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I submit a report entitled "Criminal Laws and Procedures" pursuant to Senate Resolution 195, 89th Congress, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

REPORT ENTITLED "PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 167)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I submit a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," pursuant to Senate Resolution 201, 89th Congress, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

REPORT ENTITLED "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 168)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I submit a report entitled "Immigration and Naturalization" pursuant to Senate Resolution 196, 89th Congress, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

REPORT ENTITLED "DEVELOPMENTS IN AGING, 1966"— REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 169)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, pursuant to the requirement of Senate Resolution 189, adopted February 17, 1966, I submit a report from the Special Committee on Aging entitled "Developments in Aging, 1966." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate Special Committee on Aging today submitted to the Senate its latest report, "Developments in Aging, 1966." As chairman of that committee, I am taking this opportunity to make a few observations about the contents of the report and also to comment briefly on several of the statements made by Senators DIRKSEN, CARLSON, PROUTY, FONG, MILLER, MORTON, and HANSEN in their minority views.

First I would like to direct your attention to President Johnson's statement, given in his message about older Americans on January 23, that "one of the challenges of a great civilization is the compassion and respect shown to its elders."

Judging by that standard, the committee report this year has much encouraging news to give, but it must also report that far more must yet be done.

Its chapter on health reports that implementation of medicare has been surprisingly smooth, thanks to the "patient and tolerant understanding of the Nation's elderly, along with the active cooperation and participation of physicians, hospitals, home health agencies, and other interested persons." But the Subcommittee on Health warns once again, as it did in 1965, "that continued attention should be given to the maintenance of high standards in the certification of provider agencies," such as hospital and home health agencies.

This is a timely warning. As more older Americans seek medicare coverage, more demands may arise for lowering of standards to give instant service to greater numbers of individuals. But substandard institutions will never provide quality care, and too often our "emergency solutions" linger on and on as painful reminders of hasty shortsightedness.

The full committee has also put into its report the recommendations made by the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly in its report on December 30, 1966, in connection with "Detection and Prevention of Chronic Diseases Utilizing Multiphasic Health Screening Techniques." The subcommittee recommendations—calling for Federal legislation to establish a multiphasic screening program on a large-scale basis with eventual application on a national scale—are given in full. In my opinion, the subcommittee findings and recommendations provide splendid arguments for passage of S. 153, the Adult Health Protection Act of 1967, which I introduced on January 18.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, is planning several major inquiries within coming months. The subcommittee will have expert help in its planning. Dr. Austin B. Chinn, retiring this month as chief of the Adult Health Protection and Aging Branch of the Public Health Service, has agreed to give some of his time for consultation with the subcommittee this year.

The chapter on employment and retirement incomes reports on last year's steps toward the 1967 administration bill on age discrimination, and it also describes attempts to improve employment services for older workers. Work opportunities for men and women past 45—the so-called older workers—certainly deserve intensive study by the Congress, and I am happy to report that the subject will receive careful attention this year by more than one subcommittee in the Committee on Aging. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes, has already announced plans for an inquiry April 24 and 25 on whether new social security increases would again result automatically in reductions in old-age assistance and other retirement income. The subcommittee's deliberations should be of great assistance in congressional consideration of the administration program and other proposals to increase social security.

The chapter on housing for the elderly issues a timely observation on the demonstration, or model city program. I would like to read two paragraphs to pinpoint the areas of committee concern:

> It is too early to tell to what extent the interests of the urban elderly may be represented in the planning and execution of these demonstration programs. The subcommittee notes that in the Department's recently issued "Program Guide" no mention is made of the stake elderly residents of cities have in model neighborhood demonstrations or of measures to reflect the interests of this population group in such plans.

On the other hand, the President stated in a recent message to Congress:

> I am directing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make certain that the model cities program gives special attention to the needs of older people in poor housing and decaying neighborhoods.
>
> This is heartening reassurance. It is to be hoped that in urban areas where substantial numbers of elderly people make their homes a conscious effort will be made at all levels to realize the possibilities of this program for improvement of the housing and neighborhood environment of elderly urban residents of modest means.

Senator FRANK MOSS, chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, has informed me that he will give close attention to the model city program and also to the rent supplement program. He also intends to continue his study of retirement communities, probably in conjunction with the Subcommittee on Consumer Interests of the Elderly.

Mr. President, the chapter on services provided for older Americans reminds us once again that the Administration on Aging—created unanimously by Congress in 1965—has been given a critical role in the development of community-level programs for the elderly. Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal, State, and Community Services, is planning to conduct an intensive study into many service programs offered not only by the AOA but by other Federal agencies. His subcommittee can do a real service by putting proper perspective on philosophy and actions on service programs for aging and aged Americans.

A chapter on consumer interests of the elderly reports on gratifying efforts made by several Federal agencies. Much of the new activity was encouraged directly by the subcommittee created in 1963 to look into frauds and misrepresentation affecting the elderly. Now that the subcommittee has broadened its mission and is studying consumer problems

of special concern to older Americans, we can expect even more attention from Government agencies and private organizations. Our 1967 hearings, begun in January, will continue at the earliest possible date.

The entire committee will also continue its study of the war on poverty and its programs for the elderly. I am very pleased, of course, that Congress acted promptly on a major recommendation made by the committee last year—that the Office of Economic Opportunity establish a high-level position for a director of programs for older Americans. Miss Genevieve Blatt, named as the Assistant OEO Director in charge of directing programs for the elderly poor, will certainly be a vigorous and effective director. I am encouraged by her appointment, and I am encouraged by the affirmative statements made in our annual report by the OEO about intentions to broaden present efforts on behalf of the elderly. The full committee will, of course, maintain a direct interest in the progress of the OEO within this area, as well as the progress of other Federal agencies concerned in one way or another with the war on poverty.

Mr. President, I will not discuss other proposed studies within the committee this year, except to mention that a newly established Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual should do much to help us understand the present and future dimensions and nature of retirement as an institution. Senator MONDALE, who recommended establishment of the subcommittee will—I am sure—do effective work as the subcommittee chairman.

I would also like to point out that this year's committee report has, for the first time, reports from several Government agencies that are conducting programs or research projects related to aging. This appendix material should be invaluable to Government officials and private organizations concerned about the elderly.

Mr. President, I feel that a brief comment on the minority views submitted for the committee report may be in order.

Many observations are made in the report by our valued minority members on programs under active consideration by legislative committees, and I am sure that these committees will find the observations interesting and perhaps useful.

I think that the minority statements on increased social security benefits—although the financing is discussed only in very sketchy terms—will be particularly worthy of interest.

My major regret with respect to the minority views deals with the criticism of the Administration on Aging, created by the Older Americans Act of 1965. It is ironic that the minority report implies that the administration of the act may have cut back State efforts on behalf of their older citizens. Actually, 51 of the 55 States and Territories in our Nation have designated single agencies and given them responsibility for overall planning for their older citizens. Forty-four jurisdictions have approved plans under the Older American Act, and the AOA has funded more than 400 community projects.

On the whole, I think it can be demonstrated that the Older Americans Act has strengthened the position of State commissions on aging and other State agencies on aging. For example, as a direct stimulus of this legislation, new State commissions on aging in Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina, Vermont, and West Virginia have been formed for overall planning and stimulation of facilities, services, and opportunities. Most important, all States administering the Older Americans Act now have a basic financial resource to support a wide range of State and local programs to develop the best possible programs and opportunities for their older citizens.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report was submitted:

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

Executive C, 90th Congress, first session. A Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents (Ex. Rept. No. 6).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1490. A bill for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Margurita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1491. A bill for the relief of Henry D. Espy, James A. Espy, Naomi A. Espy, Rosella E. Rhodes, and Theodore R. Espy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. TOWER) (by request):

S. 1492. A bill to provide for the further development of the Federal National Mortgage Association as a secondary market facility, to enable it to deal in conventional mortgages, and for other purposes; and

S. 1493. A bill to reconstitute the Federal National Mortgage Association as an independent corporate instrumentality of the United States, to enable it to deal in conventional mortgages, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 1494. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Transportation to cause the vessel *Cap'n Frank*, owned by Ernest R. Darling of South Portland, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1495. A bill for the relief of Alfio Narzisi; and

S. 1496. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Narzisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1497. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vicente Sievert Verzosa, and his wife, Liny A. Verzosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1498. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to require separate contracts to be entered into for the performance of mechanical specialty work required in certain construction and alteration of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1499. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to designate airports owned by a State or political subdivision thereof as international airports of entry if the State or political subdivision requests such designation and agrees to provide the facilities and funds necessary for the administration of the customs laws at such airports; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1500. A bill for the relief of Dr. Adela Aurora Rubio Madariaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1501. A bill for the relief of Gyorgy Sebok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 1502. A bill to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the field of law enforcement; 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. TYDINGS (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PERCY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1503. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. PEARSON:

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to establish the U.S. Track and Field Commission, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to provide for an equitable settlement in the dispute between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the National Collegiate Athletic Association; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks by Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of May 1967, as National Home Improvement Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTIONS

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1491 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. LONG of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 107); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 107

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1491) entitled "A Bill for the relief of Henry D. Espy, James

A. Espy, Naomi A. Espy, Rosella E. Rhodes, and Theodore R. Espy", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report thereon to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "FEDERAL ROLE IN URBAN AFFAIRS"

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 108); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 108

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations 2,000 additional copies each of Parts 1 through 6, inclusive, of the hearings entitled "Federal Role in Urban Affairs," which were held by that committee during the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

AMENDMENT OF ACT CONTROLLING THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and myself, a bill seeking to amend the act controlling the Federal National Mortgage Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a section-by-section summary of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the section-by-section summary of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1492) to provide for the further development of the Federal National Mortgage Association as a secondary market facility, to enable it to deal in conventional mortgages and for other purposes introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. TOWER), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1492

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

CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES

SECTION 1. (a) Section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—

(1) By striking out everything preceding the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) For the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) of section 301 and subject to the limitations and restrictions of this title, the Association is authorized under section 304, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, lend on the security of, service, sell, or otherwise deal in any mortgages which are insured or guaranteed as provided in the last sentence of this subsection, or which are of a quality, and made pursuant to lending standards deemed by the Association to be, generally acceptable to private institutional mortgage investors; except that any such mortgage not so insured or guaranteed shall not be purchased if the outstanding principal obligation thereof exceeds, as determined by the Association, either (1) the comparable maximum amount insurable under section 203(b) or section 207 of the National Housing Act dependent upon the number of living units covered by the mortgage, or (2) 80 per centum of the appraised value of the property securing such mortgage. For the purposes set forth in paragraph (b) of section 301 and subject to the limitations and restrictions of this title, the Association is authorized under section 305, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, service, sell, or otherwise deal in any mortgages which are insured or guaranteed as provided in the last sentence of this subsection:";

(2) By striking out in clause (1) of the proviso "purchased at" and inserting in lieu thereof "purchased under section 305 at";

(3) By striking out in clause (2) of the proviso "purchase any" and inserting in lieu thereof "purchase under section 305 any"; and

(4) By striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"For the purposes of this title, the terms 'mortgages' and 'home mortgages' shall be inclusive of but not limited to any mortgages or other obligations insured or guaranteed under the National Housing Act, chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, or other Federal law."

(b) Section 304(a)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after the second sentence the following: "The prices to be paid by the Association for mortgages not insured or guaranteed as provided in the last sentence of section 302(b) shall reflect differentials in the quality and marketability thereof when compared to insured or guaranteed mortgages bearing the same interest rate, as determined by the Association. The Association may establish a special reserve for losses with respect to mortgages which are not insured or guaranteed as provided in the last sentence of section 302(b)."

SECURITIES

SEC. 2. Section 304 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) To provide a greater degree of liquidity to the mortgage investment market and an additional means for effecting sales of mortgages held in the portfolio of its secondary market operations, the Association is authorized to set aside a part or all of any mortgages held by it under this section and subject them to a trust or trusts, and to act as trustee of any such trust or trusts. As such trustee, the Association is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests in the mortgages subjected to such trusts in the form of trust certificates or other comparable securities. Securities issued by the Association pursuant to this subsection shall to the same extent as securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Section 302(c)(4) shall have no application to the issuance or sale of such securities under this subsection. The Association, in its corporate capacity, is authorized to guarantee the timely payment of the principal of and interest on the securities issued and sold pursuant to this subsection. Appropriate language shall be inserted in all securities issued under this subsection clearly indicating that such securities together with the interest thereon, are not guaranteed by the United States and do not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Association. Mortgages set aside and subjected to a trust or trusts pursuant to this subsection shall at all times be adequate in outstanding principal balances, interest rates, and maturities to enable the Association to make timely principal and interest payments on the securities issued and sold pursuant to this subsection. The effect of the sale of beneficial interests in mortgages subjected to a trust or trusts under this subsection shall be the same as a direct sale of the mortgages to the extent of the principal amounts of such securities sold."

ORGANIZATION

SEC. 3. (a) Section 308 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended to read as follows:

"PRESIDENT, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AND ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 308. (a) The Association shall have a Board of Directors consisting of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development as Chairman of the Board; the Secretary of the Treasury or his designee from among the Presidential appointees within the Treasury Department; the President of the Association; the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or a member of such Board designated by the Chairman; the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board or a member of such Board designated by the Chairman; the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers or a member of such Council designated by the Chairman; and the Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development responsible for credit and financial policy. The Board of Directors shall meet at the call of its Chairman at least once in each quarter, and otherwise as needed by the affairs of the Association. The Board shall determine the policies which govern the operations of the Association. The President of the Association shall be appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the Association shall be administered under his supervision and direction as its chief executive officer. The President of the Association shall select and appoint qualified persons to fill the office of Vice President and such other offices as may be provided for in the by-laws, with such executive functions, powers, and duties as may be prescribed by the bylaws or by the Board of Directors. The members of the Board, as such, shall not receive compensation for their services.

"(b) The Association shall have an Advisory Board consisting of seven persons experienced in and familiar with the problems of the national mortgage market. Members of the Advisory Board shall be appointed annually by the President of the Association. The Advisory Board shall meet at least semiannually with members of the Board of Directors of the Association. Other meetings of the Advisory Board shall be held at the call of the President of the Association as needed by the affairs of the Association. The members of the Advisory Board shall not be deemed to be officers or employees of the Association, and they shall be compensated on a per diem basis and reimbursed for all necessary travel in connection with attendance at meetings of the Advisory Board and any other work therefor which is authorized by the President of the Association. Compensation for Advisory Board members as set forth in the preceding sentence shall be at such rates as may be determined by the Board of Directors. The Advisory Board may select its Chairman and adopt methods of procedure. It shall have power to confer with the Board of Directors of the Association on general conditions in the mortgage and housing markets, and on special conditions affecting the operation and functions of the Association. It may

also request information and make recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the Board of Directors and the authority of the Association."

(b) Section 309(d) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by striking out "Chairman of the Board" and inserting in lieu thereof "President of the Association".

(c) Title 5, U.S.C., § 5315 is amended by adding thereto: "(90) President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.".

(d) Any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding, the board of directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association may fix the compensation for not more than four of the corporate executive offices of such Association at the annual rate applicable to positions in level V of the Executive Schedule as established in 5 U.S.C., § 5316.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 4. Section 309(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following sentence: "The President of the Association shall, within thirty days after the first day of each session of the Congress, make a report to the President of the United States for submission to the Congress. This report shall contain a projection of the mortgage market needs and prospects during the coming year, including an estimate of the requirements with respect to availability, need, and flow of mortgage funds together with recommendations to counteract or remedy any disparity which may be indicated between the requirements and availability of mortgage funds."

OPEN MARKET OPERATIONS—PURCHASE OF FNMA OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 5. Section 309(g) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by adding at the end thereof "Every Federal Reserve Bank shall have power to buy and sell in the open market, under the direction and regulation of the Federal Open Market Committee, any obligations, participations, or other instruments issued by the Association.".

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CREDIT AND FINANCIAL POLICY

SEC. 6. (a) Section 4 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "four" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "five"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "There shall be in the Department an Assistant Secretary for credit and financial policy, who shall be one of the five Assistant Secretaries authorized under this section and who shall have the responsibility for advising the Secretary and recommending appropriate policies and action by the Department, other branches of Government, and the Congress, with respect to the flow of mortgage funds, estimated and projected financial requirements of the housing industry, and expected or probable results of monetary and fiscal policies, as these may affect housing and mortgage finance."

(b) Paragraph (8) of 5 U.S.C., § 5315 is amended by striking out "(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)"

The section-by-section summary presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

A bill to reconstitute the Federal National Mortgage Association as an independent corporate instrumentality of the United States, to enable it to deal in conventional mortgages, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility

Section 1. This section would repeal the provision making the Federal National Mortgage Association a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (now the Department of Housing and Urban Development) and would constitute it an independent corporate instrumentality of the United States. The section would further provide that the principal office of the corporation in Washington, D.C., may be located in HUD office space.

Section 2. Subsection (a) of this section would rewrite section 308 of the FNMA Charter Act, to change the method of appointment of FNMA's president and the composition of the board of directors, and to increase the number of board members from five to nine. At the present time the HUD Secretary is the chairman of the board and also appoints the other four board members; as chairman of the board, he also appoints the president of the corporation and the other executive officers. The foregoing would be changed to provide for appointment of FNMA's president by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 15 years. The president of the corporation ex-officio would be chairman of the board, and four other board members ex-officio would be the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; to serve in their stead, Secretaries could designate Under Secretaries or Assistant Secretaries and Board Chairmen could designate other Board Members. The remaining four members would be elected annually by the holders of outstanding common stock. The board of directors of the corporation would meet at least quarterly, and could provide for an interim three-member executive committee. The board would have authority to appoint the executive officers (other than the president), and would have sole responsibility to make policy decisions for FNMA with respect to all of its secondary market operations and all of its fiduciary activities. (See also summary of section 6.)

The conforming amendment made by subsection (c) would substitute the FNMA president for the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (now the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development) as the officer who at the time of the retirement of the last of the corporation's preferred stock will initiate recommendations for appropriate legislation.

Subsection (d) would place the position of president of FNMA at level III of the Executive Schedule for pay purposes ($28,500 per annum). This is the level of the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and is one level below that of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Other comparable positions at level III include the President of the Export-Import Bank, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. The subsection also provides four positions at level V ($26,000) of the Executive Schedule for other corporate executive officers.

Section 3. This section would restrict retirement of FNMA common stock to such stock, in excess of $100,000,000 outstanding, as may be held by the corporation as corporate treasury stock. Toward achievement of the goal of retirement of the Government's investment, the section would also provide for automatic annual reductions in the amount of authorized preferred stock equal to outstanding common stock in excess of $200,000,000.

Section 4. The purpose of subsection (a) of this section is to enable FNMA to deal in conventional and other mortgages and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility. That purpose would be accomplished by revising section 302(b) of the FNMA Charter Act to permit an expansion of the scope of FNMA's operations. As so revised, section 302(b) would effect the changes indicated below.

Section 302(b)(1) would authorize FNMA, under its regular secondary market operations which are almost entirely privately financed, to purchase, lend on the security of, and otherwise deal in conventional mortgages which do not exceed 80 percent of the appraised value of the security. The corporation would also be authorized to deal in all types of loans that are Federally insured or guaranteed—in addition to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration, those insured under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 by the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, and those guaranteed by the Veterans Administration—for example, such loans insured by the Farmers Home Administration under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. If a mortgage is not Government underwritten and the loan-value ratio exceeds 80 percent, it would be required that the excess amount be covered by suitable mortgage insurance written by an acceptable private insurer to qualify the mortgage for purchase. Otherwise, a privately insured mortgage would be eligible for purchase if the same mortgage without mortgage insurance would be qualified for consideration. Also, as to the corporation's secondary market operations only, two existing operating restrictions would be eliminated as not being appropriately applicable to a privately financed activity designed to meet and satisfy the financial requirements of the broad general secondary market for mortgages. These present restrictions are the prohibition against purchasing mortgages at a price (without regard to yield) exceeding par (100), and the prohibition against purchasing mortgages offered by, or covering property held by, States and their instrumentalities.

Under section 302(b)(2), conventional and privately insured mortgages would *not* be included in FNMA's special assistance functions authority; but otherwise, if and to the extent approved by the President of the United States, the Association could deal in the types of obligations permitted under the secondary market operations. Because purchases under the special assistance functions are Treasury financed, section 302(b)(2) would retain the restriction in existing law against acquisition of mortgages from States and their instrumentalities, the prohibition against purchasing mortgages at a price exceeding par (100), and the $17,500 per family residence or dwelling-unit ceiling on mortgages eligible for purchase, the last restriction remaining subject to the same several exceptions provided by existing law.

Uniformity of FNMA's operations as to Federally underwritten mortgages and loans would be furthered by section 302(b)(3), which defines the scope to include, as noted above, not only those which are FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed but also those which are insured or guaranteed under other Federal law.

Subsection (b) is a technical amendment.

Section 5. Subsection (a) would provide an additional means for the corporation to effect sales of mortgages held in the portfolio of its secondary market operations. It would authorize FNMA to create and administer trusts consisting of pools of such mortgages; against such trusts FNMA, as trustee, could sell participation certificates, which could be guaranteed by FNMA in its corporate capacity under section 304 of the FNMA Charter Act. Any Government guaranty would be expressly negatived. There would be a requirement that the mortgages subjected to the trust "shall at all times be adequate in outstanding principal balances, interest rates, and maturities to enable the

Association to make timely interest and principal payments on the participations." The participations would be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Subsection (b) is a technical amendment.

Section 6. Excepting its financing activities carried on in a fiduciary capacity under its management and liquidating functions, this section would change FNMA's operations with respect to its special assistance functions and management and liquidating functions so that commencing July 1, 1968, they would be conducted by the corporation consistent with general policy determinations made by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Such operations under these two headings would thereafter be conducted at the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Under the provisions of subsections (c) and (d), the Secretary would be required to reimburse FNMA for its related administrative expenses. As a consequence of this change, it would become the responsibility of the HUD Secretary to request and justify any future related program dollar authorizations, and also necessary appropriations to cover any losses and the administrative expenses of these functions. The guaranty by FNMA in its corporate (nonfiduciary) capacity of participations issued and sold under its management and liquidating functions would be for the ultimate account of the Secretary because such financing is for the benefit of the Government.

Section 7. This section would make all of the foregoing amendments effective on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of the bill to allow time to make arrangements for necessary changes, except that it would also further postpone the effectiveness of the section 6 amendments until July 1, 1968, because the 1968 fiscal year budget requests are already being processed.

Section 8. This section would provide express permanent authority for the Federal Reserve open market purchase and sale of FNMA obligations and other securities, including participations. The potential flexibility of open market transactions would be increased, which could serve to make FNMA securities somewhat more attractive to private investors.

EXPANSION AND STRENGTHENING OF FNMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which contains a series of amendments to the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and other acts—a bill which is designed to expand and strengthen the secondary market functions of FNMA.

This bill is designed to provide for the further development of the Federal National Mortgage Association as a secondary market facility and will enable it to deal in conventional mortgages.

I introduce this bill at this time so that it may be given thorough study by all concerned with these matters.

This bill is the product of several months of research and meetings of experts in housing and mortgage finance called together for this purpose by the officers and directors of the National Association of Home Builders.

The bill stems from the events of the past 2 years in which the country and the private housing industry have experienced a drastic curtailment in mortgage money supplies. It seems clear that this experience, coupled with the previous times in which a similar sequence of events has taken place, warrants every effort to improve and prepare our secondary mortgage market system for the future. We cannot as a nation undergo sharp downturns in mortgage supplies and housing production without seriously and adversely affecting our efforts to house adequately our present population and meet impending future housing needs that are almost upon us.

This bill, and other similar measures which may also be offered for consideration this year, is an attempt to provide an expanded means of attracting funds into the secondary mortgage market through issuance of securities by FNMA that will be purchased by large pools of investment funds which do not now flow into the mortgage market.

It also provides authority for FNMA to purchase and otherwise deal in conventional mortgages on a conservative basis and thus provide an assurance of a secondary market for this segment of mortgage finance.

The bill also provides a new structure for the FNMA Board of Directors, which would be continued under the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development as its chairman. The new Board, however, would be provided in the bill with an advisory board, and the bill would require the President of FNMA to make a report to Congress within 30 days after the start of each regular session containing a projection of mortgage market needs and prospects for the coming year. The bill would also provide that the office of the President of FNMA be elevated to that of a Presidential appointee to be confirmed by the Senate. In addition, the bill would provide the Department of Housing and Urban Development with a new Assistant Secretary responsible for mortgage finance and credit policies.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section summary of the bill explaining its provisions and purposes be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks. I also ask that the text of the bill be printed in full in the RECORD following the section-by-section summary.

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

The bill (S. 1493) to reconstitute the Federal National Mortgage Association as an independent corporate instrumentality of the United States, to enable it to deal in conventional mortgages, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. TOWER), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The section-by-section summary presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FNMA AS A SECONDARY MARKET FACILITY, AND TO ENABLE FNMA TO DEAL IN CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES

AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES

Section 1 would rewrite section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act to empower FNMA in its regular secondary market operations to deal in conventional mortgages meeting certain requirements.

Under existing law, section 302(b) authorizes FNMA to deal in FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages and certain rural housing loans insured by the Farmers Home Administration. The Association is prohibited from purchasing mortgages at a price (without regard to yield) exceeding par, and mortgages offered by, or covering property held by, States and their instrumentalities.

The new first sentence of section 302(b) would authorize FNMA in its secondary market operations to deal in FHA-insured, VA-guaranteed, and insured farm housing loans, and also conventional mortgages of a quality, and made pursuant to lending standards deemed by the Association to be, generally acceptable to private institutional mortgage investors. The following statutory restrictions would be applicable to conventional mortgages eligible for purchase—

(a) FNMA could not purchase a mortgage if the outstanding principal obligation exceeds the maximum amount of a comparable mortgage insurable by FHA.

(b) FNMA could not purchase a mortgage if the loan-to-value ratio exceeds 80 percent. This proposed bill would make *no changes* in the present provisions of law covering the special assistance dealings of the Association, including the existing prohibitions against buying at a price above par and buying mortgages from States and their instrumentalities. It would, however, eliminate both of these restrictions from application to the secondary market operations.

The language of the proposed bill would provide that mortgages insured or guaranteed under any Federal law would be eligible for FNMA purchase. This simplifies and updates present wording of the law.

Section 1(b) of the proposed bill would amend the secondary market operations provisions to authorize FNMA to set prices on mortgages which will appropriately reflect differentials between conventional and insured mortgages bearing the same interest rates. In addition, FNMA would be expressly authorized to establish a special reserve for losses with respect to conventional mortgages.

SECURITIES

Section 2 would add a new subsection 304 (d) to the FNMA Charter Act to provide an additional method for financing FNMA's secondary market operations.

It would authorize FNMA to set aside mortgages held in its secondary market portfolio, subject them to a trust or trusts, and act as trustee of such trusts. FNMA would issue and sell trust certificates or beneficial interests in the mortgages subject to the trusts in the same manner as is now done under its management and liquidation functions. The securities would be exempt securities within the meaning of the SEC laws. FNMA could guarantee the timely payment of the principal of and interest on the securities issued, but it would be required to make clear that the securities are not guaranteed by the United States.

Mortgages subjected to trusts would be required at all times to be adequate in outstanding principal balances, interest rates, and maturities to meet principal and interest payments on the securities. The effect of

the sale of trust certificates would be the same as a direct sale of the mortgages to the extent of the principal amounts of the beneficial interests sold.

PRESIDENT, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AND ADVISORY BOARD

Section 3 would rewrite section 308 of the FNMA Charter Act. The first change is in the composition of FNMA's Board of Directors.

Under existing law, the Secretary of HUD is Chairman of the Board and is authorized to appoint four other Board members from among FNMA's officers or employees, from the immediate office of the Secretary of HUD, or from any other Federal department or agency.

The bill would keep the HUD Secretary as Chairman of the Board and would name six other members. These would be the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the President of FNMA, and the Assistant Secretary of HUD for Mortgage Credit. The Secretary of the Treasury would have the option of designating one of the other Presidential appointees in the Treasury Department. The Chairman of the FRB, the FHLBB, and the CEA could designate other members of their boards.

The Board would meet at the call of its Chairman at least quarterly. Under existing law, the Board is required to meet at least monthly.

The President of FNMA would become a Presidential appointee to be confirmed by the Senate under the proposed bill. At present, the Secretary of HUD appoints FNMA's President. The President of FNMA would select and appoint other officers of the Association. At present, this is done by the Secretary of HUD as Chairman of the Board.

Section 3 would also add a new subsection (b) to section 308 of the Act. This would provide for a seven-man Advisory Board to FNMA. At present, there is an informal advisory committee which is not established by statute.

Members of the proposed statutory Advisory Board would be appointed by the President of FNMA.

The Advisory Board would meet with FNMA's Board of Directors at least semiannually. Other meetings would be held at the call of the President of FNMA. Members would be paid on a per diem basis and reimbursed for travel.

Following the example of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council (set up in 1935), the Advisory Board would be given power (1) to select its own Chairman and methods of procedure; (2) to confer with the Board of Directors; and (3) to request information and make recommendations to the Board of Directors.

This section would also amend section 309(d) to give authority to the President of FNMA to select, and appoint or employ subordinate officers and employees. The present law places this power in the Chairman of the Board, who is also the Secretary of HUD.

This section would also raise the pay of the President of FNMA from $26,000 to $27,000, and put him at a level with the Assistant Secretaries. In addition, it would provide four positions at a level of $26,000 for other corporate officers of FNMA, who are currently at pay levels below that amount. (The FNMA bylaws provide for one or more Vice Presidents, a General Counsel, a Treasurer, a Secretary, and a Controller.)

REPORT TO CONGRESS

Section 4 of the bill would amend section 309 of the Act to provide that the President of FNMA shall make a report to Congress within 30 days after the start of each regular session of Congress.

Under existing law, the Secretary of HUD is required to make a report to the President and Congress after the end of each calendar year on the activities of the Department for the preceding calendar year.

The FNMA report is to contain a projection of mortgage market needs and prospects during the coming year. This is to include an estimate of the requirements with respect to the need, availability and flow of mortgage funds, and recommendations for meeting any disparity between supply and demand.

OPEN MARKET OPERATIONS—PURCHASE OF FNMA OBLIGATIONS

Section 5 provides express permanent authority for the Federal Reserve open market purchase and sale of FNMA obligations and other securities, including participations. The potential flexibility of open market transactions would be increased, which could serve to make FNMA securities somewhat more attractive to private investors.

Under existing laws, the obligations of "any agency of the United States" (including FNMA) may be purchased. However, this permissive authority expires September 21, 1967.

AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CREDIT AND FINANCIAL POLICY

Section 6 would provide a means of enhancing the future capacity of the Government to anticipate and cope with severe mortgage money problems as experienced during the past two years and with financial policy generally.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development Act calls for four Assistant Secretaries, one of whom must also be the Federal Housing Commissioner. The proposed amendment would add one additional Assistant Secretary who is given specific responsibility for financial policy. This would *not* affect the present Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit (Phil Brownstein) who is also the Federal Housing Commissioner.

S. 1493

A bill to reconstitute the Federal National Mortgage Association as an independent corporate instrumentality of the United States, to enable it to deal in conventional mortgages, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 302(a) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—

(a) by striking out "a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "an independent corporate instrumentality of the United States"; and

(b) by inserting at the end thereof: "At the discretion of the board of directors, conditioned upon the availability of space and the payment by the corporation of economic rent therefor, the principal office of the corporation may be located in space which otherwise would be available to the Department of Housing and Urban Development."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 308 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended to read as follows:

"PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

"SEC. 308. (a) The Association shall have a president who shall be the chief executive officer of the corporation, and such other executive officers as may be provided for in the bylaws. The president of the corporation shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of fifteen years from the date of his appointment and qualification and until his successor is appointed and has qualified, except that at any time he may be removed by the President of the United States for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

"(b) The Association shall have a board of directors consisting of nine persons, one of whom shall be the president of the corporation ex officio, as chairman of the board. Another member of the board shall be the Secretary of the Treasury ex officio, except that he may designate an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Treasury to serve as such member in his stead. Another member of the board shall be the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development ex officio, except that he may designate an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to serve as such member in his stead. Another member of the board shall be the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System ex officio, except that he may designate another Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to serve as such member in his stead. Another member of the board shall be the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board ex officio, except that he may designate another Member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to serve as such member in his stead. The other four members of the board shall be persons elected annually, in the manner provided in subsection (c) of this section, by the holders of the common stock of the Association outstanding from time to time. Such elective members shall hold office until the close of the next succeeding annual meeting of the stockholders. The ex officio members of the board, as such (or as members of the executive committee), shall not receive compensation for their services. Each elective member shall receive compensation at the rate of $150 for each day he is in attendance at meetings of the board (or of the executive committee), and shall be reimbursed for his actual expenses incurred in traveling to and from such meetings. No such elective member shall be deemed to have a conflict of interest by reason of his ownership of corporate common stock or other securities issued by the Association, nor by reason of his ownership of or employment by any organization doing business with the Association.

"(c) One meeting of the holders of the common stock of the Association outstanding from time to time shall be held in each year during the month of May for the sole purpose of electing the elective members of the board of directors. Each share of such common stock shall entitle the holder thereof to one vote for each vacancy to be filled, and cumulative voting shall not be allowed. Such meetings shall be held at such times and places, and shall be subject to such rules and procedures as may be provided for in the corporate bylaws. The bylaws shall provide for the manner of filling vacancies among elective members of the board of directors occurring between the annual meetings of the common stockholders. The executive and other officers, attorneys, employees, and agents of the Association shall not be ineligible to become elective members of the board but, as such (or as members of the executive committee), shall not receive compensation for their services.

"(d) The board of directors of the corporation shall meet at the call of its chairman, who shall require it to meet not less often than once each quarter; or a meeting may be called by any four other members. Within the limitations of law and subject to the provisions of section 302(d) hereof, the board shall determine the general policies which shall govern the operations of the Association. The board of directors shall select and effect the appointment of qualified

persons to fill the usual and customary corporate executive offices (other than the office of president of the corporation), as may be expressly provided for in the bylaws, and the president of the corporation and such persons shall have such executive functions, powers, and duties as may be prescribed by the bylaws or by the board of directors, and shall be the executive officers of the Association and shall discharge all such executive functions, powers, and duties.

"(e) The corporate bylaws may provide for the establishment of an executive committee of the board of directors. Any such executive committee shall consist of three members of the board, one of whom shall be the chairman of the board ex officio, as chairman of the executive committee, another of whom shall be elected by a majority vote of the whole board from among the other ex officio members of the board, and the third of whom shall be elected by a majority vote of the whole board from among the elective members of the board. Each member of the executive committee shall hold office until he ceases to be a member of the board of directors or, except as to the chairman, until his successor has been elected by a majority vote of the whole board, whichever occurs sooner. The executive committee shall meet at the call of its chairman; or a meeting may be called by the other two members. The executive committee may be authorized to act between meetings of the board of directors with the full power of the board, except that any policy determinations or actions shall not be inconsistent with general policies determined by the board or which would govern such determinations."

(b) Section 303(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "non-voting common stock" and inserting in lieu thereof "common stock which, except as provided in section 308(c), shall be nonvoting".

(c) Section 303(g) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "president of the Association".

(d)(1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto: "(48) President of the Federal National Mortgage Association."

(2) Any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding, the board of directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association may fix the compensation for not more than four of the corporate executive offices of such Association at the annual rate applicable to positions in level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316).

(e) The first elected members of the board of directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association shall be elected at a meeting of the holders of the Association's common stock, to be called by the chairman of the board as soon as is practicable after the enactment of this Act.

(f) The incumbent of the office of president of the Federal National Mortgage Association immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be deemed to be the president of such Association as described in section 308a) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section until his successor is appointed as provided in said section 308(a), and has qualified. The incumbents of the other executive offices of the Association immediately prior to such effective date shall continue in their respective offices until their successors are selected and appointed as provided in section 308(d) of such Act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 3. Section 303(a) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "At the option of the Association, all of the preferred stock shall be retirable at par value at any time, and any common stock acquired by the corporation and held by it as corporate treasury stock shall be retirable so long as not less than $100,000,000 of such common stock will thereafter remain outstanding. The amount of preferred stock authorized to be outstanding during any fiscal year shall be the amount otherwise provided for in this section reduced by an amount equal to the par value of the outstanding common stock in excess of $200,000,000 determined as of the close of the preceding fiscal year."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) For the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) of section 301 and subject to the limitations and restrictions of this title, the Association is authorized under section 304, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, lend on the security of, service, sell, or otherwise deal in any mortgages which are insured or guaranteed as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection, or which are insured or guaranteed by an underwriter under a contract determined by the Association to be generally acceptable to private institutional mortgage investors, or which, although neither insured nor guaranteed, are of a quality generally acceptable to private institutional mortgage investors and otherwise generally the standards of the Association in its other operations under section 304. The Association shall not purchase any mortgage which is not insured or guaranteed as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection and as to which the outstanding principal balance exceeds 80 per centum of the appraised value of the property covered thereby unless payment of such excess amount is insured or guaranteed by an underwriter under a contract determined by the Association to be generally acceptable to private institutional mortgage investors.

"(2) For the purposes set forth in paragraph (b) of section 301 and subject to the limitations and restrictions of this title, the Association is authorized under section 305, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, service, sell, or otherwise deal in any mortgages which are insured or guaranteed as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection. The Association shall not purchase under section 305 any mortgage (i) offered by, or covering property held by, a State or municipality or instrumentalities thereof; (ii) at a price which exceeds 100 per centum of the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items; or (iii) if the original principal obligation exceeds $17,500 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered thereby plus an additional $2,500 for each such family residence or dwelling unit which has four or more bedrooms. Clause (iii) of the preceding sentence shall not apply to any mortgage with an original principal balance that exceeds the applicable dollar limitation per dwelling unit if it is one of the following: (i) a below-market interest rate mortgage insured under section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act, covering property which has the benefit of local tax abatement in an amount determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to be sufficient to make possible rentals not in excess of those that would be approved by the Secretary if the mortgage amount did not exceed the applicable dollar limitation per dwelling unit and if local tax abatement were not provided; (ii) a mortgage insured under section 220 or title VIII of such Act; (iii) a mortgage insured under section 213 of such Act and covering property located in an urban renewal area; (iv) a mortgage insured under title X of such Act with respect to a new community approved under section 1004 thereof; (v) a mortgage covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii.

"(3) For the purposes of this title, the terms 'mortgages,' 'home mortgages,' and 'first mortgages' shall be inclusive of any mortgages or other obligations insured or guaranteed under the National Housing Act, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, or other Federal law."

(b) Section 305(h) of such Act is amended by striking out "clause (2) of section 302(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause (i) of the second sentence of section 302(b)(2)".

SEC. 5. (a) Section 304 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) To provide an additional means for effecting sales of mortgages held in the portfolio of its secondary market operations, and for financing purposes, the Association is authorized to set aside a part or all of any mortgages held by it under this section and subject them to a trust or trusts, and in connection therewith, the Association shall act as trustee of any such trusts. As such trustee, the Association is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests or participations in the mortgages subjected to such trusts. Participations or other instruments issued under this subsection shall to the same extent as securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Section 302(c)(4) hereof shall have no application to the issuance of participation certificates under this subsection. The Association, in its corporate capacity, is authorized to guarantee the timely payment of the principal of and interest on the participations or other instruments issued and sold pursuant hereto; however, appropriate language shall be inserted in all participations or other instruments issued under this subsection clearly indicating that such participations or other instruments, together with the interest thereon, are not guaranteed by the United States and do not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Association. Mortgages set aside and subjected to a trust or trusts pursuant to this subsection shall at all times be adequate in outstanding principal balances, interest rates, and maturities to enable the Association to make timely interest and principal payments on the participations or other instruments issued and sold pursuant hereto. The effect of the sale of any participation certificates hereunder shall be the same, to the extent of the principal of such issue, as the direct sale of the mortgages subject to the trust."

(b) Section 302(c)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "by each" and inserting in lieu thereof "by the Federal National Mortgage Association (except with respect to its secondary market operations) and each"; and

(2) by striking out ", except that such authority may not be used with respect to secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association".

SEC. 6 (a) Section 301 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—

(1) by inserting in paragraph (b) immediately after "(when, and to the extent that, the President has determined that it is in the public interest)" the following: ", at the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development,"; and

(2) by inserting in paragraph (c) immediately after "in an orderly manner," the following: "at the expense of and for the ulti-

mate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development,".

(b) Section 302 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Excepting its activities carried on in a fiduciary capacity pursuant to subsection (c) of this section and under section 306, the operations of the Association under the special assistance functions (section 305) and the management and liquidating functions (section 306) shall be conducted by the Association at the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and in connection therewith and subject to the same exception determinations by the board of directors with respect to such functions shall be consistent with any written statements of general policy formally transmitted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the chairman of the board."

(c) Section 305(b) of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof: "All operations of the Association under this section shall be at the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and such Secretary shall reimburse the Association for the amount of its administrative expenses allocable to such operations, on a fairly prorated basis."

(d) Section 306(a) of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof: "Excepting its activities carried on in a fiduciary capacity pursuant to section 302(c), all operations of the Association under this section shall be at the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and such Secretary shall reimburse the Association for the amount of its administrative expenses allocable to such operations, on a fairly prorated basis."

(e) Section 307(c) of such Act is amended by striking out everything following "related obligations of the Association," and by inserting in lieu thereof: "its prorated and unreimbursed expenses, and the like, including amounts required for the establishment of such reserves as are determined to be prudent, shall inure to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and such related earnings or other amounts as become available shall be paid annually by the Association to the Secretary of the Treasury for the account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, for covering into miscellaneous receipts. As of the close of June 30 and December 31 of each year the Association shall render an accounting to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to its operations conducted at his expense and for his ultimate account."

SEC. 7. The amendment made by sections 1 through 5 of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of its enactment, and shall operate prospectively only; and the amendments made by section 6 of this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1968.

SEC. 8. Section 309(g) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by adding at the end thereof "Every Federal Reserve Bank shall have power to buy and sell in the open market, under the direction and regulations of the Federal Open Market Committee, any obligations, participations, or other instruments issued by the Association.".

POLICE OFFICERS HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, the Police Officers Higher Education Act of 1967.

Our first line of defense against the mounting crime rate is the local police force. Yet a 1966 survey showed that 64.5 percent of the police departments polled were understaffed and consequently unable to promise full protection for the populace. Equally alarming is a 1964 survey which found that only 6.4 percent of the Nation's policemen had a college degree of any kind. In this era of modern technology the police must be able to understand and apply the latest scientific advances in crime prevention and detection. The police officer cannot do so if he does not possess the requisite education and training to fit him for the task.

These statistics demonstrate that there is a national need for more and better qualified police officers. The National Crime Commission reached the same conclusion. This need can best be met by a national program to assist law enforcement agencies to recruit college-trained men and to upgrade present officers to the college education level.

We have neglected our police for too long and blamed them far too often when something went wrong in our society. We can no longer ask the police to be supermen and then treat them as scapegoats. While the cry of police brutality often rings in our ears, the vast majority of Americans, no matter where they live, have made it clear that they want more—not less—police protection. Our police want to provide their communities with better services. But they are handicapped by low salaries that discourage new recruits and by a lack of educational programs.

We cannot continue to ask our local police officers to perform their very difficult job unless we provide them with the training and the security that our Federal law-enforcement officials have. Our local police departments deserve the training, the salary, and the status of FBI agents. Although the FBI is expanding its training programs for local police—both by inviting police to the Washington area for courses and by sending instructors to local communities—a great need still exists for additional and more permanent training programs in the States and communities where the police work.

My bill will accomplish this. It is patterned after the National Defense Education Act of 1958 so that procedural requirements will be kept to a minimum. This will also insure that colleges and universities participating in the program will be familiar with its administration.

Administration of the entire program will be handled by existing agencies in the Office of Education because it deals chiefly with educational matters and because that Office has a long and successful experience in administering education programs.

Title I would establish a student loan fund at institutions of higher education—including junior and community colleges to assist those pursuing 2- or 4-year undergraduate degrees or certificates in police science. These loan funds total $3 million for fiscal year 1968 and $5 million for 1969, 1970, and 1971. A maximum student loan under the program would be $1,200 for 1 academic year with selection of recipients being determined by the individual institutions. Selection criteria would be based upon excellence of achievement and need, with special consideration given experienced law-force personnel on academic leave. Loans would bear a low interest rate, be repayable over a 10-year period after graduation, and up to half of the debt may be canceled for service on a public funded law-enforcement agency.

Federal contributions to the student loan funds would be matched by participating colleges and universities at a ratio of at least 1 institutional to 9 Federal dollars. Funds are provided in title I for loans to institutions to cover their required share. The total 4-year cost of this program is $19,800,000 plus administrative costs. A substantial percentage of these funds would be recovered by the Government as the loans and interest are paid off. An estimated 18,000 to 36,000 student-academic years of study could be supported under this title, depending on the amount and number of loans.

Title II would establish 4,000 2-year scholarships for outstanding students wishing to pursue careers in law enforcement. Stipends for such fellowships would amount to $2,300 yearly, plus $400 for each dependent of the student. In addition to the student stipend, the Government would provide grants of up to $2,500 per fellowship student each year to the institution providing him a new or improved program in police science. The intent of this provision is to create an inducement for colleges and universities to establish new or expanded programs in this field. There are presently 26 States in which no college or university provides a degree program in police science; in 12 of these there is some planning for such programs. Competition for fellowship awards would be based upon evidence of mental and moral excellence and leadership potential, with some preference being given applicants who are law enforcement professionals on academic leave. The cost of this program is $40 million plus administrative expenses over a 4-year period.

Title III will provide $40 million in grants for tuition aid of up to $300 a semester to those who have been employed for a minimum of 2 consecutive years by a public law enforcement agency. This aid would enable a police officer to attend a community college or other local educational institution part time and pursue a course of study leading to a degree in police science. To encourage police officers to remain on the force for a period of 18 months following the completion of their courses, the bill provides that if an officer leaves the force prior to the expiration of this time the grants he has received must be repaid on terms prescribed by the Commissioner of Education. It is estimated that the $40 million authorized by this title will provide up to 66,000 student academic years. This would permit one of every 12 police officer in the Nation to avail himself of its benefits.

One of the special advantages of title III is that it would promote the formation of a partnership between the community college and local law enforcement agencies to raise police education and training standards. Because of its

location and economic position the community college is well suited to offering an employed police officer the education he may not have been able to obtain in his earlier years. By so doing it will bring the academic and occupational aspects of career development together so that they combine to produce a better quality of police officer. In the end, we can expect a more effective police force and consequently, a reduction in crime.

My bill complements the proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967. That bill contemplates that a portion of the grants to States and local governments will be used for education and training of law enforcement personnel. My bill gives this provision concrete form through a specific program of grants and loans to assist in recruitment and in-service training of police officers.

Mr. President, in these times the police service cannot be content with officers who have a low educational attainment. Policemen today face a wide range of technical and social problems. They must be equipped to handle them well. Such competence can be instilled in police officers through the college degree program I have outlined here. My bill is an important step toward making the training, salary, and status of local police commensurate with that of FBI agents. Its enactment and implementation will bring new levels of professionalism to the police throughout the Nation. I am confident that this, in turn, will lead to a reduction in the crime rate throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1502) to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the field of law enforcement, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1502

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 "Police Officers Higher Education Act of 1967".

TITLE I—STUDENT LOANS

LOANS TO STUDENTS OF POLICE SCIENCE IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

SEC. 101. (a) For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students of police science in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $5,000,000 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1971, to complete a two-year course in police science. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with the agreements between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of a student loan fund.

(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1971, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the population of such State bears to the population of all the States combined. The Secretary of Commerce shall be the source of all population figures for the purposes of this section.

(c) Sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which such amounts are appropriated.

FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 102. The Commissioner shall periodically set dates by which institutions of higher education in a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions from the allotment of such State. In the event the total requested in such applications, which are made by institutions with which he has agreements under this title and which meet the requirements established in regulations of the Commissioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of allotment available for such purposes bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications which are made by institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under section 101(b) for such year. The Federal capital contribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the law enforcement and correctional student loan fund established under its agreement under this title.

LOAN FUND AGREEMENTS

SEC. 103. An agreement with any institution of higher education for Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner under this title shall—

(1) provide for establishment of a loan fund for students pursuing programs leading to either a two- or a four-year degree in police science offered by such institution;

(2) provide for deposit in such fund of (a) the Federal capital contributions, (b) an amount, equal to not less than one-ninth of such Federal contributions, contributed by such institution, (c) collections of principal and interest on student loans made from such fund, and (d) any other earnings of the fund;

(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for loans to students in accordance with such agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest on such loan;

(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from this student loan fund, special consideration shall be given to (a) men and women serving on the staffs of public funded law enforcement agencies who are on academic leave to earn either the two- or four-year degree in police or correctional science, and (b) students in good health with a superior academic background;

(5) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the institution.

TERMS OF STUDENT LOANS

SEC. 104. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed $1,200 and the total for all years to any student from such funds may not exceed $4,800.

(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any institution of higher education shall be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue the course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution, and (D) signs a declaration of intention to join the staff of a public funded law enforcement agency in the State wherein the institution of higher education is located or in the District of Columbia, after completion of the two- or four-year course of study, and (E) manifests no obvious physical or other handicap which, in the judgment of the institution, would render him clearly incapable of effective service on a public funded law enforcement agency;

(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount, together with interest thereon, in equal annual installments, or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments (determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner), over a period beginning one year after the date on which the borrower ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education and ending eleven years after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education, or (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (B) any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, (C) such ten-year period may also be extended for good cause determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and (D) the borrower may at his option accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan;

(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time law enforcement officer on a public funded law enforcement agency, such police force being within the same State as the institution of higher education granting the student loan, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete year of such service;

(4) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum except that no

interest shall accrue before the date on which repayment of the loan is to begin;

(5) such a loan shall be made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required;

(6) the liability to repay any such loan shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

(7) such a loan by an institution for any year shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with the institution under this title and, upon notice to the Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate; and

(8) no note or other evidence of such a loan may be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher education making the loan except, upon the transfer of the borrower to another institution of higher education participating in the program under this title (or if not participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

(c) An agreement under this title for payment of Federal capital contributions shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution in need thereof.

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

SEC. 105. (a) After June 30, 1974, and not later than September 30, 1974, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the student loan fund established under this title by each institution of higher education as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1974, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Commissioner under this title bears to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the institution's capital contributions to such fund.

(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the institution.

(b) After September 30, 1974, each institution with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the institution after June 30, 1974, in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of litigation incurred in collection of the principal or interest on loans from the fund and not already reimbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of principal or interest) as was determined for the Commissioner under subsection (a).

(c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commissioner prior to July 1, 1974, that the liquid assets of a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution or to the Commissioner, as the case may be, there shall be, subject to such limitations as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund. Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed as the Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the capital contributions to the fund made by the institution.

(2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall be paid to the institution.

LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 106. (a) Upon application by any institution of higher education with which he has made an agreement under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institution's capital contributions to a student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Loans made to institutions under this section shall bear interest at a rate which the Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, but not to exceed a total of $1,800,000.

(c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding ten years.

PAYMENTS TO COVER REDUCTIONS IN AMOUNTS OF LOANS

SEC. 107. In addition to the payments otherwise authorized to be made pursuant to this title, the Commissioner shall pay to the appropriate institution, at such time or times as he determines, an amount which bears the same ratio to the interest which has been prevented from accruing and the portion of the principal which has been canceled on student loans pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 104(b) (and not previously paid pursuant to this subsection) as the total amount of the institution's capital contributions to such fund under this title bears to the sum of such institution's capital contributions and the Federal capital contributions to such fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 108. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this title and to compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

TITLE II—NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION FELLOWSHIPS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 201. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, but not to exceed a total of $40,000,000.

AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 202. The Commissioner is authorized to award, under the provisions of this title, not to exceed 400 fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and 1,200 fellowships for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of two consecutive academic years. No one applicant shall receive fellowship stipends under this title for a total of more than three academic years.

FELLOWSHIP AND PROGRAM APPROVAL

SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellowships under this title to individuals accepted for study in undergraduate programs in police science approved by him under this section. The Commissioner shall approve an undergraduate program of an institution of higher education for purposes of this title only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

(1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded.

(2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the undergraduate training of effective police personnel and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and

(3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in personally contributing to more effective law enforcement under this Nation's system of laws.

(4) that such program lead to a two- or four-year degree or certificate in police science.

(b) Fellowships under this title shall be awarded only to applicants who—

(1) sign a declaration of intention to join the staff of a public funded law enforcement agency in the applicant's State of residence or in the District of Columbia upon completion of the two- or four-year course of study,

(2) manifest no obvious physical or personality handicap which, in the judgment of the institution, would render him clearly incapable of effective service on a public-funded law enforcement agency, and

(3) are pursuing or agree to pursue, the program of study specified by the institution for fulfillment of the requirements of the two- or four-year degrees or certificates described in subsection (a)(4).

(c) In the selection of students to receive fellowships under this title, primary consideration should be given academic excellence, evidence of moral reliability and leadership potential. In addition consideration should be given to years of creditable professional service by applicants who are law enforcement officers on academic leave to pursue the degrees described in subsection (a)(4).

(d) The total of the fellowships awarded under this title for pursuing a course of study in an undergraduate program at any one institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a)(2).

FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS

SEC. 204. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of $2,300 for any academic year of such undergraduate, college level study, plus an additional amount of $400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study such amount, not more than $2,500 per academic year, as is

determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the new undergraduate program or of the expansion in an existing undergraduate program in which such person is pursuing his course of study, which is reasonably attributable to him.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 205. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 204 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to study in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment with a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency.

TITLE III—TUITION AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to enable the Commissioner of Education to carry out the provisions of this title, but not to exceed $40,000,000.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 302. (a) Tuition aid under this title may be granted only in behalf of applicants who—

(1) are in the employ of a public-funded law enforcement agency, and

(2) have been employed by any such agency for a minimum of two consecutive years at the time of application for benefits under this title, and

(3) sign an agreement to remain in the service of the law enforcement agency employing any such applicant for a period, following completion of any course for which payments are provided under this title, of eighteen months; and in the event such service is not completed, to repay the full amount of any payments received by him under this title on such terms and in such manner as prescribed by the Commissioner.

(b) A person shall continue to receive payments under this title only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory academic performance.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS ESTABLISHED

SEC. 303. The Commissioner shall by regulation designate such degree programs as he determines will significantly improve the performance of an applicant in a public funded law enforcement agency. Tuition aid under this title may be granted on behalf of an applicant who is enrolled in courses within such programs.

PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make payments under this title to institutions of higher education, approved by him for the purposes of this title, for the tuition and fees of eligible law enforcement agency personnel who apply therefor in taking college level courses meeting the requirements stipulated in section 303.

(b) The maximum Federal payment that may be made for the tuition and fees of one applicant under subsection (a) is $200 per academic quarter or $300 per semester.

(c) Tuition aid under this title may be granted in behalf of applicants pursuing their studies either part time or full time.

(d) No tuition payment may be made under this title for an academic unit of study beginning after June 30, 1972;

(e) No tuition payment shall be made under this title for any program or course of study paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this title, where such payment would constitute a duplication of benefits paid to the person from the Federal Treasury.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner of Education shall prescribe the form, content and submission deadlines of the written applications and reports to be made by persons requesting educational benefits under this title. The Commissioner may require such persons to furnish such information as he deems necessary for full and fair administration of the provisions of this title.

(b) The Commissioner shall make such arrangements with institutions of higher education receiving tuition and fees payments under this title as are necessary to receive from them reports on the enrollment, termination and level of performance of persons receiving educational benefits under this title at said institutions. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to reimburse institutions of higher education rendering these reports for the costs of preparing and submitting such reports.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 401. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of this Act, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training afforded.

(c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(e) The term "nonprofit," as applied to a school or institution, means a school or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(f) The term "law enforcement agency" means the police force of any State, county or other general governmental unit but does not include any Federal agency.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 402. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

FEDERAL CONTROLS ON STATE AND LOCAL POLICE PROHIBITED

SEC. 403. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the organization, administration, or personnel of any Public funded law enforcement agency.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 404. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer of the Office of Education.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the activities of the Office of Education under this Act, including recommendations for needed revisions in the provisions thereof.

(c) Any agency of the Federal Government shall exercise its functions under any other law in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding or limiting the authority of any such agency under any other law.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 405. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with respect to the administration of the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible. Any such committee shall have 12 members as follows:

(1) Two members who are recognized authorities in the fields of law enforcement manpower needs;

(2) Four members who are distinguished, practicing professionals in law enforcement agencies;

(3) Three members who are recognized authorities in education for law enforcement personnel; and

(4) Three members from such fields of endeavor as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

(b) Members of an advisory committee appointed under this section, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 406. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

SETTLEMENT OF TRACK AND FIELD DISPUTE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on April 3, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 59 to authorize the incorporation, under a Federal charter, of the U.S. Track and Field Association. This association, a private corporation, would assume the responsibility as the supreme governing body of track and field in the United States.

At that time I announced my intention also to introduce legislation embodying other suggestions of how to settle the longstanding controversy between the AAU and the NCAA and its associates. Today I am sending to the desk two more joint resolutions which I hope, together with Senate Joint Resolution 59, will provide the committee with several alternatives with which to work in their consideration of this matter.

Mr. President, the two joint resolutions which I introduce today are as follows:

The first would create a Federal Agency, the U.S. Track and Field Commission, to rule the sport of track and field in this country.

The second joint resolution would establish an arbitration board to consider and settle the present dispute between the AAU and the NCAA. However, unlike the board which was appointed in 1965 pursuant to Senate Resolution 147, this board would have the power to make a decision which would be binding on all parties to the dispute. The order of the arbitration board could be appealed to the courts, but if affirmed, would be final.

Mr. President, I personally favor legislation in some form of the proposal I made on April 3. Such an association would be directed by men already associated with track and field. It would be Government controlled no more than is the U.S. Olympic Committee, which is also incorporated as a private corporation under the Federal charter. The association would not be dependent upon Government funds for survival.

There are still other possibilities for a solution. A Federal Commissioner might be appointed to govern track and field. Some have suggested that the controversy could be settled by a redistribution of the voting strength on the U.S. Olympic Committee. These are concepts which may be considered.

Mr. President, I send these two joint resolutions to the desk for appropriate reference, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 67

A joint resolution to establish the United States Track and Field Commission, and for other purposes

Whereas disputes have existed for many years between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, other amateur athletic organizations, and their affiliates or associates; and

Whereas these disputes have discouraged the full development of amateur athletics in the United States and the maximum performance by athletes representing the United States in international competition; and

Whereas the parties have not been able to resolve their differences through their own efforts or through previous arbitration efforts; and

Whereas it is necessary and desirable for the United States to maintain a vigorous amateur athletic program that will field the best possible teams in domestic and international competition, will protect and provide for the welfare of the individual amateur athlete, will achieve the broadest possible participation by amateur athletes in competitive sports, and will maintain a harmonious and cooperative relationship among all amateur athletic organizations; and

Whereas the independent board of arbitration appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 147, agreed to September 20, 1965, was unable to resolve the disputes; and

Whereas amateur athletics have a substantial effect upon interstate commerce; and

Whereas it is essential that means be provided whereby such disputes can be equitably and finally solved; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the United States Track and Field Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall consist of an Executive Committee and a Director.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission, either directly or through such amateur athletic associations or organizations as it chooses, shall—

(1) exercise exclusive jurisdiction over all policy matters pertaining to track and field operations in the United States, including the sanctioning of open track and field events;

(2) arbitrate a binding decision for such disputes between regional or national organizations engaged in sponsoring or encouraging track and field events as are shown to be harmful to the best interests of amateur track and field in the United States;

(3) act as the sole track and field representatives of the United States to the International Amateur Athletic Federation;

(4) exercise exclusive jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the participation of the United States in any international competition in track and field events, except for the Olympic Games and the Pan American Games, including the representation of the United States in such competition and over the organization of such competition when held in the United States;

(5) select and obtain for the United States the most competent amateur representation possible in such competition;

(6) represent and protect the individual right to compete of amateur track and field athletes in any case in which such athletes are unfairly restricted or restrained from participating.

(b) The Commission shall prepare and submit annually to the President and to the Congress a report summarizing the activities of the Commission and such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. (a) The Executive Committee of the Commission shall consist of the Director, ex officio, and 11 members appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) two from among coaches at any institutions of higher education which are members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association;

(2) two from among representatives of the membership of the Amateur Athletic Union;

(3) one from among coaches at institutions of higher education which are members of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics;

(4) one from among coaches at junior or community colleges which are members of the National Junior College Athletic Association;

(5) one from among coaches at secondary schools which are members of the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations;

(6) one from among members of the Armed Forces engaged in track and field activities;

(7) one from among representatives of the general public;

(8) one amateur track and field athlete; and

(9) one from among members of the Advisory Board appointed pursuant to section 7 of this Joint Resolution.

(b) The term of each voting member of the Executive Committee shall be six years, except that (1) the members first taking office shall serve, as designated by the President, four for terms of two years, four for terms of four years, and three for terms of six years, and (2) any members appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. Any member who has been a member of the Executive Committee for a full six-year term of office shall not be eligible for reappointment.

(c) The Executive Committee shall, except as otherwise provided in this Joint Resolution, exercise the authority granted in this Joint Resolution.

(d) The President shall call the first meeting of the Executive Committee and designate an acting chairman, at which meeting the first order of business shall be election of a chairman and vice chairman.

(e) The chairman and vice chairman shall be elected from members of the Executive Committee while serving on the Executive Committee. The term of office for each chairman and vice chairman shall be two years. The first chairman and vice chairman shall assume office immediately upon election. Thereafter, the election of the chairman and vice chairman shall be held at the semiannual meeting (as herein provided) immediately preceding the expiration of each two-year term. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Executive Committee shall elect a member to fill such vacancy for the balance of the term of office remaining.

(f) The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less than once every four months. Six members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(g) Each member of the Executive Committee who is appointed from private life shall receive $100 per diem for each day (including travel time) during which he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the Executive Committee. A member of the Executive Committee who is in the executive branch of the United States Government shall serve without additional compensation. All members of the Executive Committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties in accordance with the provisions of section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

DIRECTORS AND STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Director of the Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate, on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office and without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service. The Director shall serve as the chief executive officer of the Commission and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level 4 of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code. The Director shall serve for a term of six years, unless sooner removed by the President.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this Act, the Director shall, in accordance with policies and procedures established by the Executive Committee, exercise such other powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Executive Committee.

(c) The Director, with the approval of the Executive Committee, may employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) In order to carry out its functions under this joint resolution, the Commission is authorized to—

(1) establish such rules and regulations as may be necessary;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths and take such testimony as the Executive Committee deems necessary;

(3) provide for the making of such reports (including funds accounting reports) and the filing of such applications in such form and containing such information as the Executive Committee may reasonably require;

(4) enter into such contracts or other arrangements as may be advisable without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5);

(5) accept and use with their consent, with reimbursement, such services, equipment and facilities of other Federal agencies as are necessary to carry out such functions efficiently and such agencies are authorized to loan, with reimbursement, such services, equipment, and facilities to the Commission;

(6) acquire by lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for the exercise of such functions;

(7) make advance, progress, and other payments which the Executive Committee deems necessary without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529);

(8) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised to the Commission, without condition or restriction other than that it be used for the purposes of the Commission;

(9) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code; and

(10) delegate to any office or employees of the Commission any of the powers granted to the Commission under this Joint Resolution.

(b) The Commission shall have such powers of subpena and compulsion of attendance of witnesses and production of documents as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by section 18(c) of the Act of August 26, 1935 (15 U.S.C. 79r) and the provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpena or otherwise to attend or testify or produce such documents as are described therein before the Executive Committee or their designee; except that application to any court for aid in enforcing any such subpena may be made only by the Executive Committee. Subpenas may be served by any person designated by the Director.

JURISDICTION

SEC. 6. (a) The United States District Court shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of this Act, including violations of the rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission in conformance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) Actions under subsection (a) of this section may be brought in the district wherein any act or occurrence constituting the violation occurred, or in the district wherein the defendant is found or is an inhabitant, and process in such cases may be served in any other district of which the defendant is an inhabitant or wherever the defendant may be found.

ADVISORY BOARD ON AMATEUR TRACK AND FIELD COMPETITION

SEC. 7. (a) The President shall appoint a National Advisory Board on Amateur Track and Field Competition consisting of the Director who shall be chairman and nine other members appointed without regard to the civil service laws on the basis of their fitness to perform the duties of the Board under this joint resolution.

(b) The Council shall (1) advise the Commission with respect to the development of policies designed to achieve the purposes of this Joint Resolution, (2) review the administration of this Joint Resolution, and (3) make such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(c) Members of the Board who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Board, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this Joint Resolution.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 9. This Joint Resolution shall take effect on the date of its enactment except that section 6 shall take effect ninety days following the date of enactment of this Joint Resolution.

S.J. RES. 68

A joint resolution to provide for an equitable settlement in the dispute between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the National Collegiate Athletic Association

Whereas a dispute has existed for many years between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, other amateur athletic organizations, and their affiliates or associates; and

Whereas the dispute has discouraged the full development of amateur athletics in the United States and the maximum performance by athletes representing the United States in international competition; and

Whereas the parties have not been able to resolve their differences through their own efforts or through previous arbitration efforts; and

Whereas it is necessary and desirable for the United States to maintain a vigorous amateur athletic program that will field the best possible teams in domestic and international competition, will protect and provide for the welfare of the individual amateur athlete, will achieve the broadest possible participation by amateur athletes in competitive sports, and will maintain a harmonious and cooperative relationship among all amateur athletic organizations; and

Whereas the independent board of arbitration appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 147, agreed to September 20, 1965, was unable to resolve the disputes; and

Whereas amateur athletics have a substantial effect upon interstate commerce; and

Whereas it is essential that means be provided whereby the dispute can be equitably and finally resolved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the National Collegiate Association, and all affiliates, shall—

(1) grant a general amnesty to all individuals, institutions, and organizations affected by the dispute between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the National Collegiate Association, and their associates, in any amateur sport;

(2) vacate any disciplinary action proposed or pending against individuals, institutions, and organizations by reason of such dispute;

(3) discontinue any discrimination against the full use of all available facilities for scheduled meets and tournaments; and

(4) discontinue any restraints against participation by any amateur athlete in scheduled meets and tournaments pending a decision by the arbitration board pursuant to this joint resolution. Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the preceding sentence shall be rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

ARBITRATION BOARD

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established an arbitration board to consist of seven members. The representatives of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the National Collegiate Athletic Association are hereby directed respectively within ten days after the enactment of this joint resolution, each to name two persons to serve as members of such arbitration board. The President shall appoint three additional members solely on the basis of their fitness to perform the functions of the board under this joint resolution. The seven members shall elect a chairman. If either party fails to name a member or members to the arbitration board within the ten days provided, the President shall name such member or members in lieu of such party within twenty days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed—

(1) to compensate each member of the board at a rate to be fixed by him not to exceed $100 a day for each day during which he is engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses; and

(2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

PROCEDURE OF ARBITRATION BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) The arbitration board appointed under this joint resolution shall have power to sit and act at any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings as it may deem necessary or proper to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the current dispute between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any such board, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

(b) The arbitration board appointed under this joint resolution shall promptly hold hearings at which the parties to the dispute shall have an opportunity to be present, either personally or by counsel, and to present such oral and documentary evidence as the arbitration board shall deem relevant to the issue or issues in controversy. The arbitration board shall make written findings of fact and, within six months following the date of its appointment, shall promulgate an order adjudicating the issue or issues in dispute. The order shall be binding on both parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of the issues covered by the order.

(c) For the purpose of such findings and order the arbitration board shall consider (1) the extent to which such order contributes to the attainment of the goals set forth in the preamble to this joint resolution, and (2) the evidence submitted on the record.

APPEAL FROM ARBITRATION ORDERS

SEC. 4. Either party to the dispute with respect to which an order of the arbitration board has been issued under this joint resolution may, within 30 days from the date

of such order, petition the United States district court for any district in which the party adversely affected by the order of the arbitration board has its principal office, for a review of the order on the ground (A) that the parties were not given reasonable opportunity to be heard, (B) that the arbitration board exceeded its powers, (C) that the order is unreasonable in that it is not supported by the evidence, or (D) that the order was procured by fraud, collusion, or other unlawful means or methods. Such court, without the intervention of a jury, shall hear the evidence adduced by the parties with respect to the issue raised by the petition and may reverse the order only if it finds that (i) one of the parties was not given reasonable opportunity to be heard, (ii) that the board of arbitration exceeded its powers, (iii) that the order is unreasonable in that it is not supported by the evidence, or (iv) that the order was procured by fraud, collusion, or other unlawful means or methods. The decision of the district court shall be final unless within ten days either party shall apply to the appropriate United States court of appeals for a review of such decision. If the district court reverses the order for one of the reasons stated in this paragraph and no appeal is taken, or the reversal of such order is affirmed on appeal, or if an order of the district court affirming an order is reversed on appeal, the President may reconvene the arbitration board or may appoint a new arbitration board and such reconvened or newly appointed arbitration board shall proceed to take such action as may be required by the court's decision.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have power, upon application of the Attorney General, to enjoin any violation of the first section of this joint resolution.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have power, upon application of the Attorney General or of any person adversely affected by a refusal by any party to the dispute to abide by an order of a board of arbitration under this joint resolution, to issue injunctions, restraining orders or other appropriate process to compel compliance with such order.

TERMINATION

SEC. 6. On the one hundred twentieth day after the date of its order pursuant to section 3, the board shall cease to exist.

DESIGNATION OF MONTH OF MAY 1967 AS NATIONAL HOME IMPROVEMENT MONTH

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and my colleague [Mr. BENNETT], a Senate joint resolution to proclaim the month of May 1967 as National Home Improvement Month.

In 1949 the Congress adopted a national housing policy, which has as its goal a decent home and suitable living environment for every American citizen. Since that time, we have, through many housing and urban development programs, been working to accomplish this goal. While we have improved housing conditions since 1949, we still have an inventory of some 9 million substandard housing units in this Nation. It would be an impossible feat to demolish all of these units and replace them with new housing. In this connection, we have constantly looked for methods to rehabilitate and improve these substandard units to bring them up to the level our national housing policy prescribes. If homeowners and landlords realize that their property is substandard, and if they do something about it, they will be taking a major step toward helping to accomplish this goal.

Perhaps the declaration of the month of May as National Home Improvement Month will reemphasize the need for improvement and rehabilitation, and will make our entire Nation cognizant of the job that must be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 69) requesting the President to proclaim the month of May 1967 as National Home Improvement Month, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASES IN ANNUITIES PAYABLE FROM FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 155 AND 156

Mr. PELL submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 624) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 157

Mr. INOUYE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 158

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6950, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 159

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6950, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NO. 160 THROUGH 162

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6950, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 699), the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1967, at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor on the following pieces of legislation when next printed: Senate Resolution 68, a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment; S. 698, known as the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1967; and S. 699, known as the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1967.

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

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at the next printing of S. 876, my bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1359, to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, the names of Senators BAYH, METCALF, MILLER, NELSON, PELL, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1362, to protect against interference with certain rights, the names of Senators BAYH, KUCHEL, METCALF, NELSON, PELL, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1425, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to proscribe the mailing of certain matter not desired by addresses, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PENDING WATER RESOURCE LEGISLATION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, I desire to give notice that the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, has scheduled a public hearing for 10 a.m., Thursday, April 20, 1967, in room 4200, New Senate Office Building, on the following:

Corps of Engineers:

River Basin monetary authorizations.

Nominations: Mississippi River Commission, two. California Debris Commission, one.

Miscellaneous bills:

S. 78, to designate a navigation lock and flood control structure of the C. & S. Florida flood control project, in honor of Mr. W. P. Franklin.

S. 423 and S. 831, authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii.

S. 601, to designate a pumping plant on the St. Francis River, Ark., as the W. G. Huxtable pumping plant.

S. 986, to designate Garrison Reservoir as "Lake Sakakawea."

S. 1340, to designate a portion of the San Francisco-Stockton ship channel as the "John F. Baldwin ship channel."

Soil Conservation Service: Watershed project, Neshaming Creek, Pa.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

James Patrick Rielly, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Iowa, term of 4 years, vice Donald M. Statton, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, April 19, 1967, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and other interested persons, I announce the beginning of the second series of hearings by the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary. Attorney General Ramsey Clark will resume his testimony on Tuesday, April 18, 1967, at 10 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building. The hearings will continue through Thursday, April 20.

The testimony will be directed primarily to the following bills which are now pending in the subcommittee:

S. 674, to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the admissibility of confessions—Senator McCLELLAN.

S. 675, to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes—Senator McCLELLAN.

S. 798, to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officials killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes—Senator McCLELLAN and Senator SCOTT.

S. 917, to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, and for other purposes—"Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967"—Senator McCLELLAN, by request.

S. 1194, to define the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the inferior courts ordained and established by the Congress under article III of the Constitution in criminal prosecutions involving admissions or confessions of the accused—Senator ERVIN.

S. 1333, relating to the admissibility in State courts of certain evidence—Senator RIBICOFF.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON COPYRIGHT REVISION BILL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will hold on Thursday, April 27, in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, a final day of hearings on S. 597, for the general revision of the copyright law.

The entire session will be devoted to receiving rebuttal testimony on certain contested issues presented during the current series of hearings. Anyone who wishes to appear should contact Mr. Thomas C. Brennan, chief counsel of the subcommittee.

The session on April 27 will conclude the subcommittee's hearings on copyright revision. The record, however, will remain open until May 10.

NEED FOR INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this year's report of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, being transmitted to the Senate today, includes minority views signed by Senators FRANK CARLSON, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HIRAM L. FONG, JACK MILLER, THRUSTON B. MORTON, CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, and myself. I invite your attention to them.

Every minority report of the Committee on Aging since its inception in 1961 has commented on the special injury suffered by older Americans as a result of inflation.

We still insist that inflation is the No. 1 problem of the aging.

While losses in purchasing power endured by persons on fixed incomes probably can never be fully recovered through improvements in social security, such changes do afford one way in which Government can and should act to give older people fairer treatment.

Changes in social security should aim at: general increases in benefits schedules; higher minimum payments; removal of current inequities; greater flexibility in the system; and, its removal, so far as possible from the realm of political expediency.

No amendment is more necessary to an equitable social security system than enactment of automatic cost-of-living increases.

Arguments in favor are so clear, and possible arguments against it are so slight, that we are amazed it has not received universal acceptance.

The present administration's failure to endorse it is especially regrettable. Coupled with overwhelming minority support, such endorsement would assure enactment of the proposal at once.

Minority support of cost-of-living automatic increases is attested by the fact that over 100 minority Members in the House cosponsored such legislation during the 89th Congress. Many others, including all minority members of the Senate Committee on Aging, endorsed it.

We believe correction of other inequities in social security should be made as soon as possible.

In this regard there are three groups to which I invite special attention:

First, older widows;

Second, employed older Americans who lose social security benefits because of employment; and

Third, married couples both of whom are employed.

One of the most serious inequities in social security is the provision that widows shall receive only 82½ percent of the primary benefit payable to their husbands. We urge that these benefits be increased to 100 percent.

Another amendment which we have long believed to be important would eliminate or liberalize the present $1,500 limitation on unpenalized earnings of social security beneficiaries.

A third situation to which I particularly call attention relates to treatment of working couples who pay dual social security taxes, but receive no additional benefits on retirement as a result of their higher contributions.

We believe this discrimination is contrary to the original spirit of social security and we recommend its correction.

In addition to eight social security recommendations, the minority views contain seven on other matters of importance to the aging. Of these, two are especially pressing.

We strongly oppose the President's proposals to:

First, repeal the double income tax exemption afforded people over 65, and,

Second, treat social security benefits as taxable income.

We believe, on the contrary, that any special tax legislation affecting older people should give them additional relief—especially since they are so clearly victims of the hidden tax, inflation.

We are disturbed, also, by signs that implementation of the Older Americans Act, passed unanimously in 1965, is falling short of congressional hopes and intent.

It is reported that some States with excellent commissions on aging and well-directed programs are considering termination of such commissions and their activities. This is regrettable.

A modest sum was made available by Congress to encourage practical programs at State and community levels. The Older Americans Act provided that when funds were not used by a particular State, they might be reallotted to other States.

The administration has taken a position which results in freezing such funds.

We believe that States with desirable programs should have such frozen funds made available to them for the benefit of all their older citizens.

The administration also seems to prefer emphasis on activities, such as the so-called war on poverty which involve tighter Federal controls than apply to the Older Americans Act.

We believe there should be a thorough examination of the way the Older Americans Act is being approached by the

administration. Particular attention should be given to possibly undesirable emphasis on other Federal programs which may interfere with orderly development and progress of State commissions on aging.

The following, in summary, is a complete list of the minority's 15 recommendations:

First. Automatic increases in social security benefits equal to rising living costs.

Second. Across-the-board increases to all OASDI beneficiaries.

Third. Higher minimum OASDI payments.

Fourth. One hundred percent of primary benefits to older widows instead of current 82½ percent.

Fifth. More equitable benefits for working couples who pay dual social security taxes.

Sixth. Higher OASDI benefits for persons who do not retire at 65, but now receive no recognition for added years of contribution to social security and to society.

Seventh. Permit OASDI beneficiaries to earn at least $2,100 a year without any loss of benefits.

Eighth. Extend social security to more people.

Ninth. Expand and improve America's private pension system.

Tenth. Give more tax relief, not less, to older Americans at all levels of government.

Eleventh. Offer more liberal tax concessions to persons supporting needy elderly relatives.

Twelfth. Develop adequate old-age assistance programs.

Thirteenth. Expand job opportunities, full time and part time, for older people.

Fourteenth. Provide effective sheltered care programs for the aged who need such services.

Fifteenth. Develop better State and local programs for the aging under the Older Americans Act of 1965.

ROLAND MICHENER APPOINTED GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the appointment of the Honorable Roland Michener as Governor General of Canada should be happily received by all Americans.

We have known "Roly" Michener for a long time.

As Speaker of the House of Commons in 1958, he served as cochairman of the first Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Conference held since World War II, and was highly instrumental in planning and participating in subsequent conferences.

Thus, it happens that many Members of the U.S. Congress know him well and favorably.

More recently, he has served his country as High Commissioner to India—a post which he has filled with much distinction.

In assuming the office of Governor General of Canada, he will carry on the work of his distinguished predecessors with great dignity and ability.

To Roland Michener and his lovely wife, Norah, I extend the congratulations and best wishes of their many friends in this Senate.

May God speed them in their new responsibility.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join in the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Delegation from the United States, the senior Republican in this body, and in my opinion the counterpart of Roland Michener, in Canada, in being responsible in large part for getting the interparliamentary meetings between our two countries underway.

As the distinguished Senator from Vermont knows, Roland Michener, Prime Minister Lester Pearson's choice to the Queen to be Governor General of Canada, served for many years as Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons. Mr. Michener has often displayed his initiative, his integrity, and his understanding. He has contributed immensely to the improvement of relations between our two countries. We feel that this is an especially felicitous choice; and, speaking as one who comes from the western part of the United States, may I say that the Governor General of Canada to be Roland Michener, comes from the western part of his great country. I believe that Alberta, which borders on Montana, is the Province which gave to the Canadian Parliament Roland Michener. He has made a splendid record for himself, not only as a Member of Parliament, as the Speaker of the House of Commons, and as the leader of the Canadian delegation to the Canadian-United States parliamentary meetings, but also as his nation's High Commissioner to India.

We believe that, while the late Gen. George Vanier, his predecessor, contributed in an outstanding fashion to a better understanding of Canada throughout the world and represented his country with great distinction and dignity, his successor, Roland Michener, will make just as great a contribution. We of the United States are confident that this fine man—who, incidentally, happens to be a Conservative—with his outstanding abilities, his unempeachable integrity, and his deep understanding will do much not only for his own country, Canada, which with him always comes first and foremost, as it should, but also will continue to pursue a course toward the improvement of relations between our two countries and toward the betterment of Canadian relations with the other nations of the world.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks which have been made by the majority leader, and I am certain that the new Governor General of Canada will also appreciate them.

However, in order to give full credit where credit is due, I believe I should add this fact: When the Canadian-United States Parliamentary Conference was being established in 1958 for the first time after World War II, one of the leading exponents was the Honorable John Diefenbaker, who at that time was Prime Minister of Canada and who as a young man had participated significantly in the conference which was held during the world war.

I also would like to pay tribute to the Speaker of the Senate at that time who enthusiastically joined in planning these conferences, the Honorable Mark Drouin, who has since passed away.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join with the Senator in his commendations of these outstanding gentlemen: Mark Drouin, who was the Speaker of the Canadian Senate, and as the Senator pointed out, Mr. Diefenbaker, now a Member of Parliament and a former Prime Minister. And, of course, the present Prime Minister, Lester Pearson, must be included. They have all made great contributions and we in the United States are the beneficiaries of what they have done down through the years.

SENATOR RIBICOFF ADDRESSES CONNECTICUT CREDIT UNION LEAGUE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at the 32d annual convention of the Connecticut Credit Union League, our colleague, the very able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], delivered the principal address. It is a fine and thought-provoking address and contains much interesting matter which Senators and the public generally will be interested to read.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ABRAHAM RIBICOFF BEFORE THE CONNECTICUT CREDIT UNION LEAGUE

Here before an organization whose motto is "Not for profit, not for charity, but for service";

Here in our state of Connecticut where the early American settlers struggled to establish a free society;

Here I want to talk about a basic trend which runs through the history of our country and its application for you members of the Connecticut Credit Union League today.

This trend was written in the Mayflower Compact and was part of the thinking of every group that started out in this land. This trend can be called humanitarianism or just neighborliness.

Whatever you call it, it means that Americans have always had a deep concern for the other fellow. When a man's crop failed, his neighbors shared with him. Oh, they might complain and growl, but they shared. Something deep inside compelled them to.

When a man's barn burned down, his neighbors helped him raise a new one. They might have called him careless, shiftless, but they helped him build a new barn.

This sort of thing is part of us. It underlies every measure we enact to promote the general welfare. It underlies the credit union movement with its emphasis on service—on helping its owner-members to conquer their problems and achieve their dreams.

The credit union movement has come a long way since the Federal Credit Union Act

was passed in 1934. In all this 33 years time Congress has maintained a healthy interest in credit unions. Law after law has increased their scope, their efficiency, and therefore what they are able to do for the low and middle income groups who are the backbone of this nation.

In 1959, the Congress rewrote the Federal Credit Union Act of 1934. It increased the maximum maturity of loans from three to five years and raised the unsecured loan limit from $400 to $750. What's more, Federal credit unions were authorized to cash and sell checks. And borrowing restrictions on Federal credit union officials were liberalized.

In the past, Federal credit unions could invest their funds only 1) in loans to members, 2) in obligations of the United States or securities fully guaranteed by the United States, 3) in loans to other credit unions or 4) in shares of accounts of insured savings and loan associations.

Then, in 1964, Congress enacted legislation geared to give Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operation, and made new investments possible. Federal credit unions can now invest in securities with higher yields, and United States Government agencies now have a wider market for their securities.

What's more, the law allowed larger supervisory committees, with greater flexibility. Interest refunds could be paid at the close of any dividend period, and insurance obtained under Title I of the National Housing Act could be recognized as adequate security. This Title I home improvement plan has been useful to the homeowners throughout the nation. It has helped people finance repairs, alterations and minor improvements in their homes. It has helped them too, to increase equities in heir homes and build up the national stock of housing.

Another change in the law made it a federal offense for anyone knowingly to make a false statement or report—or willfully overvalue any land, property, or security to influence the action of a Federal credit union in connection with any application, loan, or the like. This gives further protection to the money which you have put in your credit union.

The two most recent pieces of legislation place credit unions on equal footing with most other types of banking and lending institutions. A 1965 law clarified and simplified certain legislation relating to Government disbursing procedures.

And, in 1966, Congress passed a law which allowed credit unions to invest their funds in Federal National Mortgage Association participations.

So the Congress has acted to welcome credit unions into the family of major financial institutions. I support such legislation. For I believe in credit unions and their efforts to help people help themselves through joint action. These efforts have been in the American tradition of self-help and neighborliness. And they have already helped untold numbers of people in the lower and middle income groups.

It would have been simple for credit union leadership to organize credit unions only where it is easy to do so. They might have organized only among those who work for great corporations, or the state or Federal governments.

Instead, the credit union leaders have tried to organize credit unions to serve those who need them most. They have organized in public housing projects and among very low income groups. Sometimes they have failed the first time, and they had to try again. Such persistent efforts have paid off.

They taught men and women who have been exploited by loan sharks for many years how they could get financing at a much lower cost. They encouraged people who had never had any sort of savings before to put away a few dollars out of their pay checks.

Men and women gain experience in democratic voting procedures when they have the chance to organize and operate their own credit union. They learn to work together to help each other. They learn to solve their problems. They learn to work today for their well-being tomorrow. This experience and training is invaluable and needed in other community programs.

These have been constructive efforts. They have been successful—as far as they have gone. Now the time has come to expand and develop them.

When the Federal Credit Union Act was passed in 1934, this nation was in the depths of a depression. The national credit union movement played a basic part in facing that depression crisis.

Today we face another crisis—the crisis in our cities. And you members of the credit union movement must move with vigor to help deal with it.

You know we are living in a new era. It is the era of the megalopolis and the computer. Already, a full 70 percent of our people live in urban areas. Another 55 million will live there by 1980. At that time, some of our urban centers will be so huge that two-thirds of our population will be living on 10 per cent of our land.

This urban era—this era of the big city—has brought us many blessings, it is true. But it has brought us vast, complex difficulties. Whether it be tangled, inadequate transportation, unhealthy smog, or decrepit slum housing, many present day urban facts complicate and disturb our lives, sometimes even threaten to destroy them.

By the year 2000, which is only 33 years away, we will have to rebuild urban America completely. We shall have to build as many housing units as we built in our first 200 years as a nation.

Our nation has faced great challenges before. But this is one of the greatest we have ever faced. In fact, the cost of rebuilding our cities has been estimated at one trillion dollars. This means the total of all public and private actions which would provide for the continuous sound maintenance and development of our cities. All slums would be cleared, all existing structures replaced, renovated or repaired, all new structures maintained in standard condition. All of us would have safety and comfort in housing, highways, and public places. We would have enough community services—like police, fire and health protection.

Mind you—this would not mean spending a trillion dollars of Federal money alone. Testifying before our subcommittee, David Rockefeller stated that for every government dollar there should be five private dollars involved.

So what we must do is approach the task of building the city of tomorrow systematically. We must approach it as a question of assembling capital investment to deal with a host of urban problems—problems of employment, housing, transportation, education, land use, poverty, race, health, public and social services, design and new towns. This the United States has done many times. We have taken public actions to generate response in the private sector—in time of war, in the assault on space, in the construction of a supersonic transport. Now we must take public actions to generate a private response and so aid our cities—where most Americans live. Just as our $20 billion commitment to conquer space created the aerospace industry, so the $50 billion used to end substandard housing could be the first step in creating the "cities industry."

Consider the history of our space program.

A little more than five years ago, we declared our intention to put a man on the moon in this decade. We are going to succeed in this fantastic adventure because we committed the resources—the men, the money, and the time—to make it happen.

We trained space scientists through research grants and fellowships. We set the best talent in universities and industry to work. They not only came up with new hardware, they came up with new ideas, new concepts, whole new approaches to problem-solving.

And, with government support, we put together an aerospace industry to meet the tremendous market demand created by this commitment to go to the moon.

But in the last analysis we are more of an urban nation than a space nation. And it is time to apply the lessons and the concepts of technology to problems closer to home.

Our cities both need and deserve a commitment like the one we have made in space—a commitment of time, money, and talent. The needs are there, and they must be filled. We must shape the future by taking constructive and selective actions today.

Clearly this enormous task is far too large for government—or any other single institution—to handle alone. The solution must come from many, many groups and from many, many people. There is a role for the Federal government. There is a role for the state government, and for the local government. There is a role for industry, and a role for business. There is a role for the individual. There is a role for you members of this audience both as individuals and as members of the credit union movement.

As you know, the Senate Subcommittee I chair held extensive hearings on our cities' problems last year. In six weeks of hearings we heard from many people about our cities and their problems. One of our witnesses was the Reverend Leon Sullivan, who directs the Opportunities Industrialization Center in Philadelphia. He told us: "Begin to rehabilitate a people and you begin to rehabilitate a city. Structures do not make democracies or civilizations, only attitudes and the spirits and desires of men to promote a change for their own betterment can do this."

Combine this statement with that of the perceptive Daniel Moynihan—"We seem somehow unable to recognize that what it means to be poor is not to have enough money"—and you have your mission cut out for you.

The purpose of the credit union is to reduce the cost of personal credit to the people named in its charter. What the poor need to escape the shadow of the slum is money. What the middle income group needs to improve the chances of its children and better the character of our cities, is money. You have the money that is needed. you have the power to make available to more people.

You estimate that to the extent that you follow the national pattern, some 270,000 persons—eligible to belong to Connecticut's 497 chartered credit unions—do not belong. This shows the potential growth for your industry.

I know you will continue to modernize and improve your services and methods of operation. You can provide exciting leadership to others. You can provide the know-how and leadership for neighborhood credit unions.

Fortunately, as that perceptive student of America, Gunnar Myrdal, has pointed out, "Never in the history of America has there been a greater and more complete identity between the goals of social justice and the requirements of economic progress"—between what is right and what is practical. The improvement and expansion of your credit union services would be the right thing to do. But it would also result—as you yourself have put it—in a spectacular increase in financial power.

I spoke at the start of the great American tradition. That is the tradition of helping a neighbor out when his barn burned down. Today we have many many neighbors in a more modern kind of trouble. We must help them so that the national barn will not burn down—and because it is right to do so.

EXTENSION OF MINIMUM WAGE COVERAGE TO AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last year, as part of the Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1966, minimum wage coverage was extended to approximately 390,000 agricultural workers. With solid support from Senators in whose State agriculture is a substantial contributor to the economy, an attempt was made to delete this provision of the bill. During debate on this amendment it was pointed out that, contrary to the opinions of the proponents of the bill, not only would this extension of coverage not help the economy of the agricultural community, but it would also have an adverse effect thereon. Apparently, this argument was not accepted since the amendment was defeated by a 37 to 51 rollcall vote. Recently, I received copies of memorandums prepared by the administrator of the employment security division in Arkansas, the Arkansas State welfare director, the vice president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, the director of the Arkansas Office of Economic Opportunity, and a letter from the Governor of Arkansas to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, all of which support the proposition that the inclusion of certain agricultural workers has had a crippling effect on the economy of areas which are primarily dependent on agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is conservatively estimated that 800 to 1,000 family heads have been permanently displaced with the Arkansas Delta region as a direct result of last year's congressional action. It is my opinion that this displacement will be generally true in virtually all of the major agricultural areas throughout the country.

Today, I have written the Secretary of Agriculture requesting his immediate attention to this most critical problem. I welcome the support of any Senator who has found that the same type of problem exists in his State.

EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
Little Rock, March 31, 1967.

Hon. JOHN MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed herein please find a copy of a letter which I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture concerning a situation which exists in the Delta Region of Arkansas. Any assistance which you may be able to give us in this matter will be appreciated.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,
WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
Little Rock, March 30, 1967.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Attached to my letter you will find a memorandum which reflects the opinion of various members of my administration concerning a situation which has arisen in the Delta Region of our State. These opinions were submitted at my request because I felt that we were facing a situation which was rapidly deteriorating.

In view of the comments which have been made to me, I feel that immediate action should be taken to alleviate the situation. There is no simple solution, however, I am sure that with the cooperation of the Labor Department; the Health, Education and Welfare Department and your Department, a solution can be found. Commissioner Moss has made several suggestions which will give temporary immediate relief.

I hope that you can prevail upon the Department of Labor to clarify our problems with the federal wage and hour legislation in order to provide the maximum possible employment to the families involved. Because of the urgency of the situation, I am contacting Senators McClellan and Fulbright, and Congressmen Mills, Gathings and Pryor.

Any assistance you can give will be appreciated.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,
WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.

MEMORANDUM, MARCH 29, 1967

Fred D. McKinney, Administrator of the Employment Security Division: "During the period of February 24 through March 6, 1967, an agricultural survey was made in Phillips County to determine the number and characteristics of the agricultural workers who are losing their jobs this season because of the application of the Federal Wage and Hour Law. This survey revealed that there will be approximtaely 400 hand laborers used in previous years that will be unemployed this year. No personal data was obtained on these individuals because they could not be identified. However, it is logical to assume that most of these are older people, women and children used only during the chopping season. Of eight large farmers who were contacted, it was determined that 60 workers (family heads) would be displaced. It is estimated that there will be 800 to 1,000 family heads permanently displaced in the Delta Region. According to the survey, the immediate problem is providing food. A long range program should be developed to train them for some other type of work. Due to the fact that the majority of the displaced workers are age 46 and over with education of less than four grades, the long range program of training should begin immediately to be of any material benefit. The only figures we have available are the ones that were obtained in the survey of Phillips County. However, the problem exists in all counties of the Arkansas Delta Region. Additional funds are urgently needed to conduct a comprehensive study of the whole region. We have notified the Regional Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security of this problem, and have requested assistance through the Department of Labor."

Mr. A. J. Moss, Arkansas State Welfare Director: "This is the fifth time we have called attention to the critical condition concerning the needs of farm workers in Eastern Arkansas. Ashley, Desha, Chicot and Drew Counties have raw commodities distribution programs, and the situation is less critical in these counties than in the others I will enumerate. In Phillips, Lee, St. Francis, Poinsett, Mississippi and Craighead Counties the department operates the food stamp program. Up to the present time, we have not been allowed to permit free food stamps to be distributed to those farm workers who are so critically in need of food, although to the best of my knowledge there is no law to prevent free distribution of stamps. If this is not possible, or if there is a reluctance to set a precedent by issuing free food stamps to those workers who so desperately need food, then there is another alternative. The State Department of Welfare could be authorized to establish a dual program in each of these food stamp counties by permitting raw commodities as well as food stamps and limit the issuance of raw commodities to those farm workers who are in a distressed group. Either one of these two measures would be an emergency measure, and would not represent a final solution to the problem.

"Requests have been made to take one of these two courses of action twice through the Regional Office at Dallas and twice through Congressman Gathings. I cannot really understand the reluctance to recognize the need for food which exists among 1,000 farm families in this area, who cannot receive advances from landlords due to the restrictions of the Federal Wage and Hour Act and failure of the Labor Department to provide adequate guidelines to the planters.

"We request that an exception be made in this case by providing either for the free issuance of food stamps to these people or to authorize us to set up a dual commodities program in the counties I have previously enumerated. In the interest of humanity, I know that our request will be granted."

Mr. Waldo Frazier, Vice President, Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation: "The minimum wage act has had, and is having, a great impact on the labor force on commercial farmers in this state and more particularly in the Delta of the Mississippi, Arkansas, Black and White Rivers. Sound farm management dictates to the commercial farmer that he can pay minimum wages and above only to workers who have the physical and mental ability to do work commensurate with the pay. He is no longer able to hire and pay wages to people who are physically and mentally unable to do a fully acceptable job.

"The farm labor force is further disrupted by the Wage and Hour Act because of the definition of hazardous occupations that prevent many boys and young men from being employed as machine operators on the increasingly mechanized farms in these areas. All of this means that there will be many people living in these rural areas during this crop season who in the past have had some employment that will be completely without employment.

"Farmers are without ability to give assistance to these people because there is no way for them to be repaid for any advances that they may make. Even though farmers are greatly interested in the welfare of these unemployed farm people, to ask them to support them would be to ask them to contribute to charity far beyond their ability."

Glen Jermstad, Director of Arkansas Office of Economic Opportunity: "The problem came to my attention when I was contacted by the Community Action Directors of Mississippi, St. Francis, Phillips, and Cross Counties. Unfortunately, of the twelve counties involved in the problem, only four are covered under OEO Community Action Agencies. In the discussion with the Community Action Agency Directors, they felt that the problem was critical and needed immediate attention, and from their comments, I am sure that the problem is also critical in the other eight counties.

"Future plans are to attempt as funds are available to cover the remaining eight counties, but this will take time. To give an example, only one-third of the counties affected have a Head Start Program in operation. I feel that in time we will be able to increase NYC and OJT funds to the affected areas, but this again will take time and is no immediate answer to the problem. I concur that the food problem is the most critical, and requires immediate action."

WATER RESOURCES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at the recent annual meeting of the Arkansas Basin Development Association in Tulsa, Okla., Maj. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke was one of the distinguished speakers. His topic was "Good Stewardship of Our Water Resources."

As one who has been a lifetime advocate of the proper development of our Nation's water resources, I was particularly impressed with his speech.

We are finding today the reality of the very urgent and pressing need for making the fullest use from the potential which our water resources offer. I recall that not so long ago water resource development was called pork barrel or boondoggle. The people who hurled these ridiculous phrases are now becoming embarrassingly aware of the shortsightedness and lack of vision which they displayed.

Seldom have our national water problems been better described and the potential solutions more aptly discussed than in General Clark's speech. He points out that water is now a source of overwhelming demand by industry, the most integral element in the conservation of fish and wildlife, and the primary factor around which expanding opportunities for healthful outdoor recreation can be developed.

I commend General Clarke for his outstanding presentation, and I urge every Senator who has an interest in the comprehensive development of our Nation's water resources to read and study General Clarke's speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the RECORD.

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

GOOD STEWARDSHIP OF OUR WATER RESOURCES

(Remarks by Maj. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, Deputy Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, Arkansas Basin Development Association, Tulsa, Okla., Mar. 17, 1967)

It is a double pleasure to visit the impressive Arkansas project and to meet with this fine Association. What is being accomplished on the Arkansas today is due in large measure to vigorous, conscientious, and future-minded civic leadership. A conspicuous share of the credit belongs to you, and you have every right to be proud.

This is a happy occasion for all of us. With the project already almost two-thirds finished, and budgeted to keep it on schedule during the coming fiscal year, the green light is shining bright. As Colonel Bane and Colonel Rebh indicated this morning in their progress reports, there is good reason to anticipate with confidence that the navigation features of the project will be completed by 1970, according to plan.

You have almost within your grasp a real "handle" on your future, but, as I know you are well aware, a great deal remains to be done before you will be able to take full advantage of it. Progress has already been made toward the development of ports and industrial parks. It is imperative that you continue to put your full weight behind the push to insure that the non-Federal facilities needed to attract and sustain large-scale commercial and industrial enterprise are actually ready for business by the time navigation is opened. Your canalized Arkansas can—and certainly should—become one of the Nation's "showcase" navigation projects, fully demonstrating the outstanding value of a modern improved waterway in benefits to the area it serves and the Nation-at-large.

Throughout the United States an accelerated water resources development effort is being made to support the phenomenal growth rate of our country. The Arkansas Basin project is an integral element of that overall effort. The foresight, enthusiasm, energy, and unity of purpose displayed by the people of this basin furnish a splendid example to those in other parts of the country faced with critical water problems and big development jobs.

Although our country has a potential supply of water large enough to meet our essential needs for a long time to come, it is unevenly distributed by nature. More and more often we find that water is unavailable in sufficient quantity, or of acceptable quality, at the times we need it, or at the places we would like to use it. At other times and places there is too much of it. Floods destroy lives and property.

Our national water problems are rapidly growing in magnitude and complexity as overall demands upon our water resources are expanding at an unprecedented rate. The accelerating upswing of our population is only one reason. Another is the phenomenal growth of congested megalopoli, or super cities, where the per capita demand for water is greatest and hardest to meet. Present trends indicate that by the turn of the century about a third of all the people in the United States will be living in such cities. We are becoming more and more dependent upon industrial production, which requires immense quantities of water. Within the next four decades, total U.S. water needs—already straining present facilities in many places—will perhaps triple.

The prosperity, safety, comfort, and convenience of today's 200 million Americans are founded on engineering development. Such development will be equally essential to the well-being of the 400 million Americans of the next generation, and perhaps a billion a century hence, if the current growth rate continues. We cannot progress—probably we cannot even survive as a Nation—unless we accelerate development efforts along all lines to meet our material requirements. This is particularly true with respect to water resources.

Providing for the material needs of our people is the major purpose of water resources development, but it is not the only purpose. In recent years, other objectives have become increasingly important and competitive. Heavy emphasis is being placed on good stewardship of the natural environment, the conservation of fish and wildlife, the provision of expanding opportunities for healthful outdoor recreation, and other measures contributing to a better and happier life.

The rapid and massive expansion of our urban-industrial society keeps pushing the countryside—the open spaces—further and further back. Many people are deeply concerned that we may be sacrificing too much of the natural environment in order to fulfill our material requirements. This is particularly relevant in the more thickly populated portions of our country, where the tensions of modern life are generally greatest, and the need for relaxation and recreation most pressing.

Urban dwellers want to be able to emerge from their high-rise apartments, get off their paved streets, and find beautiful landscapes, green fields, wooded hillsides, and clear, free-running streams somewhere nearby. They deplore what has happened to the air they breathe, the open spaces of yesterday, the woodlands, and the rivers. The fact that there is still plenty of wild country in comparatively remote regions is no answer to their immediate need for easily accessible opportunities for esthetic and recreational enjoyment.

Environmental factors are typically qualitative. Hence they are difficult and sometimes impossible to express in quantitative terms. They can be evaluated only through judgment. Nevertheless, these qualitative factors must be given full weight in all future water resources planning. And they must be considered from the very start of the planning process. The public demands this, and we recognize it.

The Corps of Engineers has employed environmental specialists of various kinds on its staffs for many years, and has consistently sought the expertise of other agencies. We are now strengthening our capability, both in-house and by contract, to respond to the growing need to preserve environmental resources while meeting the essential development needs of our expanding economy.

We are seeking improved working relationships with conservation groups and organizations, and progress made has been encouraging, though sometimes the road is rough. Our purpose is not just to explain our activities to them, but also to acquire a better understanding of their needs and views, and to enlist their full cooperation in planning for tomorrow.

No rational answer to our nationwide water problems can be found in an atmosphere of conflict between groups—for example, between those whose interests are largely commercial, and those who are primarily concerned with esthetic and related values. If all concerned fail to get together, and work effectively together now, toward the fulfillment of our future water-related needs, not many years hence there will be a frantic scramble for enough available good water just to meet our most pressing basic utilitarian requirements. Such a scramble could—and probably would—result in the wholesale destruction of precious environmental values which ought to be preserved.

Practical solutions to highly complex problems must be found. Clear alternatives in the use of water resources must be presented in such a manner that wise public decisions can be made. We *can* both meet our economic needs and preserve and even enhance environmental values. But we can only do so through true endeavor on everybody's part to understand the other fellow's point of view, and to comprehend the nature and full magnitude of competing demands upon our limited water resources—and then we must have a real willingness to cooperate realistically toward the achievement of the greatest good of the greatest number of people.

Waterway development presents many special environmental problems. We often hear concern expressed as to whether an efficient navigation project can be compatible with the preservation of ecological and esthetic values and the proper conservation of fish and wildlife. Your Arkansas project will provide a particularly good answer to this concern. A variety of measures are being taken by the Corps, State and local agencies, and private interests to make it beautiful, enjoyable, and a great contribution to the cause of nature conservation as well as a tremendous economic asset.

As elsewhere throughout the country, we are making every effort in construction on the Arkansas to be good stewards of the natural environment. In the section of the waterway traversing the Little Rock District, many millions of cubic yards of dredged silt and sand will be placed to fill swampy reaches between dikes. This will have the happy incidental effect of eliminating large mosquito-breeding areas. This material will be shaped, reforested, and planted with grasses or other vegetation to blend with the countryside. In the Tulsa District, where some of the channel is largely a land cut, construction areas will be dressed and replanted to heal the scars of construction, and help to make your waterway throughout its length a scenic resource of outstanding value.

Future maintenance dredging will be required to keep channels open and navigation moving. We are seeking ways to dispose of the soil dredged from the channel without adverse effect on esthetic and ecological values. Timely and effective planning, and the cooperative effort of all interests will be required to assure the availability of suitable spoil disposal sites when and as they are needed. This involves a very important responsibility of civic leadership.

Supplying the pressing need for greatly increased outdoor recreational opportunities of all kinds, especially for the many millions who live and work in our crowded cities, is a function of water resources development which is of increasing national importance. During recent years there has been a phenomenal rise in public recreational enjoyment of water resource projects—particularly reservoirs. During 1966, we had 190 million visitors at our Corps of Engineers reservoirs.

The growing demand for more and more water-related recreation is reflected in fundamental changes in Federal water programs. In plan formulation, economic evaluation, and cost allocation, recreation is now treated as a full partner with other purposes of water resources development. Recent legislation has provided strong incentives for greater participation by State and local agencies in recreation planning and development. Where one feature of a multiple-purpose project serves recreation and all other authorized purposes across the board, the Federal government bears the full cost. It also bears up to half of the added cost of features which serve recreation exclusively—as well as of fish and wildlife enhancement measures—when they are sponsored by, and cooperatively planned by, State and local governments.

The many steps which are being taken to develop the tremendous recreational potential of the Arkansas Valley promise to pay handsome dividends. They will benefit not only this region, but people living far beyond its boundaries. The two beautiful lodges at Lake Eufaula sponsored by the State of Oklahoma, together with other recreational development going forward at Keystone, Dardanelle, and elsewhere in the headwater areas and along the river, will help to make the valley a playground of wide renown. Webbers Falls and Robert S. Kerr Reservoirs on the main stem have an excellent potential for the establishment of major parks. We expect these reservoirs to attract more than 2½ million visitors annually.

Fish and wildlife resources are being greatly enhanced by the Arkansas project. Migrating ducks are already stopping at project reservoirs in increasing numbers. Fish will benefit from reduced turbidity, stabilized banks and channels, controlled flows, and deeper pools. The Fish and Game Commissions of Oklahoma and Arkansas are cooperating fully in the conservation of these resources. The stocking of Dardanelle reservoir with large-mouth bass, bream, crappie, and catfish is a good example. The experimental introduction of half a million highly prized striped bass—which we call rock fish on the Atlantic Coast—is an innovation I know sport fishermen will welcome.

Water pollution is a national problem which has a major impact on all our water resources planning and development today. We Americans have compounded our water troubles by disregard for good water management. A substantial part of the water available to us is limited for general use because once beautiful streams have been turned into open sewers to flush away the wastes of our cities and industries. Good stewardship of our water resources demands that to the maximum practicable extent pollutants be kept out of them, and we are seeking to do so through intensified State and Federal waste treatment programs. But despite the best we can hope to accomplish through treatment at the source, the menace of pollution will have to be combatted also—and to an increasingly large extent—through the substantial augmentation of stream flows during low-flow periods. This means that, nationwide, much more reservoir capacity must be constructed and earmarked for this purpose.

The salt content of the Arkansas River presents a serious problem which is being attacked vigorously both by the Federal government and the States involved. The Corps of Engineers has devised and recommended a $270 million program to minimize brine pollution from natural sources. That resulting from petroleum and natural gas operations is being dealt with through State action. Otherwise, your Valley is in a particularly advantageous position with respect to pollution. Your great upstream reservoirs impound plentiful water for low-flow regulation. By comparison with many of our other major river basins, you have little contamination from municipal or industrial wastes to contend with. Your slate is relatively clean. Keep it that way. Make it a matter of high priority as new population centers and industry develop along the waterway to see that adequate regulatory safeguards are provided—and strictly enforced.

It has been a real pleasure to be with you, and to discuss some of the problems with which you and people throughout the United States are deeply concerned these days. No matter how much is accomplished, there is always another beckoning horizon just beyond. I am confident that you will continue in the vanguard of leadership toward new goals. We of the Corps of Engineers are proud to work with you, and with all the people of the Arkansas Basin dedicated to the good stewardship of the water resources of this great part of our Nation.

SEIZURES OF U.S. TUNA VESSELS BY PERU AND ECUADOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have long been a firm advocate of inter-American cooperation and brotherhood; consequently, my hopes and prayers are with our President as he meets with officials of our Latin American neighbors in Punta del Este. I know that every effort will be made on our part to insure a long and productive future for the Alliance for Progress.

At the same time, I sincerely hope that the nations of Latin America will remember that cooperation is a two-way street, and I address this comment particularly to the representatives of Peru and Ecuador, each of which countries now has an extraordinary opportunity to exhibit good will by offering positive, realistic solutions to the problems which have arisen from their seizures of United States tuna vessels. These problems are not new, and proper attention to them is long overdue. Now is the time for such attention. Indicative of the sentiment which surrounds this issue is a resolution passed recently by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

"Whereas, the Port of Los Angeles serves as the home base port for the largest commercial fishing fleet in the United States; and

"Whereas, the owners of the fishing vessels operating from this Port pioneered and developed the long-range fishing capabilities of this fleet, which enabled such fleet to fish in international waters off the South American Coast; and

"Whereas, the economic advantages that flow from the prosperity of the fishing fleet inure to the benefit of the business and individuals throughout the entire United States, from the transportation industry to food processors, distributors, wholesalers and retailers, to the ultimate housewife consumer; and

"Whereas, the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles is vitally interested and concerned in the welfare and safety of the crews manning such vessels and in the prosperity of the commercial fishing fleet;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles hereby expresses its growing concern to the State Department of the United States of America for the welfare, safety and prosperity of the crews and vessels of the commercial fishing fleet operating from the Port in view of the antagonistic acts recently perpetrated by a certain South American country, and urges that the matter be given careful study and resolved in a manner satisfactory to the economic interests of the affected businesses and individuals in the United States; and

"Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of the board be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the State Department of the United States and to interested Senators and Representatives serving in the Congress of the United States."

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Board of Harbor Commissioners at its meeting held Mar. 8, 1967.

J. F. PARKINSON,
Secretary.

Approved as to form March 6, 1967.

ROGER ARNEBERGH,
City Attorney.

E. C. FAUELL,
Assistant.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the most valuable of the Great Society programs has been the National Teacher Corps, which has done much to break down the resistance to education in poverty-stricken areas, in spite of inadequate funding by Congress.

This program has been well accepted in the educational community. Not only does it provide additional help to strengthen present programs of the schools which employ Teacher Corps interns, but also the program looks to the future by developing young, dedicated teachers to continue to work in the schools where the task is most difficult.

Last week the Minneapolis Tribune published an article concerning the Teacher Corps program at Harrison Elementary and Franklin Junior High School in Minneapolis. It is an excellent article which both describes the operation of the Teacher Corps program in general and documents its effectiveness in Minneapolis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Teacher Corps Wins Friends in City," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of Thursday, April 6, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 6, 1967]

TEACHER CORPS WINS FRIENDS IN CITY—15 LEARNING CENTERS AID POOR PUPILS

(By Fred Johnson)

Nestled in nooks and crannies around Harrison School in Minneapolis are 15 unconventional classrooms that teaching professionals call "learning centers."

One of their purposes is to teach youngsters in small groups. They provide both "remedial" and "enrichment" instruction.

The idea is to break down the resistance to education offered by children from poverty-stricken families.

Most of the 1,100 children at Harrison have participated in a learning center at one time or another.

According to Mrs. Edna A. Anderson, Harrison's principal, the centers have revolutionized the school's curriculum this year.

They were made possible, she said, by a National Teacher Corps (NTC) team at Harrison.

Two NTC teams came to Minneapolis last fall. Each consists of six persons—a leader and five interns.

The other team is at Franklin Junior High, another school where many of the children are considered disadvantaged.

The Minneapolis schools requested 46 NTC workers for the current school year, but only 12 were available.

Donald Bevis, director of special federal projects for the schools, said Minneapolis could use 50 NTC members next year.

"It's a very effective program in my judgment," said Supt. John B. Davis Jr.

School officials in many cities are reported to feel the same way about the federally sponsored program, which aims to develop teachers with special expertise in dealing with disadvantaged children.

The NTC, in fact, seems to have plenty of friends except where it counts most—in Congress.

Though the 89th Congress was extraordinarily generous to education, it almost left the NTC out in the cold.

Congress reluctantly established the program, supported by President Johnson, in 1965. Since then the NTC has had a difficult time getting money to operate, and the program is said to be in serious trouble in the present Congress.

Through the program, interns, or trainees, work in poverty-area schools under the guidance of team leaders, who are experienced teachers.

In addition to receiving on-the-job training, an intern is expected to enroll in a nearby university to work toward a master's degree and to seek teacher certification, if he doesn't have it.

Besides this, said David Ferrens, NTC member at Harrison, interns do "community work aimed at bringing the people of the community in closer contact with the school."

The federal government pays 90 per cent of the salaries of NTC members, the local school district 10 per cent.

The local interns are receiving salaries equivalent to those of other beginning teachers in Minneapolis. Their leaders are paid according to their professional status.

Ferrens, 29, Philadelphia, Pa., said that interns expected to serve two years.

Implicit in the program is the idea that teachers need special training to do an effective job with poverty children.

At Harrison, Ferren said, NTC members have devoted much effort to improving children's reading skills.

"In all disadvantaged schools," he said, "it appears that reading is the big deficiency."

NTC members at Harrison and Franklin have helped develop programs to distribute paperback books among children. (Both schools have received substantial donations of paperbacks.)

The result, officials said, is that pupils have been doing a lot more reading.

THE USE OF BATTLESHIPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made last Monday on the floor of the Senate by my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, stressing the need and desirability for deploying battleships off the coast of Vietnam.

As Senator RUSSELL pointed out so well, many of the arguments which the Department of Defense has used in objecting to the proposal originated by Senator RUSSELL are "unconvincing at best."

I personally see no reason why one or two battleships should not be reactivated and made part of our fleet.

But one of the most important points that the distinguished chairman made in his remarks yesterday was that he intends to discuss this matter on every available opportunity until some good reason is given by the Department of Defense for its failure to reactivate a battleship.

I applaud Senator RUSSELL for his determination and his intention to speak out until his proposal is either accepted or some excellent reason is given for not accepting it.

I, too, have spoken on the floor of the Senate many times about the need to reactivate battleships for use in the Vietnam theater of operations.

And I, too, plan to use every opportunity to join Senator RUSSELL in support of this proposal.

F.D.R. AND L.B.J.: A LEGACY CONTINUES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 22 years ago today, Franklin Roosevelt passed into history.

He died in the midst of a terrible war that tested anew mankind's resolve to defend liberty against aggression and enslavement. America was never the same again because of Franklin Roosevelt.

He was the wise teacher who led us through difficult and perilous years. He taught us to be self-confident; he revived our Nation's spirit; and he reaffirmed our faith in democracy.

But most of all he taught us a mighty truth: That freedom is only as meaningful as the number who share in its blessings.

President Roosevelt helped us to face the inequities of life with boldness and courage. From him, we learned that poverty, illiteracy, and disease are conditions that result when a society becomes complacent or indifferent.

Above all, he proved that human destiny is shaped by man's willingness to push against those forces which hold him down.

That lesson guides us yet. We see today, in America in the 1960's, that a people responsive to the political and social needs of their time can create a new era of opportunity and progress.

President Johnson is committed to this task. Through his leadership the Roosevelt legacy is as meaningful and challenging today as it was a generation ago.

Both of these great Presidents shared a vision of America that seeks to restore the full potential of our human and material resources.

Like Roosevelt, President Johnson sees America not in terms of what we are, but of what we are capable of becoming. This is the real meaning of the Great Society: That every man, in every place, can know the joys and satisfactions of realizing his skills and talents and ambitions.

One year before his death, President Roosevelt addressed Congress and articulated a second Bill of Rights for all Americans.

Among these rights were the right to a useful job; the right to earn enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and shelter; the right of every family to a decent home; the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve good health; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old ags, sickness, and unemployment; and the right to a good education.

These are the basic rights of a free and enlightened people. And today, more Americans have secured these rights than ever before.

We are working today, in unity, to invest the benefits of our vast wealth and technology for human needs. Our goal is a quality of life—quality in education, in medical care, in our social and political institutions, in our great cities and in our rural communities. And we are striving for such qualities at a time of unprecedented prosperity and economic growth.

President Roosevelt awakened the Nation's social conscience during the difficult days of the great depression. President Johnson has prodded our conscience during these golden years of prosperity. For he knows, indeed, history has proven, that a democratic government is worthy of popular support only when it meets its obligations to all of its people.

I believe that the American people, regardless of party affiliation, can be proud of what we have accomplished in the past 5 years.

President Roosevelt was the great inspiration for much that we are doing today. His place in history is assured. And President Johnson's place is assured through his dedication to civil rights, education, and eliminating poverty.

And so, as we sadly acknowledge the passing of a beloved President 22 years ago, we are also comforted by the fact that all that he stood for and, all that he taught us, is alive and vital and significant today.

I think we can be hopeful about the future. As President Roosevelt observed, in a speech he was to have delivered on April 13, 1945:

> The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

President Johnson has made this commitment to our American tomorrow. And so have the American people.

OUR FOOD

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the National Limestone Institute has re-

cently put out a press release on "Our Food" which compresses many unappreciated facts about our food supply into a comparatively few words; the misapprehensions about grocery bills, the true cost of food, inadequate farm income, and a few other things.

Without adding more words, I ask unanimous consent to put the release in the RECORD to speak for itself.

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

[A National Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C., news release]

OUR FOOD

Frequently one hears complaints about the cost of food in the marketplace. When the housewife goes to the supermarket, she can get an assortment of items which cannot be classified as groceries or food. These items include: alcoholic beverages, auto accessories, clothes, electrical appliances, fertilizer (including lime), furniture, pesticides, photographic equipment and supplies, power tools, seeds, shrubbery and many other items too numerous to mention. Despite the items in the shoppers' basket, every item is fixed in the shoppers' mind as groceries.

The following figures show that the percent of disposable income spent for food is at an all-time low:

Year	Disposable income	Total expenditures	Expenditures for food	Percent of personal disposable income
1947	$1,179	$1,115	$303	25.7
1957	1,801	1,643	373	20.7
1966	2,568	2,363	464	18.1

In the last issue of "National Food Situation" published by the USDA, there is a table comparing "Expenditures for food as a proportion of private consumption figures by countries in 1964." The five lowest and five highest are:

Country:	*Percent*
United States	19.8
Canada	21.5
Denmark	22.0
Australia	22.4
Puerto Rico	25.2
Ghana	58.7
Korea, Republic of	58.5
China, (Taiwan)	50.8
Ceylon	50.0
Vietnam	48.2

These figures show that the consumer in this country was paying less for food in 1964 in comparison to total expenditures than in any other nation, and we, undoubtedly, have more built in *main service charges* in the prices than any other nation. On the other hand, prices received by farmers are only 74% of parity. In 1947, corn sold for $2.16 a bushel, wheat sold for $2.29 a bushel, beef cattle sold for $22.20 per cwt. Now corn is $1.26 per bushel. Last year wheat averaged $2.14 and beef cattle $21.60. The farmer gets ½ cent for the wheat in a loaf of bread, 24 cents for the cotton in a $4.38 shirt and only 25 cents a lb. on beef that sells at 85 cents at the market.

Although per capita disposable personal income of the farm population reached a high of $1,731 in 1966, this is only 66% of the $2,618 average for the non-farm people.

Since the consumer is being subsidized by the farmer, it behooves everyone to take a personal interest in conserving the soil for future generations. One of the programs meriting the support of all is the Agricultural Conservation Program which stimulates the carrying out of conservation practices on the farms by sharing in the cost of specified and approved practices. And yet, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended that this program be cut from $220 million to $100 million exclusive of administrative expenses of $30 million. In view of these facts, isn't this proposed reduction shortsighted to our future growth and needs?

DEATH OF JOHN C. O'BRIEN, CHIEF OF WASHINGTON BUREAU, PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "John C. O'Brien Dies; Chief of Inquirer's Washington Bureau," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Tuesday, April 11, 1967.

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

JOHN C. O'BRIEN DIES—CHIEF OF INQUIRER'S WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON, April 10.—John C. O'Brien, chief of the Washington bureau of the Philadelphia Inquirer, died Monday at Georgetown University Hospital here after a brief illness. He was 72.

Mr. O'Brien covered the news fronts of Washington as correspondent and columnist for more than three decades. His byline appeared in The Inquirer over the top government and political stories of an era that spanned war and peace, boom and bust.

SAW CAPITAL CHANGE

Arriving here in 1935 as White House correspondent, he saw Washington change from a small town astir with the ferment of the New Deal to the capital of a great world Power, and he reported many of the stories of that transition.

Mr. O'Brien covered the Administrations of five Presidents and enjoyed the distinction of having had the longest association of any Washington newsman with Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He began covering Mr. Roosevelt when he was Governor of New York.

Mr. O'Brien was with the New York Herald Tribune when first assigned to Washington, and in 1939 he joined the staff of the Washington bureau of The Inquirer. He continued as The Inquirer's man at the White House after becoming bureau chief in 1944.

LAUNCHED COLUMN

"Washington Background," a regular column, made its first appearance under Mr. O'Brien's byline in 1941. He wrote the column on a daily and, later, on a thrice weekly basis until his final illness.

Mr. O'Brien covered every political convention of both political parties since 1932 and was on a first-name basis with many of the best-known political figures of the period.

PROLIFIC WRITER

Shortly before America's entry into the Second World War he went to Great Britain to write about the Battle of Britain. The British Embassy here never forgot. His name appeared regularly on the guest list of embassy functions.

A prolific writer, Mr. O'Brien contributed articles to magazines and wrote a regular column for the News Service of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The column was carried by a number of Catholic weeklies around the country.

In 1944, the year he became Inquirer bureau chief, Mr. O'Brien was elected to membership in the Gridiron Club, an association of 50 of Washington's leading newspapermen, famous for their annual "roasting" of public figures at a private dinner. He became president of the Gridiron Club in 1960.

Mr. O'Brien also was a veteran member and past president of the National Press Club and was chairman of the board of directors of the National Press Building Corp.

BORN IN HARTFORD

He was a member of the Overseas Writers Club of Washington, the White House Correspondents Association, Sigma Delta Chi, Lambda Chi Alpha and the Silurian Club of New York. He was a commander of the Order of the Southern Cross of Brazil.

Mr. O'Brien was born Aug. 5, 1894, in Hartford, Conn., and received a bachelor's degree from Clark University, of Worcester, Mass., in 1914, and a master's degree from the same institution the following year.

After a year of advanced study at the School of Fine Arts of Yale University, Mr. O'Brien enlisted in the Navy, serving as a hospital apprentice in the First World War.

A teaching career beckoned briefly, but after several semesters of lecturing high school botany classes in Denver, Colo., Mr. O'Brien gave up what seemed, in his words, a fruitless effort of "trying to keep three days ahead of my students." In 1920 he went to work for the Rocky Mountain News as a $15 a week reporter on the "hotel" beat.

WORKED IN DENVER

Mr. O'Brien worked on the News and the Denver Post before joining the New York World in 1925 for a four-year stint that included coverage of Jimmy Walker, the flamboyant Mayor of New York in the Roaring Twenties.

Mr. O'Brien went over to the New York Herald Tribune in 1929 as that newspaper's legislative correspondent in Albany, and it was then that his association with Mr. Roosevelt began.

Survivors include his wife, the former Eveline Rydell; two sons, John Dennis, a public relations executive in Chicago, and Dr. Hugh R., of Miami, Fla.; a daughter, Mrs. Rene E. Laurencot, of La Canada, Calif.; a brother, Dr. George O'Brien, of Chicago, and 11 grandchildren.

RITES THURSDAY

A Requiem Mass will be sung at 10 A.M. Thursday in the Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament, 6001 Western ave., N.W., Washington, and burial will be in Gate of Heaven Cemetery, Silver Spring, Md.

The body will be in state on Wednesday from 2 to 4 P.M. and from 7 to 9 P.M. at the funeral home of Joseph Gawler and Sons, Wisconsin ave. and Harrison st., N.W., Washington.

Contributions in Mr. O'Brien's memory may be sent to Children's Hospital, Washington.

THE BOMBING OF VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a reminder of the very high cost we are paying in pilots and planes for the bombing of Vietnam is provided by a news story in the Washington Post of April 5.

From the very beginning, I have had grave reservations about our use of bombers in this guerrilla war. I think it has helped us very little militarily while damaging our political and moral position in the world. In my judgment, it has triggered a greater war effort on the part of the North Vietnamese and has greatly increased the risk of involving the Soviet Union and China in what began as a localized conflict.

I believe that each day we continue the bombing pushes the possibility of a peace settlement further away, while inviting greater reprisals on the ground against our soldiers in the field.

Today's news tells us that we have now lost our 500th airplane over North

Vietnam since the air campaign began on February 7, 1965. We have also lost 390 pilots in North Vietnam. The estimated cost of the downed aircraft is $1 billion, and the financial cost of training and equipping the lost pilots is over $300 million.

In South Vietnam, we have lost 162 airplanes and over 300 helicopters.

Thus, our combined plane and helicopter loss in North and South Vietnam now stands at approximately 1,000 aircraft.

This is an enormous expenditure of costly military equipment, plus the incalculably greater loss of our finest pilots. Many of our most knowledgeable observers are reported to be strenuously arguing that the loss to us is much greater than any damage we have done to the other side by our bombardment.

I ask unanimous consent that the article on this subject in the Washington Post of April 5 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. AIR RAIDS ON NORTH HEAVIEST IN 5 MONTHS

SAIGON, April 4.—U.S. officials announced today that Monday's air raids on North Vietnam were the heaviest since last November. They hinted that clearing weather would see even more planes flying north.

In bombing missions against bridges, storage areas, trucks and barges, an estimated 400 planes flew in 174 missions. A mission includes one or more planes.

FIVE HUNDREDTH PLANE LOST

The record number of missions was on Oct. 14 of last year with 175. On Nov. 4 there were 155.

Another statistic was also announced—loss of the 500th plane to North Vietnamese fire since the air campaign began Feb. 7, 1965. The pilot was lost to ground fire Sunday. Up to 390 are now killed, captured or missing, according to statistics quoted by Associated Press.

AP estimated the cost of the downed aircraft at $1 billion and the cost of training and equipping the pilots at over $300 million.

Of the 500 planes downed in combat in the North, 10 were destroyed by Mig interceptors and 30 to 40 by Soviet-supplied SAM missiles, AP said. The rest were lost to conventional groundfire.

Most of the planes carry one or two crew members. About 500 of them have been rescued.

AP reported renewed debate in Saigon over the worthiness of the targets in relation to losses. In addition to the plane and pilot costs, bombs, rockets and missiles are expended at a monthly average of 50,000 tons, it said.

Official figures say the bombs destroyed or damaged 5000 bridges, 3000 railroad cars, 7000 trucks, and 5000 barges.

The critics say damage is quickly repaired and trucks are replaced.

Over South Vietnam, 162 planes and over 300 helicopters have been lost.

Today planes based in Thailand and aboard aircraft carriers launched dive-bomb attacks on targets just north of the Demilitarized Zone and near the Mugia Pass. Both are used to send men and supplies into South Vietnam.

Meanwhile, today in South Vietnam, Marine jets were reported to have bombed a Vietcong mountain sanctuary with "burrowing blockbusters"—that penetrated 50 feet underground, fused to explode up to 12 hours after impact.

TUNNELED MOUNTAIN

Intelligence reports say the mountain, not specifically located, is honeycombed with tunnels.

One fighter-bomber strike, about 150 miles south of Danang, was off target, and a U.S. Army advisor, four South Vietnamese soldiers and 30 civilians in a sampan were reported hurt. An investigation was underway.

COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ADDS ACTION TO 10 YEARS OF TALK

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, yesterday, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, I called attention to several of the group's notable achievements during the past decade. An informative article in yesterday's Washington Post, "COG Adds Action to 10 Years of Talk," by a reporter who has followed the council's activities since its inception, gives an interesting and more detailed account of the organization's history and development. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

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

"Perhaps to break the ice," the District of Columbia Commissioner began, "it would be well for all of us to know who the other people are . . . Would you rise and state your name and connection?"

This is a normal way to start a meeting of people who don't know each other. But the wonder, at this particular meeting on April 11, 1957—10 years ago tonight—was that Commissioner Robert E. McLaughlin had to ask for such self-introductions.

For one would have assumed that the county board members, city councilmen, legislators, Congressmen and officials of Maryland, Virginia and the District who governed the complex metropolitan area of the Nation's Capital would at least have been on speaking terms.

A few specialists did know each other, of course, such as highway officials who had to make sure their roads joined at the boundaries, and delegates to that noble but ineffectual experiment in metropolitanism, the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

Though it may not have seemed so at the time, the meeting convened by McLaughlin in 1957 was historic. For, a month later, the group reconvened and decided to formalize its existence under the name of Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference.

After that second meeting, I described the new organization as a "communications system . . . lacking any overtones of a supergovernment.

"Its purpose is to disentangle, through roundtable discussions and special studies, some snarled situations of mutual concern."

Today, the most widely heard criticism of the organization, now renamed the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and familiarly called by its acronym, COG, is that it is too much a talking society and not enough of an action agency.

Actually, on the metropolitan scene, COG is where the action is, or may soon be expected.

Its members are 13 Metropolitan Washington jurisdictions including Montgomery County, which for a time pulled out (but prudently continued to send an observer). It is officially recognized by the Federal Government, which adds to the money provided by the member localities. Its staff, nonexistent the first year, has grown to about 50.

COG has deep official involvement in planning as the inheritor of some functions of the now-abolished Regional Planning Council. An affiliate has control of the area's all-important transportation planning program.

The Council also has taken an increasingly active and strong part in such other vital fields as air and water pollution, water supply, regional police cooperation, health and welfare programs and conservation in the Potomac River Basin.

Looking back at 1957, however, the statement of limited purposes reflected the realities of the day. Suburban politicians were unwilling to join any group that seemed to threaten a surrender of local authority to the central city.

As things developed, the rewards to the suburbs for participation in COG have been great and no politicians have paid penalties for their lack of parochialism. For example, former Montgomery County State Senator Edward S. Northrop and ex-Maryland Congressman DeWitt S. Hyde, who were active members, in COG's early years, have gone on to distinguished careers on the bench.

Nonpartisanship has always prevailed within the regional organization. An example was the strong support given McLaughlin, a Republican appointee of President Eisenhower, by Charles K. Fenwick, Arlington's Democratic State Senator.

Fenwick, incidentally, is the sole remaining member of the original active members, and the COG board adopted a resolution last year lauding him as an outstanding metropolitan citizen.

The other day, in his law office on 15th Street nw., McLaughlin reflected on the growth of his decade-old offspring.

"It developed just about as we had anticipated," he said. "There were disappointments along the way. But if we had moved too fast, it would have torn itself apart at the seams. We moved slowly and we got somewhere. I'm very well pleased."

IS WIRETAPPING NECESSARY TO LAW ENFORCEMENT?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, an excellent column in the New York Times recently raised a most important question: Is wiretapping necessary to law enforcement?

The column, written by Tom Wicker, points out that wiretapping is a repugnant invasion of privacy and suggests that its use cannot be justified simply on the basis of its convenience.

I heartily concur with Mr. Wicker and ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 26, 1967]

THE BURDEN ON THE TAPPERS

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—Attorney General Ramsey Clark went to the heart of an important matter in his recent Congressional testimony in favor of the Johnson Administration's antiwiretapping legislation.

"Where," he asked a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, "is the evidence that [wiretapping] is an efficient police technique?"

Where is it, indeed, when the facts suggest, for instance, that there is an organized crime problem in New York City, where wiretapping can be authorized, but that there is no such problem in San Francisco, where wiretapping cannot legally be done?

Those who demand authorization of wiretapping in order to help prevent crime, Mr. Clark was saying, must come forward and make the indisputable case that "bugging"

really is so necessary to efficient law enforcement that its obvious evils are justified.

WHERE THE PROOF LIES

This is a crucial point. In the general national concern about crime, it is all too easy to make the assumption that wiretapping obviously is an effective deterrent to crime, and that, therefore, those who believe it is an unwarranted invasion of privacy should bear the burden of proof.

As Mr. Clark pointed out, this puts the case backward. Without question, wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping are large-scale, scatter-shot invasions of privacy. They may or may not in some circumstances be necessary tools of law enforcement. Therefore, it is not the defenders of privacy who ought to have to prove their case; instead, those who would invade privacy for what they consider a useful social purpose must bear what Mr. Clark rightly called "the heavy burden of proof our values require."

As the Congressional hearings go along, wiretap proponents—like District Attorney Frank Hogan of Manhattan—will have the opportunity to prove the need and to suggest methods of control for authorized wiretapping. The committee and, later, the whole of Congress ought to be adamant in demanding specific evidence, not general statements of opinion.

"Public safety will not be found in wiretapping," Mr. Clark testified.

"Security is to be found in excellence in law enforcement, in courts and in corrections. That excellence has not been demonstrated to include wiretapping."

LACK OF CONVICTIONS NOTED

Senator Howard Cannon of Nevada, concurring, pointed out that when Federal agents "undertook a program of massive wiretapping" in Las Vegas, "not a single conviction" followed. "As far as I am aware," Mr. Cannon said, "no great social good has been accomplished."

Wiretapping proponents, however, can and should point out that whatever evidence might have been obtained in Las Vegas by such means was not admissible in court. How many convictions, what effect on organized crime, might have been had if the findings had been admissible? Only this kind of information can make it clear whether there really is a need for authorized wiretapping and eavesdropping.

That, of course, is a different question entirely from such obvious outrages as the "Infinity Transmitter," an advertisement for which Mr. Cannon read to the committee:

"Would you believe [the ad stated] you can hear whole happenings in a room in Los Angeles when you are in New York? And without anyone being the wiser? You can. It's true, incredible as it sounds." It is true and it is incredible.

The Johnson bill that Mr. Clark and Senator Cannon support not only would provide a comprehensive ban on such vicious eavesdropping devices but also on wiretapping (except in rigidly defined national security cases). It also would clear up the major deficiency in the present law governing wiretapping.

DEFECT IN THE STATUTE

This statute already prohibits "interception and divulgence" of wire communications and provides penalties. The trouble is that in practice an accused person is guilty only if it can be proved that he both intercepted *and* divulged a wire communication. Thus, an eavesdropper can bug telephone lines with virtual impunity so long as it cannot be proved that he has disclosed what he learned. This leaves the way open for businessmen, gamblers, private detectives, government officials—almost anyone—who want to obtain others' secrets solely for their own guidance or benefit.

Under the proposed law, interception alone or divulgence alone would be a crime, thus erecting a real hindrance to some of the most insidious and invisible wiretap practices.

It seems clear that this portion of the proposed statute ought to be enacted, whatever proponents of wiretapping for law enforcement purposes may say. There can be no excuse whatever for bugging not done by authorized law officers under the strictest control and for the most specific purposes.

The only real question is whether crime has become such a menace to society that combating it outweighs the obvious right of the individual to assured privacy. It will not be good enough for those who believe this proposition to show only that authorized wiretapping makes it easier to catch criminals; that could be achieved by abolishing most of the Bill of Rights, too.

The burden that lies on those who advocate authorized wiretapping, rather, is to prove that this repugnant weapon is *necessary*, but merely convenient, to law enforcement.

PROTEST OF ARMS RACE—RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, as the Presidents of the American Republics meet in Punta del Este, to consider the further development of the hemisphere under the Alliance for Progress, we should all hope that at the head of their agenda will be a limit to the arms race in Latin America.

The acquisition of superfluous military armaments by the Latin American republics, as the Senate has many times said, can only impede development and unnecessarily strengthen military establishments which are readily overpredominant.

In January, the National Assembly of the Republic of Panama passed resolutions protesting and deploring this arms race. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[A translation from its original in Spanish]

PANAMA NATIONAL ASSEMBLY,
30th January, 1967.

Considering:

That during the course of the last two years, approximately, various American States have plunged into an armament race;

That lately some American States have acquired more armament than necessary;

That this Assembly recognizes the necessity of each Nation to maintain internal and external security;

That newspaper "El Mundo", of the city of Panama has protested in its editorial, the armament race of the American States;

That it is imperative that this Chamber, utmost expression of the popular feeling of the Republic of Panama, which according to its Constitution and Laws has no army, repudiates the armament spiral of the American States,

Resolves:

To protest the armament race.

To deplore the acquisition by the American States of more armament than necessary.

To reaffirm the pacific devotion of the Republic of Panama,

To send copy of this Resolution, with the customary formal Note, to all Parliaments of the American States.

Given in Panama City, on the 30th day of January, 1967.

(sgd) RAÚL ARANGO, JR.,
The President.
(sgd) ALBERTO ARANGO N.,
The Secretary General.

NEED FOR FOREIGN FARM WORKERS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on March 23, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] indicated in remarks to this body that a spokesman for the Council of California Growers "has declared, there will be hardly any requests for foreign farmworkers in California this year," thereby possibly giving the impression that there will be no need for supplemental workers.

Apparently this misconception has arisen in several places, particularly in an edition of the Los Angeles Times; consequently, I am sure that the Senator accepted the statement of the alleged spokesman in good faith. However, I am just as sure that the Senator is primarily interested in the actual facts; therefore, I shall ask unanimous consent that a portion of the March 20 Newsletter, which is the official organ of the Council of California Growers, be printed in the RECORD to clarify the matter.

In this excerpt, it is clear that the Council of California Growers does, indeed, expect that there will be another critical farm labor shortage in my State this year and, by implication, that foreign laborers will be needed. Under such circumstances, it is only logical for the growers to seek the foreign farmworkers they need and if they do not do so as readily as they have in the past, it is only because their efforts along these lines have been discouraged by the burdensome, unrealistic regulations which the Secretary of Labor has imposed on the seeking of such foreign assistance. Once again, therefore, I invite attention to the unfair and discriminatory wage rates which the Secretary of Labor has inflicted on an already badly harassed farmer.

I ask unanimous consent that the Newsletter item be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Council of California Growers Newsletter, Issue No. 240, Mar. 20, 1967]

COUNCIL PROTESTS EFFORT TO CREATE DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN AGRICULTURE AND GOVERNOR

A completely unjustified conclusion by a Los Angeles Times reporter . . . later copied by a wire service . . . was flatly rejected by the Council in telegrams to Governor Reagan . . . and to the editor of the Times.

Using a telephone conversation as a base . . . the reporter claimed there was disagreement between growers and the Governor over the need for farm workers . . . although nothing in the conversation justified such conclusions. Because of some inquiries from members concerning the circumstances surrounding the story . . . we are reproducing the text of the telegram which went to the

editor of the paper concerned. That message was as follows:

"NICK B. WILLIAMS,
"*Editor, Los Angeles Times*

"We were shocked and deeply disturbed by the headline and lead paragraph of a story by Harry Bernstein in the Thursday, March 9, issue of the Times. There is absolutely no disagreement between the Council of California growers and Governor Reagan over the possibility of a critical farm labor shortage in California this year. The headline, and the lead paragraph, has caused us deep embarrassment and required that the following telegram be sent to Governor Reagan. We would appreciate the Times publishing this telegram to clarify our position for your readers who may have been misled:

" 'The Council of California growers was shocked by the attempt of a Los Angeles Times writer to place California growers in direct conflict with your position on possible farm labor shortages and the recent discriminatory wage criteria proposal issued by Secretary Wirtz. The conclusions drawn in the news article written by Harry Bernstein of the Los Angeles Times on Thursday, March 9, 1967, indicating that growers are in disagreement with your statement on the possibility of a shortage of farm labor were entirely the writer's conclusions. You may be assured that we are in support of your position and fully intend to demand a retraction from the Los Angeles Times. California growers endorse and applaud your support on this vital issue.' "

The telegram to Mr. Williams concluded:

"Should you desire additional details, I will be most happy to discuss this problem . . ." and it was signed by O. W. Fillerup, Executive Vice President, Council of California Growers.

LAND CONDEMNATION CASES UNDER TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, for some years there has been a great deal of discussion throughout the State of Tennessee about appropriate procedures in land condemnation cases, particularly when land is taken under provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. Many persons feel that either party should have the right to demand a jury to determine issues of just compensation.

In this regard, the 85th General Assembly of the State of Tennessee has adopted a resolution, House Joint Resolution 29, and that resolution has been approved by the Governor.

In order that the resolution may be brought to the attention of all Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 29

A resolution petitioning and memorializing the United States Congress to amend Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that either party, in cases involving the condemnation of land by the TVA, may demand a jury to try the issue of just compensation

A resolution petitioning and memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that the issue of just compensation may be tried by a jury in any case involving the condemnation of the real property, by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and that the Congress give consideration to the passage of H.R. 4846, on this subject.

Whereas, The principle of trial by jury is a cherished part of the system of jurisprudence of the American people and has, since the birth of the Republic, been considered as the individual's greatest bulwark of freedom and;

Whereas, In practically every statute providing for the condemnation of private property under the laws of eminent domain, the land owner is entitled to have a jury trial for the determination of the compensation to which the property owner may be entitled for the taking of the land by condemnation proceedings and;

Whereas, The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831x), is unique in that it provides for the taking of land under the powers of eminent domain by the Tennessee Valley Authority without granting to the property owner the safeguard of a jury trial, and in fact prohibits the use of a jury in such cases, and;

Whereas, Under the procedure now in effect under the TVA Act the only appeal is to a three Judge Federal court, or upon waiver to a one Judge federal court, where the case is tried upon the written testimony adduced before the Commissioners appointed under the Act to award damages and;

Whereas, This procedure is expensive and cumbersome and may impose undue hardship and expense upon the property owner, who in many instances may not be able to withstand such expense and;

Whereas, Legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States by H.R. 4846, proposing to amend said Tennessee Valley Authority Act to provide that either party to such condemnation suits may demand a jury; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate concurring, That we reiterate our belief in the principle of trial by jury, and that we memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to give consideration to H.R. 4846, being a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that the issue of just compensation may be tried by a jury in any case involving the condemnation of real property by the Tennessee Valley Authority and; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to enact into legislation a law which will guarantee to the property owner whose land is being taken by condemnation proceedings by the Tennessee Valley Authority the right to trial de novo before a jury, when the demand for a jury is made within the time and in the manner provided by law and; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be furnished to each member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Adopted: March 29, 1967.

_____ _____,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

_____ _____,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved, March 30, 1967.

_____ _____,
Governor.

NELLIE TAYLOE ROSS, FIRST WOMAN GOVERNOR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, my State is known far and wide as the Equality State because of its action, when still a territory, of giving women the franchise. But Wyoming proved itself equal to the task of recognizing the talents and ability of its ladies in a more direct, personal way when, in 1924, it elected a woman as Governor. She was Nellie Tayloe Ross, who resides among us in the District of Columbia today, having retired as Director of the U.S. Mint. She was the first woman Governor, by 5 days, in U.S. history.

Mr. President, the Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia, in its publication News and Views, has paid tribute to Mrs. Ross, calling her "one of America's most remarkable women." We in Wyoming, and we of the Democratic Party in Wyoming, most especially, agree with that assessment. I ask unanimous consent that the article published in News and Views be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From News and Views, February 1967]

The first woman to be elected Governor of a sovereign state . . . to be appointed Director of the United States Mint . . . to have her likeness on a mint medal . . . to have her name appear on the cornerstone of a federal government building was . . . Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross.

Nellie Tayloe Ross was born in St. Joseph, Missouri. Her father, James Tayloe, was a merchant by profession and a gentleman farmer by avocation.

Only months after the turn of the century, while visiting friends in Paris, Tennessee, Miss Nellie Tayloe met a young lawyer named William Bradford Ross, and a year and a half later married him. A year prior to their marriage young lawyer Ross decided to "go West" and carve a career in the colorful capital of Wyoming. Mrs. Ross's arrival in Wyoming was the beginning of her lifetime love for that state and for the city of Cheyenne. She has been quoted as saying, "I am devoted to Wyoming. I love its mountains, forests and plains, its beautiful blue sky—and more than all, the interesting, fine people with whom my fate was so closely linked." The Ross marriage was blessed with four sons, one of whom died in infancy. For some two decades after her marriage, Mrs. Ross's time and energies were devoted to her home, husband, and the raising of their sons. These were probably the happiest years of her life. Despite her significant achievements, she says, "My most important career has been that of wife, mother, and homemaker. No career is as glorious or as satisfying as wifehood and motherhood. It is here woman fulfills her highest destiny."

William Ross became a successful attorney and leader in Democratic politics at a time and in a state where the Democratic party was so hopelessly in the minority. For this reason not many qualified persons were willing to fill its tickets and face probable defeat at the polls. "This fact," Mrs. Ross reflects, "doubtless stimulated my husband's zeal to proclaim emphatically and widely his support of his party's principles and its candidates." Mr. Ross was elected governor of Wyoming in 1922 and served as such until October 4, 1924, when he passed away after a short illness. It was not until after her husband was elected governor that Mrs. Ross became vitally interested in politics and public affairs. During these two years after her husband's election she said, "I behind the scenes aided him in every way I could. On his official trips I often accompanied him over the State which widened my acquaintance. I listened to his speeches with great interest and sanctioned the policies for which he stood." It is not surprising that after the governor's death, the Democrats in a special convention nominated his wife to fill his unexpired term of office. On November 4, 1924, she was elected, and on January 5, 1925, she was inaugurated as the first

woman governor.[1] Concerning the facts leading up to her nomination Mrs. Ross today simply says, "My husband's death occurred the 4th of October, in the middle of his four-year term. The November election was only weeks off. Who first thought of my succeeding him in office and proposed it, I shall never know. It certainly was not I. The Democrats held a special convention. They nominated me. They seemed to realize that he had made me the repository of his confidences, that he had familiarized me with his purposes; also where strength and weakness lay in his official family and who were his most trusted advisors—and I was elected."

Mrs. Ross served as governor until January 3, 1927. A woman and a Democrat in the heart of a masculine Republican stronghold, she fought for two years a courageous uphill fight against all kinds of political pressure, and finally lost the 1926 election to heavily-backed Republican Frank C. Emerson by a slim 1,300 votes in a strong Republican year.

After leaving the governorship she traveled over the United States for several years lecturing on "The Experiences of a Woman Governor." In 1928 she was elected National Vice Chairman of the Democratic Party Organization and took an active part in the campaign of that year. From 1929 to 1932 she was in charge of women's activities for the Democratic Party with offices in Washington, D.C.

On May 1, 1933, Franklin Roosevelt broke precedent by appointing Mrs. Ross as Director of the United States Mint—the first woman ever to hold this position.[2] Running the Mint is truly a "man-sized" job. Manufacturing coins (bills are made by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing) is its biggest function. However, the Mint also buys silver and gold, melts, assays and refines it, stores and protects it (as much as 24 billion dollars at one time), makes coins for foreign countries; produces military and commemorative medals; licenses commercial users of gold and keeps a sharp eye out for gold smugglers. Under her regime as Director many technical improvements took place by long-time employees in the Mint, due in large part to the encouragement she gave to her employees to make utmost use of their brains and skills and imaginations. For instance, two men in the San Francisco plant invented equipment that just about doubled coinage output while utilizing the same machinery. She saved the taxpayers many times her salary with an airwashing system, perfected under her supervision, that reclaimed gold and silver dust from the air of her mints. This and other reclamation measures (like the processing of worn-out clothes, shower-bath drain water and wall and floor sweepings) every year retrieves about $100,000 worth of precious particles that otherwise would vanish in thin air or down the drain.

Typical of the Wyomingite and her approach to her job was the way she handled the first really big inter-mint shipment of gold—five and a half billion dollars worth. Faced with a like responsibility, many a government bureau chief would have loaded the shipment with insurance, used a heavily guarded special train and taken precautions rivaling those of a cross-country presidential tour. Mrs. Ross decided not to spend thousands of taxpayers' dollars. She merely turned to an assistant, said with womanly simplicity, "Oh, let's just mail it parcel post—but don't forget to register it." All mint shipments during her tenure as Director went parcel post, registered, and all without mishap!

Mrs. Ross's tenure as Director of the Mint was completed in May, 1953, after having been appointed for four five-year terms. She is proud that under her regime several women were elevated to positions of high responsibility. She says she votes the Democratic ticket every four years, but every day votes "for the release of the genius and ambition of the individual woman." But she warns, "It behooves a woman to watch her step. We are on probation. It is only by making an example of any of us who may slip that our success can be challenged."

Mrs. Ross is the first woman whose name was engraved on the cornerstone of a federal building. This was the U. S. Gold Depository at Ft. Knox, Ky. which was completed during the early part of April 1936. Her name also appears on the cornerstone of the San Francisco Mint, the Denver Mint, and the U. S. Silver Depository at West Point.

An employee of the Mint who was also there when Mrs. Ross was Director describes her as being proficient to the point of perfection and who was impatient with inefficiency. Her credo was, "We mustn't waste the taxpayers' time or money." He never recalls seeing her lose her temper—any displeasure was voiced in her eyes, which he describes as "haunting" and "Madonnalike." He says that she has always been possessed of an extremely alert mind, and had the ability to grasp the thoughts and expressions of others remarkably quickly. He also noticed that when people first met her they would be awed, probably because she was a rather reserved person and very feminine. However, when she became better acquainted with a person her friendliness and warmth came through. She was a popular Director with the employees because she was always interested in them as individuals rather than just as employees. She is a good conversationalist and is a favorite in the social life of Washington. One of the most delightful of her traits is her wonderful sense of humor, which became evident shortly after becoming Director of the Mint. It seems that many men throughout the country could not accept the fact that a woman had been appointed and before long many, many letters came pouring in requesting her to send them her recipe for mint juleps. Mrs. Ross was amused and in fact secured a good recipe and sent them out.

Mrs. Ross has resided in Washington, D. C. since her retirement, and is still very active in church, charity, and philanthropic activities. Two of her sons are still living. Bradford Ross is an attorney practicing in the District of Columbia, and her son, George, has a real estate business in Warrenton, Virginia. Bradford Ross says his mother is the most tenacious person he has ever known. She is a self-educated person who all her life has been a voracious reader and a devotee of classical music.

WBA is proud indeed to pay tribute to Mrs. Ross, one of America's most remarkable women.

[1] Mrs. Miriam Amanda ("Ma") Ferguson of Texas was elected governor of Texas on the same election day, but was not inaugurated until January 10, 1925, because Texas law provided for a later inauguration than Wyoming law did.

[2] WBA is very proud that the second woman to hold this position is one of our members, Miss Eva B. Adams, who became Director in October 1961 and is still serving.

THE OAHE IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, South Dakota's good neighbors on the north, the citizens of North Dakota, have recently expressed their support of the Oahe irrigation project in my State through their State water commission.

I have thanked Governor Guy of North Dakota, chairman of the commission, and all of its members, for this thoughtful action. It is typical of the great neighborliness of prairie citizens who have, since they settled the semiarid and arid plains area, cooperated closely with each other to overcome the handicaps of aridity and make the Great Plains a productive area and source of national strength.

The great Garrison project in North Dakota, and the Oahe project in South Dakota, are going to go a long way toward realizing the hopes of three or four generations of Dakota plainsmen.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to put the North Dakota State Water Commission resolution on the Oahe project in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 67-3-235

(Adopted by the North Dakota State Water Commission, First Stage, Oahe Unit, James Division, Missouri River Basin Project)

Whereas, construction by the Federal Government of the four dams on Missouri River in South Dakota—Gavins Point, Fort Randall, Big Bend, and Oahe—has resulted in the loss to the State of over half a million acres of valuable agricultural land required for the projects, which loss can be partially mitigated through the irrigation development authorized by the Congress as a part of the Missouri River Basin Project in the Flood Control Act of 1944; and

Whereas, proposed legislation pending in Congress—H.R. 27 and 1163, and S. 6—would authorize the Secretary of the Interior "to construct, operate and maintain . . . the first stage of the Oahe unit, James division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, for the principal purposes of furnishing a surface irrigation water supply for approximately 190,000 acres of land, furnishing water for municipal and industrial uses, controlling floods, enhancing the generation of power, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, and enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities, and other purposes"; and

Whereas, the unit report and legislative measures have been developed through exhaustive studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation, South Dakota's congressional delegation, and affected local interests, and all have determined the unit to be engineeringly sound and economically feasible, and a development that will bring many benefits to South Dakota, the region, and the Nation through the balanced and stabilized economy in the area and other benefits which it will provide; and

Whereas, North Dakota as the upstream border state has a common interest with its sister state in the regional economy of the two-state area; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota State Water Commission, meeting in regular session in its office in the State Capitol, Bismarck, North Dakota, March 23, 1967, That it strongly favors and supports the proposed Oahe unit, initial stage, development and does hereby most respectfully urge the Congress to consider and take favorable action upon the aforesaid legislative bills at the earliest practicable date; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be and he is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Honorable Nils A. Boe, Governor of South Dakota; U.S. Senators Karl E. Mundt, George McGovern, Milton R. Young, and Quentin N. Burdick, and U.S. Representatives E. Y. Berry, Ben Reifel, Mark Andrews, and Thomas S. Kleppe; Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary, Honorable Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, and Honorable Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

For the North Dakota State Water Commission:

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor, Chairman.

Attest:

MILO W. HOISVEEN,
Chief Engineer-Secretary, State Engineer.

UNFORTUNATE INJECTION OF VIETNAM ISSUE INTO CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the attempts to inject the Vietnam issue into the civil rights movement in America is unfortunate. It confuses issues that should not be related. It splits the Negro people. And it causes others who support the fight for increased civil rights grave problems, as well. Indeed, as columnist William S. White has written, the recent resounding victory of Mayor Richard Daley, or Chicago, is living proof that the civil rights movement can be carried too far.

One way in which it can be carried too far is by its injecting Vietnam into it, for Vietnam is, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has said, a national obligation which could know no color line. Mr. White's column, published in yesterday's Washington Post, strongly illuminates this issue. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1967]

REBUFF TO DR. KING—DALEY LANDSLIDE REBUKES EXTREMISM

(By William S. White)

Profound shifts in the centers of power within the civil rights movement are occurring in the wake of Dr. Martin Luther King's decision to go all the way in his bid for the favor of Negro extremism.

Dr. King's savage denunciation of American motives in Vietnam has done more than to transport him finally and fatefully into the far left wing of the civil rights struggle. It has caused an instinctive rallying of moderate Negro forces toward such men as Sen. Edward Brooke, Republican of Massachusetts, a recent convert to the necessity of the American position in Vietnam, and Roy Wilkins, the veteran and highly responsible chief of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Perhaps more importantly in the long run, the King manifesto—which proposed a boycott of the war stopping just sort of sedition—has caused a great fallout in purely political terms.

For he spoke just as the election returns in Chicago were giving to the country's last old-time boss, Mayor Richard J. Daley, the greatest victory of his long political life. Mayor Daley's obvious liberalism on race matters for two decades had been a byword until the King wing set out to attempt his destruction because he had refused impossible Negro demands. In the face of this form of attack Daley won 73 per cent of Chicago's vote for his fourth term.

That this was an instance of a white backlash was obvious. For example Dick Gregory, a Negro anti-Vietnam war extremist, received about one per cent of the city's vote. Less obvious than the white backlash is the accompanying fact that what happened in Chicago has stirred and frightened the reasonable Negro spokesmen. They are aware that it is the handwriting on the wall, a grave warning that even the most liberal of white politicians can be pushed too far and abused too often by all-or-nothing Negro pressures.

Most of all, the message of Chicago is that the injection of anti-Vietnam war propaganda into the campaign for civil rights is not only inflaming the white community but is harshly dividing American Negroes as well.

A recognition of this reality undoubtedly was one of the motivating forces in the recent and moving public reversal of position on Vietnam by Edward Brooke, the first Negro Senator since Reconstruction. Brooke, in fact, anticipated Dr. King's bitter attack upon the United States by saying simply that the war of resistance in Vietnam was a national obligation which could know no color line.

The attempted perversion of the civil rights movement by pro-Communists, Communist sympathizers, and honest but deluded pacifists alike has already brought legislative reformers to a dead stop in Congress.

Indeed, as matters now stand it is as good as certain that regardless of the outcome of the 1968 presidential or congressional elections, there is hardly a ghost of a chance for any additional civil rights legislation either in the present Congress or in the Congress to be elected in November, 1968.

In this frame of reference, Mayor Daley's victory in Chicago has implications running far beyond that city. For Daley, as a Democratic politician heavily dependent in the end upon minority group support, has clearly shown that the great bulk of the minority groups—and specifically the Negro group—simply will not follow excessively violent Negro leadership.

In a word, this ostensibly local election established beyond further doubt that there is no future in this country for politicians or ideological leaders who attempt to divide the races for doctrinal ends.

Dr. King has now destroyed the capacity he once clearly had for national leadership of the Negro movement. He has isolated himself within a small hard core of Negro extremism which the great majority of the Negroes themselves are rejecting.

PRIVACY AND INFORMATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently, the Federal Aviation Agency informed me of certain changes in their policies dealing with the release of information from the Agency's airman records. The FAA informed me that although they are still releasing information pertaining to name and address, current certificates and ratings, class of medical certificate, date of certificates and ratings, and date of medical examination, they will no longer release information on sex and date of birth. I have been informed that the medical certificate contains no medical information which might invade the privacy of the airman.

This new policy appears to draw a proper balance between the protection of individual privacy and the release of information which the public has a need and a right to know. The FAA is to be commended for this policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter and supporting material from Mr. D. D. Thomas, Acting Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, explaining this policy.

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

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1967.

Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The review of Federal Aviation Agency policy and practice on the release of information from the Agency's airman records, referred to in our letter of February 6, 1967, has been completed.

The Federal Aviation Agency and its predecessor, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, have long considered it permissible to release information about licensees or certificate holders. These licenses or certificates attest to the ability of airmen and others to meet safety standards. Since their issuance is the product of the regulatory process, the Agency has considered them properly to be in the category of public records.

An exception has always been made, however, in that information is not released concerning medical examinations, allegations of violations while they are being investigated, and scores attained on written examinations. Similarly, information contained on applications is not released, since we believe that certain information that applicants are required to submit for the Agency's use in determining qualifications for certification is personal in character. We have always considered it exempt from disclosure, and this position now proves to be consistent with the exemption prescribed in Section 3(e)(6) of the amendment to the Administrative Procedure Act of last year (PL 89-487).

As a result of our review in accordance with your request, we will discontinue release of information on sex and date of birth and will limit information which can be released to: name and address, current certificates and ratings, class of medical certificate, date of certificates and ratings, class of medical certificate, date of medical examination (which determines the expiration date of the medical certificate), and the numbers of the certificates. We should explain that the medical certificate contains no medical information other than the class of medical certificate which relates to the airmen's rating and level of qualification, and attests that his qualification is current since medical reexaminations are required periodically.

Further, copies of applications, certificates and other documents will be released only when individual airmen expressly request their release.

We hope to have these changes effective operationally by April 1.

We believe the modification of these release policies as a result of our recent review is consistent with the purposes of the Federal Aviation Act. We will also, of course, continue to withhold release of information described in Section 1104, which contains the only prohibition against release found in the Act. No information will be released which is covered by any exemption in the recent amendment to the Administrative Procedure Act.

The Agency is not in the business of "selling" lists, as such. It merely makes a charge for the service involved in providing information available in its public records, when there is no statutory or other basis for withholding the release of such information. This charge is required by law, 65 Stat. 290, formerly 5 U.S.C. 140, and Bureau of the Budget Circulars.

We believe our amended policies represent a sound balance between the public's right of access to information found in public records with the individual's right to be secure from a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Thank you for calling this matter to our

attention. The specific information you requested is enclosed.

Sincerely,

D. D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator.

RELEASE OF AIRMAN LISTS FROM FAA RECORDS

(Activity from July through December 1966)

1. *State Listings.* These are computer printout lists of all airmen within a state.

a. Number of lists distributed: 170.

b. Number of organizations obtaining state lists: 56.

c. Representative organizations obtaining lists:

(1) State and Federal Government agencies. (6)

(2) Oklahoma University Research Institute.

(3) Russell White Products.

(4) Avion Aids Company.

(5) Richmond Aviation, Incorporated.

(6) Private Pilot Magazine.

(7) Air Transport Specialists, Incorporated.

2. *Airmen Certificates Processed Listings.* These are computer printout lists of all airmen certificate actions processed during the previous week.

a. Number of lists distributed each week: 9.

b. Organizations obtaining lists:

(1) Cessna Aircraft Company.

(2) Hooper Holmes Bureau, Incorporated.

(3) Insured Aircraft Title Service.

(4) Pilots International Association.

(5) Retail Credit Corporation.

(6) American Service Bureau.

(7) Aircraft Owners' and Pilots Association.

(8) Charles O. Finley and Company, Incorporated.

(9) W. A. Storing and Company.

3. *Complete U.S. Airmen Listings.* This is a listing of all airmen in the United States furnished on magnetic tape.

a. Number of lists distributed: 5.

b. Organizations obtaining lists:

(1) Aircraft Owners' and Pilots Association.

(2) Pilots International Association.

(3) Encyclopedia Brittanica.

(4) Charles O. Finley and Company, Incorporated.

(5) Hank Smith Associates.

4. *Charges for lists.* There were $10,727.99 collected in user charges for the cost of preparing the above lists. All receipts were returned to the Treasury Department general fund.

FURTHER EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR A FEDERAL LAW PROHIBITING AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has completed its open hearings on the bills to prohibit arbitrary age discrimination in employment introduced by myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. It is my hope that an effective bill will soon be reported by the committee.

Mr. William M. Freeman has written an interesting and informative article for the New York Times on the subject of age discrimination. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

In addition, Mr. George A. Whittington, the editor of Research/Development magazine, in an editorial published in the February 1967 issue, has clearly, succinctly and forcefully stated the case for legislation prohibiting age discrimination in employment. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Whittington's editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1967]

PARADOX IN JOBS: AGE HOLDS A KEY—WORKER OVERSUPPLY IS NOTED DESPITE MANY OPENINGS

(By William M. Freeman)

There is a great shortage of men and women to fill a large number of job vacancies.

There is a large oversupply of men and women available to fill the vacant positions.

Both statements are true.

Scores of mergers and acquisitions every day combine two companies into one, and a president is out of a job, since only one president is needed. Or if the president continues to direct the acquired company as a subsidiary, a controller is out of a job, since only one controller is needed.

A company automates an operation, and a plant superintendent is out of a job.

A top executive dies, and a confidential assistant is out on the street.

AGE IS THE KEY

It is men and women like these who are looking for jobs, and it is precisely these jobs that are vacant in other companies.

The big reason the paradox exists—jobs looking for workers, and workers looking for jobs—is one of age.

Companies want youth (at a lower salary and lower fringe-benefit costs such as insurance) at the expense of experience, while the workers seeking jobs have greater responsibilities, in general, and therefore require a larger salary than the newcomers.

It is a paradox to which President Johnson has addressed himself. In two recent messages on the State of the Union and the annual message to Congress he called attention to discrimination in hiring on account of age and urged that employers avoid this pitfall.

While there are laws in some states forbidding such discrimination, there are many ways of declining to hire a specific individual without giving the true reason.

It is not correct to say that all employers want the younger man or man with relatively less experience. Such an important advertising agency as Deutsch & Shea, Inc., which regularly assesses employment trends in the nation, recently placed a full-page advertisement headed with these words:

"Over 45? Don't Call Us. We'll Call You!"

EXPERIENCE WANTED

The text of the advertisement said that experienced men and women were wanted. There have been many other ads in which business concerns pleaded for experienced and skilled help, but when the showdown comes the employer more often than not chooses the younger man at a lower salary.

Deutsch & Shea reported last week that its engineer-scientist demand index stood at 170.7 on a seasonally adjusted basis (190.0 on an unadjusted basis), a rise of 17.0, or 11.1 per cent, from the December level. While this increase is normal for the December-to-January change, it still is far above the base figure of 100, the 1961 level.

The agency commented that while the data confirmed earlier predictions that demand for technical personnel would remain at a fairly high level in 1967, it might not reach the high levels recorded in 1966.

Weterrings & Agnew, Inc., a professional placement specialist organization in Rochester, took full-page space to detail the advantages of living in Rochester, with high income, close-in suburban living, fine schools and shopping and other inducements.

With this went a long list of concerns—from Bausch & Lomb through Eastman Kodak Company to Xerox—interested in seeking workers.

No mention was made of an age requirement and, in fact, the copy went on to say that jobs were open "at all levels, from junior positions for recent college graduates to senior professional and management levels."

RECRUITERS COMING

Career Center, a New York employment organization, took large space to say that "41 major employers are on their way to New York to find the men they desperately need"—chiefly engineers, scientists and computer programers.

Recruiting will reach a new peak at the coming convention of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers at the New York Coliseum. In an effort, presumably, to get a jump on competitors for talent, Warner, Bicking & Fenwick, Inc., of this city is using a humorous approach, poking fun at what it calls the "the great résumé hoax."

It asks engineers to fill in a résumé data sheet for "a technical man of your choosing—a failure or a genius, famous or unrecognized, dead or alive." Certain facts, chiefly the name and the age, are omitted to avoid giving away the show. The organization asks if Thomas A. Edison or the young Albert Einstein would be considered misfits, or would "big industry recognize their genius from the start?"

[From Research/Development February 1967]

EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

Myths to miss by—Scientific management has been with us more than 50 years, to date from the organization of the first professional society dedicated to advancing management as a field. In that half century, the arts of "getting things done through others" have been greatly enriched by the work of many outstandingly competent men and women. Today's literature of the field contains useful information on organization, administration, control, economics and, as well, systems concepts and applications, computerology, interpersonal relationships at all levels of the organizational hierarchy, many other key subjects. But I do think that at least one other important subject has been neglected: *mythology*. Myths held in positions of power—misconceptions, false premises, unsound reasoning on any basis—are more influential and cruel, of course, than those honored in error by people in general. And managerial mythology can be nationally wasteful, costly, and socially destructive.

Official attitudes toward age are a great example. Our national foolishness about the calendar and the rights of the individual was dramatized last month by an advertising agency, which bought advertising space in *The New York Times* and the Saturday Review for the purpose. Perhaps you passed over one of the ads in reading. Perhaps you noticed the headline: *Over 45? Don't call us. We'll call you.* Behind the "brush off" phrases is a situation that should concern even those of us who are comfortably wired-into a good pension plan: one million unemployed job seekers are unable to find employment *primarily* because they are more than 45 years old.

Opportunity for obsolescence. Department of Labor studies provide information that can easily be termed more than informative; even persons under 45, even scientists and engineers in a bullish employment market, might feel amazement, dismay, fright, fury, or all those emotions at the revealing statistics. More than half (almost 3 out of every 5) employers have age limitations in hiring, which are applied wtihout consideration of any other qualifications; 40% of all Americans who work are 45 or over, but only 8.6% of new hires last year were in that age group.

Facts and fictions in this case clearly illustrate that modern managers are behaving illogically—even unintelligently—toward older working persons. Middle-aged employed individuals are said to be particularly valuable because of their experience, maturity, and stability; the same individuals, when applying for employment, are turned away because of their age alone. The one million over-45 unemployed mentioned above *remained that way,* out-of-work, *all year!* Supposedly, it costs more to hire older workers, they are more often absent, they "can't keep up the pace," they are "old dogs who can't learn new tricks." Not so, according to the Department of Labor, as quoted in the advertisement. Its studies show that there is no higher cost involved in adding an older person to payroll, the number of working days lost decreases with age, older persons compare favorably with their juniors in adaptability and in stamina.

This foolishness is expensive, too. In unemployment compensation and lost production, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has estimated, the country "spends" at least $4 billion annually. Worse—far worse—we could follow such policies to the great detriment of our technological future; while we waste experienced minds, the nature of jobs is changing toward increasing emphasis on mental, not physical performance. Perhaps it's time to question a general management attitude as poor judgment, deeply though it is enshrined in red tape. Perhaps staggering national wastes in productive power and human values is too high a price to pay for medical, hospital, and retirement plans based on outdated actuarial tables. One thing is certain, the soundness of today's personnel policies for the over-45 is a *Myth to Miss By.*

GEORGE A. WHITTINGTON,
Editor.

THE CONTINUING APPEAL OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in our current preoccupation with the war in Vietnam, we sometimes tend to forget that we are quietly balancing the ledger in many other parts of the world. I am speaking about the Peace Corps, which is deep in the business of peace in 52 developing countries overseas.

Peace Corps volunteers—and today more than 13,000 are serving in schools and on farms in southeast Asia and India, in city slums in Latin America, on desert wastelands in Africa—are winning small daily battles against poverty, ignorance, disease, and other elements that nurture war.

We should not lose sight of the fact that we are waging peace. It is a slow process, sometimes too slow to be comfortable in our world of action. But more than 27,000 Americans have found deep satisfaction in pausing for 2 years to make their individual contribution to the cause. My own State of Maryland has contributed more than 400 volunteers to this magnificent effort.

Peace Corps Director Jack Vaughn, when questioned in a recent television interview about the continuing appeal of the Peace Corps, pointed out that applications are running at a rate perhaps seven times that of 1962, the initial period of excitement and glamor and emotion over the idea of the Peace Corps. Mr. Vaughn also pointed out that the Peace Corps is looking for a steady growth in the percentage of talented, sensitive Americans who will enter the Peace Corps. Peace Corps also anticipates continuing requests for help from other developing countries.

I am sure that Mr. Vaughn's remarks about the goals of the Peace Corps will interest all Senators. I therefore ask for unanimous consent that the transcript be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From "Opinion: Washington," WTTG, Channel 5, Mar. 12, 1967]

OPINION: WASHINGTON—A METROMEDIA-WTTG PRESENTATION

Executive producer, Mark Evans.
Producer, Florence Lowe.
Director, Charles Horich.

Guest: Jack Hood Vaughn, director, Peace Corps.

Interviewed by: Pye Chamberlayne, Metromedia News (guest host in the absence of Mark Evans), Marianne Means, King Features.

This program is broadcast on all Metromedia radio and television stations and the Eastern Educational Television network. It is also broadcast by the Armed Forces radio network.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. Mr. Vaughn, has the war in Viet Nam hurt the efforts of the Peace Corps?

JACK VAUGHN. I don't believe so. I believe just the opposite. I think the war in Viet Nam dramatizes the need for more Peace Corps-type efforts, for more preventive medicine of the type that the Peace Corps specializes in.

MARIANNE MEANS. Mr. Vaughn, if as you say there's no question that the war could have hurt the Peace Corps. What would prompt such a charge then? There must be some feeling among some Peace Corps members?

JACK VAUGHN. There is indeed . . . but you must remember that we stress to Peace Corps volunteers the need to communicate better with each other and with their hosts abroad. And this isn't the first petition letter we've had. I receive them almost weekly on all topics. And the fact that 800 former Peace Corp volunteers, which would be 6 or 7 percent of those who have come back from Peace Corps service, would take this position responsibly, soberly on Viet Nam is not surprising. We encourage them to stand up and be counted responsibly. They do this all the time. So this is just one segment of the former Peace Corps volunteers expressing themselves.

MARIANNE MEANS. Did you have a feeling that this was a spontaneous expression, and that some Peace Corps members just started circulating a petition? Or did you feel that there were some outside influence, maybe some anti-Vietnam group that started it.

JACK VAUGHN. I would say at best it was only partly spontaneous. I think it's clear that there was a small group, or perhaps one individual who started the campaign and tried to collect as many signatures as possible.

MARIANNE MEANS. You do not feel that it hurts the Peace Corps domestically in this country to get involved in, well, Viet Nam is among other things a political question? To express views on something like this? Don't you think that sort of involves the Peace Corps in politics in a way that maybe it should not be?

JACK VAUGHN. I don't believe so. I view the issue there as broader than just a U.S. domestic political issue. I think it's the issue of war and peace. It brings into stark relief the need to find better ways of seeking peace and avoiding war. And this is what the Peace Corps is all about. It's a long range strategic effort to help eliminate the causes of war.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. What about the effect of the war on countries where the government is distinctly opposed to the American efforts? For example, in Guinea, you recently had trouble there, when asked to leave. Could that not be related to the Viet Nam war in part?

JACK VAUGHN. As I read what happened there it was in no way related to the war in Viet Nam. It was a series of domestic political issues and crises in Guinea, a certain misunderstanding and, in my interpretation, the Peace Corps was caught in a political crossfire of misunderstandings and we were asked to leave. This is not the first time this has happened, either, and we left with tears and gratitude for having had a great experience there. We hope to be invited back.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. The draft, I would think, is taking some of your best Peace Corps prospects. I think you commented that sometimes they even take Peacecorpsmen who are on assignments overseas.

JACK VAUGHN. Yes, we have had six volunteers returned to the United States to be drafted. One flunked his physical and was sent back to his country. You see, we take physically handicapped people, and we have blind volunteers, and they are some of our best. But there has been a problem, especially in regard to the volunteer applicant who faces two years of military service. When he adds this to two years of Peace Corps service that four year slice out of his life seems a long time to some. In other cases they give four years willingly.

MARIANNE MEANS. One of the proposals that was being discussed when they were talking about changing the draft was that perhaps two years in the Peace Corps might be substituted. Would you think that this would be a good idea? Would you favor that?

JACK VAUGHN. I selfishly am rather intrigued by this idea, although I recall that President Kennedy at the outset commented that he thought perhaps three years of Peace Corps work should be equated with two years of military service. I like that idea very much.

MARIANNE MEANS. The President's new draft proposals however should hurt the Peace Corps, should it not? There's no exception in it for graduate students or Peacecorpsmen as there was under the old provision, is there?

JACK VAUGHN. I feel that in the existing and previous draft arrangements the Peace Corps was not really hurt. We missed getting a few of the fine people we wanted. But I would say the Peace Corps was relatively unaffected by the draft. And is, today, under the new proposal where the draftee in the main will be nineteen year olds. I don't believe that this would hurt the Peace Corps because we in fact take very few nineteen year olds. They are eligible for Peace Corps service but usually they do not have the experience, the skills, the educational background that we seek.

MARIANNE MEANS. Are the kids losing interests in the Peace Corps? Is the rate of applicants as high as they were in the beginning in the first early days when it was so romantic for the students to apply?

JACK VAUGHN. It's still romantic. And one of the big successes, perhaps the biggest, is the fact that today applications are running at a rate perhaps seven times the rate of 1962, during th period of excitement and glamor and emotion and President Kennedy. We expect to have 60,000 applications this year out of which we will take perhaps 13,000.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. In the final analysis, how many do you take for training?

JACK VAUGHN. We take about one out of five applications and approximately three out of four successfully complete training and go overseas. About seven percent return early.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. We think of the Peace

Corps as being something for extremely young people. We were talking about 19, 20, and 22 year olds. That is not really true, is it?

JACK VAUGHN. We have many older people, we have a lady in Ethiopia who has gone back for her second two year tour. She is incidentally writing a thesis to get her Ph.D. on the Role of Women in Ethiopia. She is 75 years old and looks 50 . . . she is really a great gal and we seek older people . . . older retired people . . . retired teachers especially. Retired married couples. In 1962 only 4% of the volunteers were married. And today, over 15% of the volunteers are married couples. We like this, they seem to do better.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. Do you have a need for people who are successful in ordinary high level management positions? You talk about retired people, but do you need other people? Ordinary management types?

JACK VAUGHN. We find that in so many cases in early middle age there are so many commitments, involvements in our own society that it is very hard to break free. There are children to educate and children under 18 years of age, so they just are not available for Peace Corps service. In case they are fed up with suburbia and that second sports car and want to do something really important, some of these people break away and take two years of Peace Corps service. We like that.

MARIANNE MEANS. Mr. Vaughn, the domestic version of the Peace Corps, the VISTA is generally considered not to be a very big success. The applications have been at a low rate. Can the Peace Corps somehow encourage the people that you are not able to take, to do the work in VISTA. Could you help them more?

JACK VAUGHN. We can help them more. I think that VISTA has been highly successful. I still think they are number two. But they have been very successful. We are collaborating with them more and more. As an example, we have just announced a new program for this summer which is being done in conjunction with the VISTA associates program. This is a program where volunteers work for ten weeks during the summer. We are taking five hundred Peace Corps volunteer applicants and placing them as VISTA associates for ten weeks to work in Appalachia, our slum areas, and Indian reservations. We will look at them, help train them, let them see if they are good enough and tough enough to be Peace Corps volunteers. For those who are successful this will be part of their Peace Corps training, and after they graduate next year, they will go overseas as Peace Corps volunteers.

MARIANNE MEANS. It is not true then that VISTA is unsuccessful and will be dropped?

JACK VAUGHN. On the contrary, the number of VISTA volunteers increases yearly. I've had reports from places such as the Virgin Islands, Indian reservations, all over the United States where they are doing spectacularly well.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. How about the report that you might merge with VISTA?

JACK VAUGHN. I think this would be a spectacular event. It would add to the Peace Corps credibility. I think that we could do a better job world-wide. I think that we could save some money. I think that we could teach them something, and I'm sure that we could learn something from them.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. Credibility, why would it help the Peace Corps credibility? I didn't know it needed any help.

JACK VAUGHN. There are still charges that the Peace Corps is not as stated, that is, nonpolitical and there to serve the volunteers' fellow man. We recognize openly now that we have serious problems in our own society, in slum areas and in Appalachia and elsewhere. Volunteer service is needed everywhere, even in the affluent nations. That being the case, the objective being volunteer service, I see no reason why one agency of volunteers could not serve the United States as well as around the world.

MARIANNE MEANS. Speaking of credibility, has the revelation that the CIA has been funding various student groups in foreign countries, don't they suspect that there might be some sort of spying involved, or something?

JACK VAUGHN. I'm afraid there are some suspicions, but they are groundless. As far as I know, the Peace Corps is the only Federal agency that, from the beginning, has taken the position, through Presidential directive, that there will be no involvement of any kind with intelligence agencies. And this has continued since 1961. To give you an idea of how thorough and complete this is, a former Peace Corps volunteer cannot join a U.S. intelligence agency until he has been out of the Peace Corps for five years. That has not happened yet. If a former Peace Corps volunteer has been drafted, he cannot be assigned to military intelligence. It's just hands off and we monitor this very carefully, investigate all rumors and allegations, and to my knowledge and to the knowledge of my colleagues there has been no violation of this prohibition.

MARIANNE MEANS. Mr. Vaughn, I had a feeling you didn't quite answer my question. In spite of all precautions you have taken to avoid this sort of charge, has the airing of all this now hurt the work of the Peace Corps abroad?

JACK VAUGHN. I can't detect any damage at this point. It will be remembered that from the first day of the Peace Corps the Communist international radio has claimed that Peace Corps volunteers were CIA spys, and this lie has been told now for six years. It's a big lie, often told, and there are many people around the world who believe this. So that the kind of exposé we have recently on CIA activities and penetration may give some credence to this charge. But my point is that it's unfounded totally. It has never been the case, and we have been the most vigorous agency in the United States in making sure that this does not happen.

MARIANNE MEANS. Senator McCarthy did say the other day that he felt that it had hurt the Peace Corps badly. He was just talking in a general sense. Had he no specifics in mind?

JACK VAUGHN. We've had no specific report from abroad that this has been detrimental to the Peace Corps or has caused suspicion about our activities.

MARIANNE MEANS. Do you ever conduct surveys, like the polls abroad or something to show whether this would hurt or not?

JACK VAUGHN. We do not have funds for polls. We do certain evaluation and research on our own activities to determine how we can function more effectively. We took a poll last year concerning why college seniors were interested in the Peace Corps, and why some were not. We found a very encouraging thing. Two-thirds of all college seniors in the United States at least give some consideration to joining the Peace Corps.

MARIANNE MEANS. Why were those who were not interested, not interested?

JACK VAUGHN. I think in some cases, it's the parents, especially mothers. They don't feel that they will be making enough money, although after being abroad for two years that $75.00 a month before taxes adds up to about $1500.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. Mr. Vaughn, this is sort of a birthday. The sixth anniversary of the Peace Corps founding. Where is it going from here? What do you see in the future of the Peace Corps?

JACK VAUGHN. I think the fact that the Peace Corps has been able to maintain this freshness and non-bureaucratic approach to solving problems indicates that we can stay fresh and keep our eye on the target of peace. I suspect that we are going to be able to grow gradually. Last year the Peace Corps grew about 12 per cent. And next year, in June '68 there will be 145,000 more college graduates than this year, and we hope to get 3 to 4 per cent of that group. I look for a steady growth, perhaps ten, twelve, or fifteen per cent a year. I look to see the Peace Corps in another four or five countries this year and, perhaps, five or six countries next year. The large increase will be in Africa. We expect to send volunteers for the first time to Gambia and to Lesotho, to Upper Volta, to Dahomey, and we expect to go to two or three more countries. There's a good possibility of going back to Ceylon this year. We were there for two years and we have been in five countries in all. We hope to return to all five.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. In the six years, what have you really done?

JACK VAUGHN. It's such a broad accomplishment, and so important, and so much of the spirit of the individual that it's hard really to summarize. We can talk about technical accomplishments, and very convincingly. For example, looking at the Colombian ETV project, this was a major effort. We have had some four hundred volunteers go through this process, building an educational television program, nationwide, in Colombia, South America. They started from scratch, working from the studio with teachers in the classrooms throughout the country, and today more than a half-million Colombian youngsters are getting educational material, the new math, the new science, at a level that they couldn't have hoped to achieve in fifty years under the normal procedures in growth of their educational system. And in India, where four years ago there were seventy-five or eighty volunteers doing teaching and health work, today there are 1400 volunteers. The large majority are working on food production at the insistence of the Indian Government.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. You are working on the opposite problem too, aren't you? For the first time, family planning?

JACK VAUGHN. Yes, we are. I can't tell at this point how large this effort will grow in family planning. The volunteers there now will be joined by another group this summer in family planning, working only in the informational and educational aspects, not in the clinical part. But this could well be one of the major efforts of the Peace Corps in the next ten years. But back to what we have done. I think we are sophisticated and confident enough now to admit that, in virtually every case, the Peace Corps volunteer gets more out of it than he puts into it. What he becomes as a citizen, what he becomes as a professional, we have all sorts of statistics to bear this out. For example, we have a very high percentage of return volunteers who are teachers now who would not have been teachers had they not had the Peace Corps experience. And they are the best teachers you can find.

MARIANNE MEANS. Do many of them go into the government?

JACK VAUGHN. Yes, they go into the Foreign Service. They go into the Peace Corps. And 40% of our overseas staff are former volunteers. It's a very lively input. They keep us on our toes, challenging us for our jobs.

MARIANNE MEANS. I've heard about a reentry problem. Do you think that there might be a problem, an adjustment to coming back?

JACK VAUGHN. Not at all, it's a cliche, and you know the government specializes in cliches. I'm sure there is a kind of disillusion felt when a volunteer comes back after spending two years in a country, in a village where his interest is still focused. He comes back to find that the people in the United States are concerned with business as usual and materialistic kinds of objectives. They have never heard of where he served and they really don't care who is the mayor of the vil-

lage in which he served. This is quite a letdown, because the volunteer has lived it so deeply, so fully, and thinks that what is going on there is important. And yet he comes back home and finds that to most of his friends, it's not important; it's not even worth listening to.

PYE CHAMBERLAYNE. Mr. Vaughn, one thing that fascinates me is the fact that you have been a boxer of some skill and success. You did fight 26 professional bouts. One thing I've wondered, how many did you win?

JACK VAUGHN. I won 25. On the 26th, I had a very serious injury to my eye. I decided I was not going to be a champion and I was not going to be wealthy. I still have this conviction. I will not do either thing. I have a better chance in other fields of endeavor than boxing.

MARIANNE MEANS. Mr. Vaughn, I remember when President Kennedy was in Germany, we watched him participate in some sort of a ceremony inaugurating a German peace corps. Is there some kind of program helping them to do it?

JACK VAUGHN. Yes, if you ask me what is the greatest success of the Peace Corps, I would say it is the stimulation that we have provided and the example that we have set for other nations to do similar projects. There are now 21 other nations who have volunteers abroad. We have encouraged them, we have helped them, have shown them what we have done and taught them the lessons that we have learned.

And it's big business, in some countries there are 7 or 8 other nations providing volunteers who work along side ours, and they date and occasionally get married to German, Swiss, Dutch and other volunteers. We seem to do better with this competition and rivalry that occurs when we have other nations sending volunteers to countries.

COHOES, N.Y.—A WINNER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Cohoes, N.Y., is one of 11 cities to win the 1966 All America City Award sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. I congratulate Mayor McDonald and other members of the Citizens Party who, in a few short years of government, have brought this award to Cohoes. In 1963, the Citizens Party set out to clean up the municipal government, institute needed reforms, and arouse the community from the lethargy which had claimed its public life for the previous years.

The Citizens Party campaigned on a platform of reform, and once in office proceeded to activate its campaign promises by creating, among other things, a new industrial commission, a recreation commission, and an economic opportunity commission. Under the guidance of Mayor McDonald and other dedicated leaders, Cohoes has experienced a reawakening which has resulted in an enhanced sense of civic pride for many of its residents.

The enthusiasm and success of the Cohoes experiment should serve as inspiration to others elsewhere to fight for and demand good government in their own communities.

I ask unanimous consent that a New York Times article which further describes Cohoes' progress be printed in the RECORD.

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

UPSTATE CITY IN REVOLT—REFORMERS IN COHOES DEMONSTRATE THAT CITY HALL CAN BE FOUGHT AND CAPTURED

(By McCandlish Phillips)

COHOES, N.Y.—The parade that came throbbing down the main street of this turn-of-the-century mill city Saturday would not have looked thin on Fifth Avenue.

In the narrow passage of Remsen Street it looked mammoth and oddly mixed—as though a circus parade had stumbled amiably into an army embarkation march.

The parade lasted almost three hours. It had 17 bands and 20 floats in 21 divisions. Thirty-three palomino horses—"the largest group of palomino horses ever assembled in one place in the state," according to the parade chief, Larry Favreau—clopped elegantly down Columbia, Oneida, Mohawk and Remsen Streets to the reviewing stand at City Hall.

Some 35,000 spectators watched, quite a crowd for Cohoes (pronounced Coh-HOSE, an Indian word believed to mean "something is falling"). Cohoes, which is near a waterfall, is a drowsy city at the confluence of the Mohawk and Hudson Rivers, nine miles north of Albany. Its population is 20,000.

The city had turned out to help celebrate a spectacular citizens' revolt against a political machine. In that sense, Cohoes, like many towns in this country, was demonstrating its faith in an old principle: that you can fight City Hall—and not only win but also take over City Hall.

In the fall the battle will be fought all over again. There is a new city election then, and the Democrats, will be making a determined effort to get back in control.

The main street here is lined with old red-brick and frame storefronts built from 1870 to 1920. But it was freshly decked in red, white and blue bunting for the two-day civic jubilee. Banners were flying everywhere—on all the storefronts, across railroad bridges, at all the entrances to the city.

Several years ago a college professor and a general medical practitioner rose up to lead the citizens' revolt. The celebration over the weekend of the "rebirth" of the city was a classic bit of Americana—with fireworks splashing in the night, the parade, a ball at the State Armory and the singing of a new municipal anthem.

The amateurs of the Cohoes Citizens party overthrew a Democratic machine that had ruled the city almost without interruption, and with only token opposition, since 1922.

Their victory in 1963 was considered fabulous, since the Democratic leaders had enjoyed a feeling of absolute security in an enormously lopsided voter registration—7,000 Democrats and 800 Republicans.

Yet the Citizens party ticket, headed by Dr. James E. McDonald—a physician whose popularity rested in part on a long record of treating the poor for little or no money—got 5,837 votes to 4,443 for the Democrats and 404 for the Republicans.

The man who headed the Democratic machine William J. Dawson, was convicted last year of Federal income-tax evasion. Court testimony showed that Dawson kept the party's financial records in Japanese, a language he apparently had picked up in World War II.

Dawson ran the party from the local Elks Club, until he retired following his conviction last June. He is free on bail pending an appeal.

The Citizens party suffered a damaging blow on April 1, when the State Supreme Court ordered Paul R. Coughlin not to sit as the police judge in Cohoes. Mr. Coughlin has been a leader among the reformers.

The courts upheld a taxpayers' suit brought against him by a Republican committeeman and a Democratic committeeman, charging that Judge Coughlin lived in Colonie, not Cohoes, and was therefore sitting in violation of the City Charter. Mr. Coughlin is appealing. He says he has residences in both Colonie and Cohoes.

Before the parade, in the garage beside the Golden Krust Bakery's home plant here, the finishing touches were being put on a gingerbread house float.

"I think I'm crazy out here, making a float, but you've never seen this city like this," said John J. Jarosz, an owner of the 10-store bakery chain.

"Everybody thought that Cohoes was dying, was on its way out. . . . Now we're so proud of it we're ending all our radio commercials with 'Cohoes, the All-American City, the home of Golden Krust Bakery.'"

Mr. Jarosz was referring to the selection of Cohoes as one of 11 cities to win a 1966 All-America City Award in a competition jointly sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. The award was announced last week.

Last month the new administration proudly opened the H. Grogan Memorial Fire Station on Central Avenue for $365,000 a supermodern facility that replaced a firehouse built in 1869.

When the Citizens party took office, the salaries of city firemen were raised from $3,550 to $4,700 a year.

In the new fire station, Lloyd (Butch) Flavin, president of the Firemen's Association, showed how the control panel could throw on red traffic lights to clear a path for the engines.

"You know, we used to give $50 back to the party a year to hold our jobs," he said. "They'd come in and tell you, 'Have it tomorrow morning or you're done.' And I've seen guys get done for not giving it."

At the Dawson trial last year, a deputy county clerk testified that he had made contributions of $100 to the party chairman for three years, and a tavern operator said he had paid $100 in cash to Dawson at the Elks Club. Of the first 12 witnesses called by the defense on behalf of Dawson, most testified that they had handed cash to the party chairman.

One of the major campaign promises of the Citizens party was aimed at city employees in two words: "No kickbacks."

Dr. McDonald, a thin sharp-featured man of 57 years with wavy, white hair, works evenings and weekends as Mayor for $4,000 a year. He said he had cut his medical practice down from a "come one, come all" system to one "by appointment only." His father, a Republican and also a physician, had been the last non-Democratic Mayor of Cohoes—in 1920 and 1921.

Paul Van Buskirk, a 32-year-old former junior college professor, is the party's founder, chairman and chief tactician. He is now the full-time executive assistant to the Mayor at $9,600 a year. The Democrats call him "Boss" Van Buskirk.

The Citizens party began its campaign by sending out 500 letters to residents protesting alleged misappropriation of city money and asking recipients to pass the letters on to their friends.

An early problem was getting publicity for the reform cause. Mr. Van Buskirk scored a coup when he discovered that "you could pick out an over-appropriation a mile away" on the city budget and decided to challenge it publicly.

"They're required by law to hold an annual hearing on the budget, but in all the years I've lived in Cohoes they never did, and I was born here," Mr. Van Buskirk said. He forced a public hearing.

"The machine got scared and ordered all the city workers to be there for a show of force," he recalls. "There were three of us against the budget, and that wouldn't have amounted to much, but they absolutely packed the place; so the next day the paper had a big story on 'Capacity Crowd at Budget

Hearing.' I felt I should have thanked them."

In an attempt to "move the city from the 19th to the 20th century," the Mayor said, the new party added an Industrial Commission, a Recreation Commission and an Economic Opportunity Commission to the local government. Cohoes is now working on a Model City application for Federal aid. It is building a new high school.

Dewey Mulcahy, a former truck driver with the Cohoes Department of Public Works, is the new Democratic chairman. He sits at a table in the new storefront headquarters at 26 White Street, a large American flag on the wall behind him. Nearby is a stenciled sign that advises: "What you do here, what you see here, what you say here, what you hear here; Let it stay here, when you leave here."

"We're going to win this fall, because I don't think they've accomplished anything—only on paper," Mr. Mulcahy says, referring to the "holier than thou bunch" in the other party.

"When the new bunch came in, they ordered an independent audit of the city's books for $25,000. They found nothing wrong," Mr. Mulcahy asserts.

At City Hall, Mayor McDonald laughs. He pulls the auditors' report out and says, "Well, here it is."

The report, by Urbach, Kahn & Werlin of Albany, charges "a serious deficiency" and "lack of internal control" in the keeping of the city's accounting records.

Such practices as preferential buying, duplicate expenditures and improper purchasing, the report asserts, have "resulted in violations of the City Charter and state regulations, as well as causing funds to be expended far in excess of the amounts that would have been necessary to obtain the same results."

Folks here are looking for a spirited election battle this fall.

THE RESULTS OF FAILURE TO RESIST AGGRESSION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in a column entitled "The New Isolationists," Roscoe Drummond this morning has given us a lesson in rather recent history. It is recent, that is, for most of us, if not all, in this Chamber. Unfortunately, there are those who have forgotten, not to mention a new generation on the campuses of this Nation whose first-hand experience does not encompass the results of failure to resist aggression when it rears its head. Mr. Drummond's column is an apt reminder, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1967]

THE NEW ISOLATIONISTS—RESISTING AGGRESSION ALSO PLAGUED F.D.R.

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is no reason President Johnson should be surprised that he is losing the support of quite a number of the liberal intellectuals—particularly on the college campuses—over Vietnam.

Franklin Roosevelt had the same experience—and the parallel is revealing.

When the war clouds began to rise in Western Europe and FDR began to show that he saw it as vital for the United States to help resist the Nazi aggression, that was when the academic liberals, who had been devoted allies of the New Deal, began to abandon the President.

As today, their warning was that, if Roosevelt allowed himself to get involved in holding back Hitler, he would be deserting the social reforms that we needed at home.

Reform America First was their slogan and their plea to the Roosevelt Administration and to the American people was that what happend to Ethiopia or to the Rhineland or to Czechoslovakia or to Poland was no important concern to the United States.

And now the liberal intellectuals are deserting LBJ on the same issue. Like their counterparts in the 1930's, they are becoming the isolationists of the 1960's.

President Roosevelt did not take their advice when he concluded that America had to join in resisting aggression in Europe and President Johnson is not following their advice today in his conviction that America must arrest the tide of aggression in Southeast Asia.

A Harvard professor reports that in his experience on the campuses across the country most of the "alienated" groups are students and teachers of a generation whose lifetime gives them no first-hand awareness of how the failure to resist aggression at its inception in Europe led to more aggression and to World War II.

Perhaps this lack of perspective and experience tempts them to abandon objectivity in the harsh and onesided judgments they so easily pronounce on the President.

When the liberal critics berate Mr. Johnson for apparently neglecting to take peace initiatives, their assumption automatically is that the President is either too dull-witted to act or really prefers war over peace.

Then, when it develops that Mr. Johnson has been doing exactly what the critics said he should be doing—but keeping his five different letters and direct contacts with Ho Chi Minh unpublicized in order that the approaches may have the best chance of acceptance—do the liberal intellectuals give the President any credit at all.

FDR had his critics on resisting aggression but he proved to be right. Mr. Johnson has his critics on resisting aggression but, I believe, he, too, will prove to be right.

THE PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL INTEREST, AND THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, President Johnson has acted firmly and thoughtfully in the face of a threatened nationwide railroad strike.

The President's request for a joint congressional resolution to extend rail service and collective bargaining another 20 days deserved and received prompt action by Congress and had the support of the American people.

This threatened strike can and should be averted. Negotiations have been conducted for almost a year. We must hope that a settlement of differences can be managed within the 20-day extension period. The alternative is a walkout that would have severe consequences for our economy, our welfare, and our national security.

But I believe that reason, good will, and the responsibility of the two sides engaged in this dispute will find the way to a satisfactory settlement with this extension.

We simply cannot afford the consequences of such a strike. It would cause terrible burdens on many industries, disrupt passenger and commuter service, and endanger the job security of many thousands of workers whose jobs are dependent upon railroad service. I commend President Johnson and Congress for taking this action and hope that it will lead to a quick settlement of this serious dispute.

THE PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today President Johnson begins the 3 days of meetings with the Latin American heads of state.

I hope that he will feel able to express, in reasonably explicit terms, our support for and sympathy with the immediate objectives of our sister republics.

The President can do this, I feel, without doing violence to our constitutional principles, to our doctrine of the separation of powers.

He can give the Latin American leaders the support and the encouragement and the understanding that they need, to undertake the gigantic task that faces them, individually and collectively.

At a later date, we in Congress will have ample opportunity to consider and put our own imprint on any understandings that grow out of the Punta del Este meeting.

The President may assure the Latin American heads of state of our support without exceeding the bounds of his authority.

And Congress, without challenging the fundamentals of the President's position, may hold hearings, discuss, clarify, modify, weaken or strengthen, the decisions reached at Punta del Este.

There is ample scope, within the framework of cooperation with the administration—and cooperate we both must, on a matter as serious in import as this—for difference of emphasis, and for differences in the details.

But we must remember this overriding fact, that the countries of the Americas expect and need leadership from us.

And they expect and need our assistance in the efforts they are now making to break out of their age-old poverty and backwardness, through the development of a common market and for other measures designed to expand trade, increase industrial production, and raise their standard of living.

I hope we will give this to them.

U.S. AID AND THE CRISIS OF THE AMERICAS

The aid we have given to the countries of Latin America and to other countries around the world has been motivated in great part by humanitarian considerations. But it has also been motivated by enlightened self-interest.

For this we do not have to apologize. Indeed, there is every reason to be proud of the fact that we accept the dependency of our own prosperity on the prosperity of other nations, and the dependency of our own security on the security of the free world in general.

Not even the most ardent isolationist today believes that we could long retain our own freedom if the rest of the world went Communist, or for that matter, if the rest of the hemisphere went Communist.

The existence of Castro Cuba makes the danger of communism in the Americas an actuality we cannot ignore.

The Castro government has on count-

less occasions committed itself to the goal of a Communist Latin America.

It maintains some 30 guerrilla training camps, in which Latin American cadres are trained in the arts of subversion and terrorism and guerrilla warfare, and then reinfiltrated into their homelands with arms and equipment.

It provides a home and logistical support for the international apparatus of subversion which was set up at the Tricontinental Conference in Havana in January 1966.

It is primarily responsible for the epidemic of guerrilla and terrorist actions which threaten the stability and security of so many American states.

It has made chaos and violence an epidemic condition throughout the Americas; and it has produced an outpouring of frightened capital that thus far exceeds the intake of new capital through the Alliance for Progress and private investments.

I have in repeated statements made the point that the problem of Latin America will never be solved and we will have no security in this hemisphere unless the American states collectively take measures to put an end to the menace of Castroism. I still stand by this position.

But those who believe that all of our Latin American troubles would disappear overnight if we simply sent in the marines to unseat Castro, have woefully oversimplified the situation.

For the fact is that, with only a few countries excepted, the masses of the people in the Latin American countries are abysmally poor and abysmally lacking in education, and their social structure remains untouched by the vast reforms that have swept through most of the civilized world in recent decades.

If Castro were removed by the marines tomorrow and if nothing were done to improve social and economic conditions in the Americas, then, as surely as night follows day, it could be predicted that we would be confronted with another half dozen Castros in various parts of the hemisphere over the coming decade.

That is why the Alliance for Progress and the Punta del Este Conference are matters that demand our most vital concern.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: THE RECORD AND THE CHALLENGE

Progress, not spectacular but steady and workmanlike, has been made during the past decade, especially since 1961 and the inception of the Alliance for Progress.

Many thousands of housing units have been constructed.

Over a million acres of land have been irrigated or reclaimed.

Thousands of schoolrooms have been built, and millions of textbooks distributed.

Roads have been built, the incidence of some serious diseases has been dramatically cut.

And I could go on and on, listing accomplishment after accomplishment.

The record of progress is clear, solid, even impressive.

But we have barely scratched the surface.

Farm production has to increase at double the present rate.

A million homes have to be built each year, not just 75,000 or 100,000.

Hundreds of thousands of classrooms are needed, not just thousands.

Millions of new jobs have to be created.

Hundreds of thousands of doctors and teachers must be trained, to meet even minimum requirements.

As President Johnson has stated:

New sights must be set, . . . new directions and renewed drive must be found if we are to meet the challenge, if we are to move forward.

It is with these sober problems confronting us that the leaders of the American states will meet at Punta del Este.

The main burden of this task, of course, rests with our sister countries.

It is they who must make the basic decisions take the initiative, and somehow provide most of the funds.

But our country can and should support them, to the very maximum extent that it is practicable for us to do so.

Our sympathy, our understanding, our financial and other assistance, our discreet prodding, and our insistence on their own initiative and efforts at self-help, can play a role of incalculable importance to what is done in Latin America during the next decade.

And the mere fact, the knowledge that the United States is standing by them, ready to contribute and work with them, will strengthen the Latin resolve to forge ahead.

The Punta del Este meeting could be the catalyst, the all-important first step toward a new and better era in hemispheric relations and development.

It could be the meeting from which the leaders of the Latin nations and the United States disperse and go back to their own countries full of high purpose, firm resolve, and practical ideas and agreements for carrying out the peaceful and progressive revolution that can truly transform Latin America.

Let us hope that it will prove to be so.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO EUROPE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, with other Members of this body, I am pleased by the recent trip abroad of Vice President HUMPHREY, whose winning ways and skilled statesmanship served American interests well in Europe. It is certain that Europe is better informed about our Government's policies and that we are better informed about the temper of our European friends as the result of this trip.

The Washington Post commented wisely about our Vice President's trip in an editorial printed yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1967]

HUMPHREY'S TRIP

Vice President Humphrey very clearly accomplished the two foremost purposes of his European visit: the governments he visited know more about American policy and the Government of the United States is better informed on European attitudes. It is doubtful if the President could have sent a better ambassador on such a dual mission. Vice President Humphrey is a persuasive and amiable advocate and he is, as well, a quick and perceptive observer.

Time will tell how many results he achieved both as advocate and as reporter. Subsequent events will show if things go more smoothly in the Kennedy round and in the maneuvers for a nonproliferation treaty. Later developments will indicate if he made any progress in reconciling European leaders to the American role in Southeast Asia. Our own policies no doubt will reflect the information which he acquired.

The limitations of such a mission, of course, arise from the narrow scope of the enterprise. If differences exist because of genuine misunderstanding and misconstruction as to European and American policies, a gifted emissary can accomplish a great deal. If they spring inherently, not from misunderstanding, but from real differences over policies that are well understood on both sides, there are strict limits to what an interpreting visit can achieve.

The Vice President's personal charm obviously had its impact on European leaders and his success at this level suggests that he should be utilized as an ambassador more frequently. These affirmative reactions cannot eclipse entirely the dismay created in the United States by some of the hostile demonstrations he encountered. News photographs of Paris demonstrators burning an American flag made a painful impression on American newspaper readers. Fortunately they are sophisticated enough to know such disorders do not reflect governmental opinion, or even general French opinion.

The general reaction to the Vice President's trip suggests that it would be useful and helpful in maintaining historic friendships in Europe if the excursion were to be repeated at frequent intervals.

CRITICISM OF ADMINISTRATION'S VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. William L. Shirer, author of "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," and one of America's most distinguished historians, has written a very thoughtful letter to the editor of the New York Times concerning the President's recent complaint about the "moral double bookkeeping" by critics of the administration's Vietnam policy. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1967]

PROTEST AGAINST WAR

To the EDITOR:

In his speech to the Tennessee Legislature March 15 President Johnson complained about the "moral double bookkeeping" of Americans who criticize our bombing of North Vietnam, accusing them of remaining silent about the Vietcong atrocities while loudly protesting the slaughter of civilians by our bombing.

Is it not rather the President and our Government which indulge in "moral double bookkeeping"? Have we not in fact for some time insisted on a double standard of conduct in world affairs—one for ourselves and quite another for others, not only in Vietnam but elsewhere?

It is all right, we hold, for us to send troops and guns to help one side in a civil war, but wrong for another country to do the same, though its intervention is far more feeble than our own and deals with its own kindred people.

FOREIGN INTERVENTION

We are punishing North Vietnam by bombing, the President said at Nashville, because

"of her flagrant violations of the Geneva accords" (which we refused to sign). But Mr. Johnson is silent about our own violations of those accords, which forbade foreign intervention in Vietnam, and the violations by South Vietnam, under our pressure, including the refusal to carry out the Geneva stipulations for a plebiscite on reunification of the two Vietnams.

It was right to subject North Vietnam to bombing, the President has also said, because she sought to "subvert" South Vietnam and overthrow its government. But would we not have resented such punishment for ourselves when we, in our turn, "subverted" Guatemala and Iran and there succeeded in overthrowing governments which we did not approve?

In our minds it was right for the United States to send in 20,000 troops, in violation of solemn treaties and of our obligations under the U.N. Charter, to occupy Lebanon (under President Eisenhower) and the Dominican Republic (under President Johnson), but we hold it wrong for another power to so act. We feel ourselves perfectly justified in regarding the Caribbean as our sphere of influence, but we oppose China taking a similar attitude toward the area near her borders.

UNDECLARED WAR

Finally, we consider it right for us to bomb a country which never attacked us, never declared war on us, and on which we have never declared war—a point on which Mr. Johnson and Mr. Rusk are extremely silent. But we condemned Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Russia and Tojo's Japan for just such unprovoked acts of violence and undeclared war.

As Athens, before the attack on Syracuse, as imperial Germany before 1914 and Nazi Germany and imperial Japan before 1939, the United States, it seems to me, is today displaying the arrogance and the irresponsibility of power. We have held great power for so short a time and we have come so quickly to abuse it.

That we are following in the well-trod footsteps of history is small consolation.

WILLIAM L. SHIRER.

TORRINGTON, CONN., *March 30, 1967.*

A NEW REVOLUTION IN LATIN AMERICA?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, interesting information of worldwide importance is being developed by persons attending the International Family Planning Conference in Santiago, Chile. The New York Times of April 12, 1967, in an article written by correspondent Juan de Onis, discusses a new type of revolution in Latin America, one which concerns the use of more than 1.5 million Latin American women of birth control bills. This revolution, according to Reporter de Onis, is occurring among women in the upper and middle classes.

The need for birth control information, of course, applies equally to all women in all economic strata. The need for the economically depressed to have family planning information, if they wish, is surely even greater than among families which have the knowledge and financial means necessary to purchase pills or other information.

According to the New York Times news story, the cost of contraceptive pills in Latin America ranges from $1.25 to $2.50 for a month's supply.

In my remarks on the Senate floor yesterday, when I discussed the conferences in Punta del Este and Santiago, I placed in the RECORD a table which included the per capita income in the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean. The table appears on page 8944 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 11. The figures in that table explain better than a thousand words why low cost is so important to the families of Latin America who might, if they could afford it, buy birth control information.

We must not forget that more than one-half of the world's population lives either at a poverty level or very close to it. I would hope that the men and women meeting in Santiago, Chile, will find ways in which this great barrier to the development of human happiness can be solved, and that their purpose will evoke a response at the other conference at Punta del Este.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times 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 York Times, Apr. 11, 1967]

A LATIN REVOLUTION: BIRTH-CONTROL PILLS

(By Juan de Onis)

SANTIAGO, CHILE, April 11.—At least 1.5 million Latin-American women are using contraceptive pills, which have become the largest selling pharmaceutical product in this region, medical delegates to the world Planned Parenthood assembly said today.

This revolution has taken place in the last two years, mostly among the upper-class and middle-class women in this predominantly Roman Catholic continent.

The changes wrought by the pill can be measured by the experience of a 27-year-old Chilean woman who returned here after several years abroad. She recently attended a class reunion at the Sacred Heart College, which is run by Roman Catholic nuns.

"There were about 30 members of my class there," she said, "nearly all married and attractive, but none was pregnant. Five years ago many of them had a baby on the way or just home from the hospital. It suddenly dawned on me that they were all on the pill."

CHURCH IS CAUTIOUS

The sharply increasing use of the pill and to a lesser extent of intrauterine contraceptive devices has made the Roman Catholic hierarchy cautious about taking a public stand. Both the pill and the intrauterine devices represent a striking departure from church teaching, which limits Catholic couples who want to space children to use of the rhythm method, in which a woman's infertile period is ascertained through charting of body temperature.

Government officials and legislators are almost as gingerly about dealing with the legal aspects of contraception and abortion, or providing public funds for birth-control programs.

But medical delegates to the eighth conference of the International Planned Parenthood Federation said that demands from Latin-American women for help in limiting the size of their families had broken through taboos, through the almost complete lack of sex education, and through even the reluctance of many family physicians to advise their patients.

A doctor from Colombia, where 300,000 pills are sold monthly, said:

"The ignorance about the pill was so great, along with the eagerness to get protection against unwanted pregnancy, that there were cases in which the wives made their husbands take the daily pill."

The relatively high price of contraceptive pills, which in Latin America cost $1.25 to $2.50 for a month's supply, creates a new social inequality. A great number of poorer women cannot afford them and can least afford the children.

The present users of the pill are estimated to represent only 5 per cent of the women of reproductive age.

Dr. Fernando Tamoyo of Colombia, who provides assistance in birth control through two clinics in Bogota, said he hoped to be able to provide pills at 40 cents a month.

DISTURBED BY INEQUALITY

The economic limitation disturbs many of the medical leaders of the 16 Latin-American national family planning programs now affiliated with the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Dr. Octavio Rodriguez Lima, head of the maternity service of the University of Rio de Janeiro, said:

"The religious barrier to family planning is not the main obstacle. Those who can afford it get protection against unwanted pregnancies by their private means. It is the poor who can't afford it who need the help the most, but there is not yet enough money for these programs."

Dr. Rodriguez Lima is chairman of Brazil's private Family Planning Association, which runs 22 clinics providing gynecological and maternity checkups and, on request, contraceptives, including intrauterine devices.

ABORTION RATE HIGH

Among poorer women, abortion is so often sought that medical surveys in some Latin-American countries show that one out of every two pregnancies ends in abortion, compared with estimates of one in five in the United States.

The conference's scientific and medical panels debated conflicting reports on the effectiveness of intrauterine devices, and the outlook for population control based on inducing male infertility through "immunization," or formation of "antibodies" that would incapacitate sperm cells.

CHANGE IN ASPHALT IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, announced today a decision by the administration to provide a means by which import controls on asphalt can be eased if required by the supply-demand situation.

I congratulate the administration, especially Secretary Udall, for making this decision, which should provide relief for asphalt firms in the Rhode Island-New England area.

During the past 6 months, I have been particularly concerned about the John J. Hudson Co., of Providence, R.I. Because of the asphalt shortage in the New England area, and the lack of competitive prices, this firm's financial stability was at stake and, equally important so were the jobs of its 88 Rhode Island employees.

On several occasions I have communicated with the Department of the Interior and high administration officials, and expressed my dismay at the plight of the John J. Hudson Co., and the necessity of having an adequate supply of asphalt in order that the Interstate Highway construction program might continue in full swing.

I have personal knowledge of the many representations made before the Department of Interior's Oil Import Appeals Board of the Hudson Co.'s situation by their able and persuasive attorney, Anthony J. Bucci, of Providence, for whom I have a very high regard.

Therefore, because of my intimate knowledge of this matter, I do hope that the Department of Interior and Office of Emergency Planning will move with celerity in order to provide immediate relief for the John J. Hudson Co.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Secretary Udall's decision on this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Release of the U.S. Department of the Interior, Apr. 12, 1967]

UDALL ANNOUNCES DECISION TO CHANGE ASPHALT IMPORT PROGRAM

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced today a decision by the Administration to provide a means by which import controls on asphalt can be eased if required by the supply-demand situation.

Decision to alter the existing oil import program was made after full consultation with all interested federal agencies, Udall said.

Under the amendment to the 1959 proclamation the Secretary of the Interior will have discretion to allow increased imports of finished asphalt. The Secretary stated that he intends to have a "thorough, expeditious consultation" with the asphalt industry and other interested parties before deciding upon how and to what extent he would exercise this discretion.

Secretary Udall related that asphalt shortages have been threatened in areas of the country over the past six months. "We must maintain ample supplies of asphalt as the inter-state road construction program is moved into high gear." Without authority to relax controls of asphalt imports, we would be helpless to deal with a serious shortage at an early stage," he continued.

Other factors influencing the decision, he said, were:

Technological changes making possible recovery of increasing quantities of light products from crude oil, leaving less residual oil for asphalt production.

Increasing concentration of asphalt production facilities.

Recent price increases on East Coast asphalt, some of which were attributed to import controls by the producers involved.

Other government bodies involved in the decision to seek the amendment were the Departments of State, Defense, Commerce, the Office of Emergency Planning, the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers.

Secretary Udall also announced that the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Governor Farris Bryant, had been requested to begin an immediate inquiry as to the national security implications of relaxing import restrictions on asphalt-bearing crude and unfinished oils to the extent they produce asphalt.

Not all crude and unfinished oils are suitable for the production of asphalt. Those which are suitable can also be refined to produce a variety of lighter petroleum products, such as gasoline, in addition to asphalt.

The Secretary emphasized that the request to OEP was limited to consideration of easing import controls on only the asphaltic component of imported oils, and not upon the other components.

"It may be," the Secretary said, "that we should relax somewhat the present controls on asphaltic crudes and unfinished oils to assure that we have ample supplies of finished asphalt, and to protect domestic asphalt refineries from temporary economic hardship and market dislocations."

The Secretary said that Governor Bryant believes that his study can be completed in two or three months. This "will give us the answers by the time we need them," the Secretary added.

THE APOLLO SPACECRAFT ACCIDENT REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the NASA Board of Review has released its report of the tragic accident which killed three brave Apollo astronauts last January 27. It is not a report in which NASA or Congress can take pride. The report is a grave indictment of the management of the space program from top to bottom, and indirectly of Congress, which has voted vast billions for the program without adequate consideration or supervision.

The real culprit in this tragedy is not the workman who did a sloppy job of electrical wiring in the Apollo capsule, or the bureaucrat who permitted such conditions to exist. The inflexible, but meaningless, goal of putting an American on the moon by 1970 is the root cause of the tragedy. Any goal which so glorifies haste generates waste, inefficiency, and errors as a natural byproduct. Accidents are built into such a system. Any dramatic failure in a governmental program brings on a spate of investigations and expurgatory reports, but the finger of blame has yet to be pointed at this race with ourselves to the moon as the real killer of Astronauts Grissom, Chaffee, and White. It is time for Congress and the NASA officials to be honest with themselves.

If the loss of these three lives is to have real meaning, there must be a full reappraisal of the space program and the system of priorities which permits $20 billion-plus to be poured into a project to put a man on the moon in this decade, while social problems here on earth multiply.

The first step should be abandonment of the goal which caused the haste that led to the grief. If this is not done, the mistakes of the past are likely to be compounded in the double-up-to-catch-up effort required to get back on schedule. Let us hope that both NASA officials and Congress learn the proper lesson from this tragic accident and that the present crash program will now be placed on a sound, practical, and deadline-free basis. If this is the result, the lives of these young men will not have been in vain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Howard Simons, published in the Washington Post of April 10 and an article written by William Hines, published in the Washington Evening Star of the same date.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1967]

NASA FACES HARD DECISIONS, PROBLEM OF CONFIDENCE—SPACE AGENCY AMBITIONS FOR 1967 ARE DASHED

(By Howard Simons)

The thrust of yesterday's Apollo accident report is to say that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has failed in many ways but not so badly as to cause abandonment of the Apollo manned lunar landing effort.

An immediate effect of the report will be to provide some psychological lift to the flagging Apollo effort. But, in reality, NASA still has to recapture Congressional and public confidence in its ability to do the job.

FACES HARD DECISIONS

NASA also has all its hardest decisions still to make. It must determine which of the Review Board's technical and management recommendations to accept. It must implement those accepted. And it must decide when astronauts can fly for the first time in an Apollo spacecraft.

None of these decisions has been made. They are expected within the next two or three weeks.

At best, yesterday's report seems to mark the beginning of the end of a two and one-half months period since the disaster during which NASA's manned space flight activities have been idling—subject to painful flagellation from within and conjecture and criticism from without.

What is clear as of yesterday is this:

The Review Board, primarily a NASA board, submitted a harsh report to NASA Administrator James E. Webb. The report is exceptionally critical about those things Webb and NASA hitherto have prided themselves on most—tight, efficient, effective management and painstaking attention to detail.

Apollo astronauts probably will not orbit the earth this year. As a result of the disaster, NASA has lost a year of manned space flight attempts. This has lessened but not foreclosed American chances for landing astronauts on the moon in this decade. The year's loss of space activity also has postponed the start of NASA's ambitious post-Apollo program to explore and exploit the space between the earth and the moon.

No matter what NASA does as a result of the Review Board's findings and recommendations future fatal space accidents cannot be ruled out. There still is a statistical possibility that American astronauts or Soviet cosmonauts will be lost in space or on the ground. The Apollo disaster of late January occurred when least anticipated.

The total cost of the disaster and the changes it will bring has not been computed. Much will depend on the changes made in the Apollo spacecraft and the rigorous testing recommended by the Review Board. To be sure, there will be added costs. Though NASA might be able to fund the added costs from its "austere" $5 billion budget, there is some apprehension that the space agency might have to rob science to pay Apollo.

What remains largely unsaid in the report, because it was not in the Board's purview, is the impact of the disaster on the national commitment to reach the moon's surface by 1970.

Had there been no disaster, NASA planned to launch its first manned Apollo spacecraft—the one destroyed in the fire—this spring. It was to have been a two-week earth orbital test flight.

EARLIER PLANS

A second Apollo spacecraft was to have been launched around mid-year this year and depending upon the success of these two manned test missions, NASA had some optional manned flights on its schedule. All of these first Apollo missions were to be sent aloft atop the Saturn IB rocket, which develops a thrust of 1.6 million pounds.

By late this year or early next, NASA had planned to begin using the gargantuan 7.6 million-pound thrust Saturn V for placing the three-man Apollo into orbit around the earth. This is the combination that is appointed to thrust the first Americans to the lunar surface.

Before the accident, NASA had estimated that 13 of the 15 Saturn V's being built could be flown in this decade. And, hopefully, one

of the 13—possibly even in late 1968—could have been the American booster to propel the astronauts to their historic lunar rendezvous.

POST-APOLLO PLANS

Moreover, NASA also hoped that if its every effort were a success it could begin using Saturn rockets and Apollo spacecraft for post-Apollo or Apollo applications missions.

This program, NASA's George E. Mueller told the Congress recently, "will begin to investigate man's role in the effective exploitation of the environment of space to meet the needs of mankind on the earth and, in the long term, to determine man's contribution to the exploration of the universe."

Though tagged "post-Apollo," the ambitious manned effort was scheduled to get off the ground late this year.

Now, NASA's 1967 ambitions have been dashed. It is evident that NASA can launch far less than 13 Saturn V's before 1970. How many fewer is undetermined. Accordingly, the chances for getting to the moon by 1970 are also lessened.

And, similarly, the post-Apollo effort now will have to wait for NASA's primary effort—landing Americans on the moon—to extract success out of disaster.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 10, 1967]

ACCIDENTS DON'T JUST HAPPEN

(By William Hines)

If there is a single truth to be distilled from the 3,000-page, 15-pound Apollo report, it is that accidents don't happen, they are caused.

The Apollo accident of Jan. 27, which killed three good men, ruined a $40 million spacecraft and set America's moon program back at least a year, was no exception to this rule.

As the report issued yesterday clearly shows, it was caused by carelessness—carelessness in workmanship, in engineering, in design, in management.

It is no secret that these conditions existed on the Apollo job. "Gus" Grissom knew it, though he probably did not know that slackness and poor management would cost him his life.

The greatest service the Thompson Board (named after its chairman, Dr. Floyd L. Thompson of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Langley Research Center) has done is to bring the facts out into the open in a carefully documented official report.

As long as the charges like those of dismissed quality control man Thomas R. Baron were being made in newspapers by outsiders, space officials could largely ignore them and take comfort from the sound of their own voices.

Thus it was that Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey—by law America's No. 1 space offical—could say on March 15, I know of no field that so insistently inspires and demands the practice of excellence as space."

Thus, too, Kurt H. Debus, director of the Kennedy Space Center in Florida, where the Apollo disaster happened, could say on Feb. 6, We have always adhered to the highest standards of safety . . . and yet, in spite of meticulous attention to the smallest detail, this tragedy has occurred."

The sound of these words may ring a little hollow against the language of the Thompson Board report: The Apollo team failed to give adequate attention to . . . vital questions of crew safety. The board's investigation revealed many deficiencies in design and engineering, manufacture and quality control. . . ."

In the 10 weeks since the Apollo disaster, the board has swept a great deal of dirt—though probably not all—out from musty corners of the space program. Under the circumstances, with a House investigation starting today and a Senate inquiry to follow in a week or so, the dirt can never be swept under the rug.

Reporting as it did on all discernible aspects of the Jan. 27 accident, the Thompson Board went as far as it could—and further than many skeptics believed it would. It fixed a probable proximate cause and rather bluntly specified the conditions that made the accident possible.

What the board did not do was explain how things ever got into such a state in the space program over-all. The laxity of men on the pad, of engineers supervising them, and of NASA officials monitoring them is not a cause but a symptom. This is no secret, either.

It was not within the board's competence to fix responsibility for this state of affairs. Relationships between contractors and the agency they do business with are a matter of high policy, and policy is made and executed in Washington, not on Pad 34. The responsibility for how policy is developed and carried out rests at NASA headquarters.

For 8½ years—since its creation in October 1958—NASA has been going its free-wheeling way with little supervision from the executive and legislative branches of government. The way to find out how NASA was doing, it seemed, was to ask NASA.

The National Aeronautics and Space Council, a presidential-level board activated under the late President Kennedy supposedly to keep tabs on the space program, has never functioned effectively. Its officials make speeches and it publishes a periodic report; this is about the extent of its activities.

The cognizant committees of Congress likewise in the past have carried laissez faire to an extreme. It may be that the corner is being turned with the issuance of the Thompson Board report and the opening of the first of the series of hearings on both sides of Capitol Hill.

The committees probably will find little to investigate as far as the Apollo accident itself is concerned. But as Rep. Olin E. Teague, D-Tex., who heads the House inquiry, put it last week, "We'll have to look beyond the accident itself; it didn't happen in a vacuum."

In looking beyond the accident, the legislators undoubtedly will go into the question of top management—of the organizational structure of NASA itself, of its Office of Manned Space Flight, and of the Houston and Cape Kennedy space centers. Top officials from all these organizations will testify in the coming days.

The question of moment on Capital Hill is where the fault for the Apollo tragedy really lies. As Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover said after the Thresher disaster in April 1963:

"If I have a job to do and it doesn't get done well, I am not going to blame the workmen."

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Foreign Service, being without a constituency among our voters, tends to absorb more than its share of public criticism. As an alumnus of this service, I have a good deal of respect for it and believe that it is more sinned against than sinning. The eminent journalist, Mr. Stewart Alsop, has written an excellent defense of this vital service in the Saturday Evening Post. His eloquent editorial does much to set the record straight. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

LET THE POOR OLD FOREIGN SERVICE ALONE

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—This country's professional diplomats—the State Department's 3,500 Foreign Service Officers, or FSO's—used to constitute an elite body of proud men. Now they are more like a collection of exhausted guinea pigs.

This is sad, and it is also serious. For as the morale of the professionals in the Foreign Service has decayed, the conduct of American foreign policy has become increasingly sludgy and zombie-like. According to many Foreign Service Officers, morale in the service has never been lower, not even in the McCarthy era. The service has been reorganized and reformed and reported on and experimented with for so long that the professionals who are supposed to be responsible for the conduct of American foreign policy are in a kind of collective catatonic state.

The Foreign Service has never been beloved by the politicians or the public—"striped-pants boys" and "cookie pushers" are the traditional epithets. But the service has respected itself—and with good reason, for it has produced some of this country's ablest public servants. Now that self-respect is oozing away.

The Foreign Service has been exposed to a whole series of traumatic shocks. In the McCarthy era, an FSO had to get used to being regarded as a traitor or homosexual, and more probably both.

Then there was the Wriston Commission "reform" of 1954, the most disastrous of an endless series of reforms. "Wristonization" transformed hordes of unhappy and unqualified State Department bureaucrats into Foreign Service Officers overnight, more than doubling the size of the Foreign Service and destroying its *esprit de corps*. The result today is the "Wriston bulge." There are too many high-level FSO's and not enough serious jobs for them to do, so that able men in their 40's and 50's are doing jobs hardly more meaningful than pushing cookies.

But the most traumatic shock of all has been the triumph of the Administrators over the Foreign Service. Until rather recently the Foreign Service used to run the affairs of the Foreign Service and the clerkish types involved in the Administration of the State Department were dismissed as mere "pants pressers" by the policymaking FSO's. Now the pants pressers are having their revenge.

By a mysterious process which is going on in many areas of American life, the Administrators have seized control of the Foreign Service—especially since 1963, when William Crockett, a brilliant bureaucratic operator, became Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration. Nowadays, FSO's who want to get ahead have learned to be polite to the formerly despised "pants pressers."

The Administrators can get a senior FSO an embassy—or they can condemn him to outer darkness as Deputy Chief of Mission in Chad or the Central African Republic. In many other ways they can make the life of an FSO tolerable—or miserable.

Most of the programs introduced by the Administrators seem designed to increase the misery quotient. For example, there is FAPS—Foreign Affairs Programming System. The idea of FAPS is to feed voluminous reports on all the activities of U.S. missions abroad into computers, and thus measure statistically the effectiveness of American foreign policy. The notion that diplomacy can be measured by a computer is enough to make any professional Foreign Service Officer froth at the mouth.

But the final humiliation, in the view of many self-respecting FSO's, is the "T-Group" program ("T" stands, rather mysteriously, for "training"). In this program, 10 or 15 FSO's and other State Department people (a "T-Group") are sequestered in a country mansion for a week at a time. In the manner of the "Socialist self-criticism" sessions, as practiced in the Communist countries, the members of the T-Group are supposed to bare their souls, confessing their own sins and weaknesses, and ruthlessly exposing the

sins and weaknesses of the other members of the group.

"Behavioral scientists" hired by the Administrators run these affairs. If the suspicions of several FSO's are correct, *agents provocateurs* are inserted into the groups by the "behavioral scientists" to "unfreeze" the FSO's. During one recent T-Group session, a pretty girl from the administrative section accused several FSO's present of snobbery, timidity, and the like. Tempers flared, and the session "unfroze" in an orgy of confessions, accusations and counteraccusations.

This reporter asked one of the "behavioral scientists," Dr. Chris Argyris of Yale, what was the purpose of this curious exercise. His answer (more or less, for it is difficult to take accurate notes in a foreign language) was as follows: "To achieve internal common commitments by neutralizing aggressions and creating a problem-solving environment, in order to achieve credibility among groups."

An Administrator, obligingly attempting to translate, suggested that the purpose was to achieve, among people with different jobs and backgrounds, "a common language." He was not amused when asked the obvious question: "Why not try English?"

Some FSO's, soul-barers by nature, have rather enjoyed the T-groups, but most FSO's regard them as monstrous invasions of privacy. And the entire Foreign Service was infuriated when Under Secretary Crockett, on the eve of his departure for greener pastures, authorized the public release of a report by Dr. Argyris which included long tape-recorded quotes from FSO's, baring their souls in "T-groups." These quotes ("I think one reason I have succeeded is that I have learned not to be open, not to be candid") made the Foreign Service look like a collection of groveling milksops.

The T-Group program is squarely based on the notion (which has also spread to many areas of American life) that whoever pays a man's salary owns his immortal soul. The Foreign Service is criticized for being too cautious. An FSO can hardly be blamed for being cautious if his professional competence is constantly being measured by computers, and his emotional reactions tape-recorded and then published by "behavioral scientists."

It is true that, for professional reasons, FSO's do tend to be cautious, which is why a leavening of outsiders in the foreign-policy process is always needed. But is caution always a bad thing?

There were no FSO's involved in the Bay of Pigs disaster. And after the second Cuban crisis President Kennedy confided that his soundest advice came from Llewellyn Thompson, now Ambassador to the Soviet Union for the second time. Thompson was the only FSO in the inner circle of Kennedy advisers during the crisis. It even seems possible that if the Foreign Service had been deeply involved in the making of policy on Vietnam—which it was not—the mess there might at least be more manageable.

In any case, it might be a good idea to make one more bold experiment with the Foreign Service. Just let the poor old Foreign Service alone, and let it get on with the day-to-day business of conducting the foreign affairs of the United States.

POLISH SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL EXHIBIT IN DETROIT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Polish Government delayed the return of a major science and technological exhibit commemorating Poland's millennium so that the people of Detroit—particularly the many Polish-American families living here—could have the opportunity of viewing it.

Clearly, one of the better ways to learn about the history, the culture, the art, the innovations, and the people of another land is through an exhibit.

Many Detroiters took advantage of this rare opportunity to see for themselves the original manuscript of Copernicus proving that the earth was indeed mobile—to see the beautiful bronze pieces created by the masterful Polish casting artists—to see the ancient coinage, the tools, the 17th century rocket designs—to see, in fact, the magnificent historical accomplishments of the people who inhabited Polish territories.

Those who saw this excellent exhibit are grateful to the Museum of Technology at Warsaw and the Polish Museum of America for providing them with a most enjoyable lesson in the history of an industrious people.

I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article about this exhibit, published in the Detroit News of April 7, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Detroit News, Apr. 7, 1967]

EXHIBIT AT COBO HALL: DETROIT SALUTES POLES

(By James K. Anderson)

"Witamy Was" is a Polish greeting that was placed in Cobo Hall a few years ago among other foreign-language expressions of welcome.

Yesterday was one time when the phrase was appropriate.

Poland, science and America all converged for a 10-day exhibit in Cobo Hall's Hall A of "Science and Technology Throughout Poland's Millennium" and "History of Poles in America."

Mayor Cavanagh, Willis F. Woods, Detroit Institute of Arts director; Mayor Joseph Grzecki, of Hamtramck; Zdislaw Szewczyk, Poland's acting ambassador to the United States; Alfred Ulman, president of the Central Citizens Committee, a federation of 180 Polish organizations; and several other civic leaders joined in opening the two exhibits.

Theme of the exhibits is the 1,000 years since Poland's emergence as a state and its conversion to Christianity in 966.

The science and technology exhibit is sponsored by the Polish government and is from the Museum of Technology in Warsaw, while the historical display is from the Polish Roman Catholic Union's Polish Museum of America in Chicago.

Cavanagh recalled that last summer during his visit to Poland he met several Polish governmental officials in hopes of obtaining another Polish exhibit for Detroit.

"We are indebted to the officials of the Polish government for delaying the return to Poland of this exhibit so that it would be available for Detroiters," Cavanagh said.

The exhibit was brought to Detroit from Chicago, where it attracted more than 200,000 visitors.

Szewczyk traced Polish history from its earliest days to the present and said that throughout long periods of foreign occupation the Poles remained loyal to their national culture and ideals.

At the entrance to the exhibit are two massive statues of Nickolaus Copernicus, regarded as the founder of modern astronomy, and Maria Sklodowska-Curie, twice a Nobel Prize winner and discoverer of radium. They are regarded as Poland's most renowned scientists.

The scientific exhibits range from displays of Polish Bronze and Stone Age artifacts to modern shipbuilding, with large photographs of Polish scientific figures alongside examples of their work.

In addition, there are examples of Polish folk arts and color photographs of Polish scenes.

The "History of Poles in America" begins with the settlement of Polish glassmakers in the Jamestown colony in Virginia in 1608 and continues through Ignace Jan Paderewski, the world famous pianist who became Poland's first president after the country was reestablished at the end of World War I.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SUPPORTS THE NEW SCIENCE FOR OUR SCHOOLS THROUGH THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the National Science Foundation—whose 16th annual report was recently sent to Congress by President Johnson—has had a revolutionary impact on our national development over the past years. The science that our children are learning in high school is the science of today, not the science of 30 years ago.

The Foundation has accomplished this through a many-pronged attack aimed at improving high school education. The program was geared to the appropriate Federal role—encouragement of excellence in research and development through local initiative and responsibility, a true Federal-local partnership in science education.

Through this program, high school science teachers have attended special institutes conducted by colleges and universities. The teachers can pick the institute most suitable, and if accepted, can learn what they feel they need to improve local instruction. In 1966, some 21,000 teachers of high school science gave up part of their summer vacations to attend such institutes. An additional 13,000 attended in-service institutes during the academic year, and 1,600 enrolled in full-time institutes covering the entire academic year.

In addition to supporting teacher training, the National Science Foundation has also supported the development of modern courses for science instruction.

About 1,200,000 students are now using at least one of many biology courses developed by the biological science curriculum study. About 410,000 students are using one of the two courses developed with National Science Foundation support. The physics course developed by the Physical Science Study Committee is now estimated to have been used by 230,000 high school students.

The educational programs of National Science Foundation will improve American science in the future just as its research programs have improved our scientific advances today. We must continue to lead the world in this vital area.

All this is indicative of a new relationship between Government and American schools. President Johnson is to be commended for his strong support of these worthwhile endeavors. Our children, our citizens, and our institutions will all benefit from this new revolution in scientific learning.

THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, dated April 10, 1967, memorializing Congress to take all action necessary, including a resolution expressing the sense of that body, in order that the Federal aid highway program be restored to a regular and fully financed program, as was the intent of Congress in 1956.

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

H. 1552

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take all action necessary including a resolution expressing the sense of that body, in order that the Federal aid highway program be restored to a regular and fully financed program as was the intent of Congress in 1956

Whereas, It was the intent of Congress that the Highway Trust fund to which all highway users contribute their taxes shall be used for a well planned highway system;

Whereas, The President himself said in August 13, 1964, that "Interstate Highway System—is the most ambitious program since the days of ancient Rome," that it was his "privilege to guide this program to passage as Senate Majority leader, and the program is not costing the General Fund of the U.S. Treasury a single cent;"

Whereas, This program has provided over one million Americans with work, is the largest public works project known to man;

Whereas, Contractor and construction workers have responded to the challenge of this enormous program leading all industries in productivity gains.

Whereas, If this program is slowed down by the 25% cut asked by the President many of these contractors and workers will reconsider their part in the highway program, should the Administration try to place the program back on schedule;

Whereas, The construction industry has had to bear the heaviest burden of the Administration's anti-inflationary policies, with over 275,000 workers unemployed now and reduction in the highway program will result in further unemployment;

Whereas, Any slowdown in finishing the highway program will only cost the taxpayer more money;

Whereas, Over 52,000 were killed on our highways in 1964, and it is estimated that with the completion of the Interstate system at least 8,000 lives will be saved annually;

Now Therefore, Be It Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island that the members of this body do hereby respectfully request the Congress of the United States to take all action necessary to have the Federal-Aid highway program restored to the amount authorized by Congress.

Be It Further resolved that the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Rhode Island and to the Governor and Secretary of each of the other 49 States.

A WAY OUT OF THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have recently read a provocative and interesting article entitled "Is There a Way Out of the Vietnam War?" written by Harrison Salisbury, the experienced New York journalist and editor who recently visited Vietnam.

It is an excellent article, full of ideas and really probing to find areas of agreement rather than areas of disagreement.

I believe that Senators might be interested in reading Mr. Salisbury's observations; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

IS THERE A WAY OUT OF THE VIETNAM WAR?

(By Harrison Salisbury)

I strongly suspected before I arrived in Hanoi that the North Vietnamese authorities would not have taken what was for them the giant step of authorizing my visa unless they had decided that the time had come for active exploration of the possibility of peace-by-negotiation in Southeast Asia. I departed from Hanoi with that suspicion transformed into positive conviction. No other sensible interpretation could be placed on the conversations which I had with the Premier and other North Vietnamese officials.

It was apparent that the war was approaching one more of those crossroads which had marked its development over the years. It could proceed in one of two totally opposed directions: down the arduous but productive path of negotiation toward settlement and peace; or it might be precipitously escalated and carried far beyond Vietnam, suddenly to embrace vast areas of Asia or the world. This evaluation was not contained in what anyone in Hanoi was prepared to say publicly. In fact, even in private there was a tendency to fall away from declaring explicitly what was expressed implicitly. But that North Vietnam was prepared to explore actively and seriously the possibility of bringing hostilities to an end was no longer a matter of doubt.

What had produced this attitude in Hanoi? Certainly I had not found that our bombing had achieved this result. I thought that a circumstance far more dangerous to Hanoi, and quite probably to the world, lay in the background of the changed thinking. That circumstance was the chaos in China. In Hanoi one felt the hot breath of the Peking crisis like a fiery draft from a suddenly opened furnace. The events in China were like some terrible charade. Everyone's attention was riveted on them. Everyone knew the fateful consequences which might flow from them. But no one knew how to influence them.

A year earlier I did not believe Hanoi had been especially eager for negotiations with the United States. At least I did not think that North Vietnam was then prepared to talk in terms of a settlement which would have been acceptable to the United States. Earlier than that, I believed, negotiations would have been even less productive.

Going back over the course of events from 1945—the struggle against the French, the vistory at Dienbienphu, the Geneva settlement, and the gradual transition from political struggle to warfare—it seemed to me that Hanoi's ambition had undergone great changes. In the early period, and probably as late as 1958 or 1959, I thought that the North Vietnamese and other Asian Communists, with Chinese encouragement had been thinking in grandiose terms. They had dreamed of the creation of a great Asian Communist movement which would have the sympathetic guardianship of Peking. Peking would help with ideological support, material means, and possibly even the kind of logistic and tactical support which had helped General Giap to succeed at Dienbienphu. The fulcrum of the movement would be Vietnam. There was every reason for Hanoi to think that political evolution in Vietnam favored the North and specifically favored Ho Chi Minh, who then (and now) was the only national leader which the country possessed. Communism or quasi-Communism might then readily spread from Vietnam and possibly from Indonesia to Malaya and to Vietnam's companion successor states of French Indochina, Cambodia and Laos.

This had been a dream and possibly more than a dream in those years. But with the steady rise of conflict within the Communist world this goal had begun to appear less and less realistic. By the early 1960s, I believed, it must have seemed quite impossible. By this time the polemics between the Soviet Union and China had begun to affect the world Communist movement radically, and no Communist regime was more caught in the middle than that of North Vietnam.

During this period, however, it was still possible for Hanoi to dream of political domination of Vietnam or at least a close working partnership with the South under National Liberation Front leadership. There had not been demonstrated up to that time (nor to the present) any political vitality in the Saigon Government which was likely to last once the war ended or the United States removed its props. The inauguration of the American bombing offensive had not changed Hanoi's evaluation of the probable outcome in Vietnam. It still seemed that Hanoi and the Front would survive long after Marshal Ky or his successors had vanished.

The bombing would make it harder for Hanoi and the Front. It would prolong the struggle. It would cost North Vietnam most, if not all, of the restricted socioeconomic gains achieved since establishment of the regime. But the gains were not essential, and the losses would not be decisive. The country was still too primitive, too poorly developed. Even if all the industries, all the improvements were destroyed, even if all the towns and cities were wiped out, the country, its essential peasant life and rice culture, would endure. There was nothing about the bombing of the North which, in the long run, was likely to add to the political viability of Saigon. On the contrary, in the end the results would be the same except that the North Vietnamese would suffer more, the casualties would be higher, the losses greater.

On the other hand, the United States would also suffer. It would begin to cost America a great deal to maintain its war effort. Those members of the Hanoi Government who took ideological guidance from Peking did not think this was at all bad. They shared the view of the Peking Marxists, who held that the more places in the world in which the United States could be mired down in grinding, endless, expensive, frustrating conflict in formerly colonial areas, the more the United States would be bled, the more its resources would be expended, the greater the burden on its social and political structure, the more intense the strain on its relations with other nations, and the greater the political defeat for the United States through loss of world support, particularly among the former colonial peoples, who possessed the majority of global population, who dominated the United Nations, and who in the future would have to be reckoned with.

China was playing the long game. It was counting on the Vietnam war as the first in a series of skirmishes in which the United States would be entrapped. When enough United States forces had been tied down in Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America, Peking would come out on top. It was an attractive theory. It would require decades to work out. But Asia had more time than anything else. Eventually this strategy might involve the United States in war with China. But that, too, would be endured. Indeed, the Chinese had already worked out the tactics

whereby they believed they could survive American nuclear attack.

Here the strategy of Peking and that of Hanoi showed a remarkable concordance. Ho Chi Minh talked about the inevitable escalation of the United States war effort. He and his associates noted how we had first bombed only a little way above the 17th parallel, then gradually widened out until the whole country was attacked. At first we did not hit Hanoi and Haiphong. Then gradually we moved on the two big cities. Eventually, Ho contended, the worst would happen—Hanoi and Haiphong would be attacked in a systematic and sustained fashion. But, he insisted, this would not mean the end. North Vietnam would retire to its caves and its jungles and struggle on for ten, twenty, fifty years and finally the United States would be defeated. Long before that another thing would have happened. The volunteers would have come into the war—the manpower of China and possibly of the Soviet Union and of Eastern Europe which stood ready to come at Hanoi's call.

Did Ho really think that events would take this course—that the destruction of his country, the involvement of all the Communist world, was virtually certain? Possibly not. Quite possibly he thought that the prospect of total involvement would, in time, bring the United States to discuss terms acceptable to the Communists. But now history had taken a turn which not even the least sanguine North Vietnamese had anticipated. The brooding quarrel between the Soviet Union and China had boiled over. The consequences already were disastrous for the orderly conduct of North Vietnam's defense. Month by month and week by week the problem grew more grave. North Vietnam was spending more effort now trying to maintain relations with its two great neighbors, trying to keep the flow of supplies coming through, than on any other aspect of the war. And the possibility daily heightened that graver disaster lay ahead.

China could at any moment erupt into civil war, which would mean the diminution or cutoff of the supply route. The intra-party conflict in China might reach such bitterness that one faction would halt supplies or close the roads. The Chinese already were hampering the movement of Soviet goods. They might stop them entirely. The conflict between Moscow and Peking might move into the open warfare. This would make deliveries impossible.

Any one of these combinations might produce the worst of consequences for North Vietnam. The country and its leadership might be drawn into the intra-China dispute through the simple fact that so many of Ho's associates had intimate relations with the Chinese. Many in his entourage had connections as close with Peking as they had with Ho. Suppose Peking thought that Soviet influence was coming to the fore in Hanoi—might it not instruct its friends in Hanoi to intervene? Might Peking already have intervened through third parties to try to affect Hanoi's policies?

It was possible the Chinese would try to confront Ho with a *fait accompli* and subvert his government if they thought he was beginning to side with the Soviet Union. In their present hysteria almost any act of Hanoi's could be interpreted in Peking as hostile to China or pro-Soviet. Hanoi had stated flatly that it would not receive "volunteers" from China or any other Communist state except in certain specified instances and only when it called for them. But could Ho be certain that Chinese "volunteers" would not suddenly pour over the frontier in response to a demand from a member of the North Vietnamese Government acting on the instruction of Peking?

There was not a diplomat with whom I talked in Hanoi who was not sensitive to these potentials. They had changed the whole aspect of Hanoi's attitude toward peace and negotiations. There was not a diplomat from Eastern Europe with whom I talked who did not strongly favor negotiations at the earliest possible moment. Not all of them favored this course because of fear of China. Many had strongly favored it before the Chinese crisis. But the Chinese crisis strengthened their feeling that the war represented a grave fissure in the world political structure, that it created a situation which under the stress of events in Peking might lead the world to nuclear catastrophe.

A nuclear war, they pointed out, was regarded with horror by all the world—except Peking, which had prepared a strategy for dealing with the nuclear devastation of China. Peking, they noted, was talking about the inevitability of American nuclear assault, the wiping out of Chinese nuclear centers, the destruction by nuclear weapons of all China's large cities. Peking thought this would merely create a trap (killing, incidentally, possibly 300 million Chinese) into which the United States would fall. Because, said Peking, after the bombs had done their work the Americans would still have to enter the nuclear-poisoned countryside and seize the land, and there they would find the Chinese, 400 million strong, emerging from caves and bunkers, ready to fight with primitive bombs and grenades at a range of 200 yards or so—closer than America's technology could be effectively employed.

The European Communists were familiar with this Chinese thinking. They were chilled by it and by the consequences it might bring to themselves and to Southeast Asia. I could not find many North Vietnamese who relished the idea, but they were so accustomed to talking of protracted war, of retreating into the hills, of fighting through decades while the Americans exhausted themselves, that the prospects did not fill them with so much horror. But I do not believe that Ho wished to lead his country down that avenue. I thought that he and his leaders had taken the measure of what the next year was likely to bring. And the year after that. It must look to them that the chances for bringing more strength into a negotiation in 1968 were less than the chances in 1967. Beyond 1968 lay more and more grave question marks.

I did not know whether Moscow, in seeking to free its hands of the China crisis and in its hopes of uniting the West in a common front against Peking, had sought to persuade Hanoi of the desirability of negotiation. Perhaps not. The Russians had found themselves in a delicate position vis-a-vis Hanoi and the Communist world. Every Communist knew Moscow had no deep interest in Vietnam. Everyone knew Moscow wanted the war settled. But that made it difficult for the Soviet Union to take a direct hand. Possibly, with the rapid deterioration in Peking, Moscow had finally spoken more directly.

Whatever the event, now, at this late hour, Hanoi was interested in talking terms. But even so there was a grave impediment. It could not talk openly or directly lest this provoke the very intervention and reprisals by the Chinese of which it was most fearful. At a hint that Hanoi was ready to talk peace Peking was apt to intervene forcibly—by closing the frontier and cutting off supplies, by bringing political pressure to bear within the North Vietnamese Government, or by sending in the "volunteers" to shift the balance back toward war.

I had felt before going to Hanoi that the only effective method of exploring the possibilities of negotiation was by private, completely secret talks, far from the spotlight of world opinion. It was not hard to see the futility of publicized techniques. Some efforts occurred while I was in Hanoi. The British Foreign Secretary, George Brown, made a public appeal for talks, putting the weight of his stress on Hanoi. He added for good measure the suggestion that the talks be held in Hong Kong, oblivious of the fact that the Chinese two days earlier had charged that Hong Kong was a base for the aircraft carriers whose planes were bombing North Vietnam. It was incredible bumbling. Or possibly it was not intended seriously except to ease the pressure on the Labor party at home to take some action toward ending the war.

The Pope made appeals and U Thant made appeals. None of these received a very enthusiastic welcome in Hanoi. There had been suggestions that General de Gaulle might make a good mediator. There was no doubt in my mind that de Gaulle was well regarded in Hanoi. But the attitude of the North Vietnamese officials suggested that they much preferred such a delicate business to be carried on without the intervention of third parties. They had had considerable experience in the past—a bit more than I was aware of when I was in Hanoi—of the difficulty of making and maintaining contacts with the United States. Publicity was the one thing they did not want. The intervention of a third party merely increased the possibility of a leak, with the unpleasant consequences which might follow.

The talks could not stand publicity. Of this I was certain. The North Vietnamese had to see the light at the end of the tunnel before they started down the passageway. Until they could feel, privately, that there was a real possibility of an agreement they could not afford public negotiations. Because the moment they entered public negotiations they could expect the China route to be cut and they could expect active Chinese efforts to upset the talks. This would be fatal unless they knew that they were going to be able to reach a peace agreement. If they started out on negotiations and failed, they would find themselves in a critical situation, compelled to renew the war against the United States but with their principal source of supply cut and the possibility that their government might have been severely weakened internally.

They had other fears, which paralleled the fears with which the United States approached the idea of negotiation. They feared that if they started to talk, their people would be convinced that peace would inevitably follow. If the talks stalled and war was resumed, it would not be possible to restore the remarkable fighting morale which they now had and which constituted their chief resource against the powerful United States. They did not have many assets and they did not feel they could jeopardize this one. They also feared that if they entered talks without a clear notion of the agreement which lay at the end, the United States might utilize the period of negotiations to increase its force levels in the South and prepare for resumption of hostilities when the talks came to an inconclusive end. This fear paralleled two great fears of the United States—that if bombing once halted it would not be possible (because of public opinion) to resume it and that the North might enter into talks simply to utilize the period for reinforcement and regrouping, which would then enable it to emerge from a deadlocked negotiation in a far stronger position.

These were the dangers which lay in the minds of the North Vietnamese and the Americans as they gingerly approached the idea of negotiations. The only way in which they might be removed was for each side to attempt an exploration in complete secrecy. They would have to see what each side was prepared to do; whether the ingredients of a deal existed. This was by no means certain. But the possibilities could be assessed through this process. I recommended it strongly to Hanoi, speaking as an interested

observer. I had no diplomatic role. Anything I said was said just as an American newspaperman who happened to be in Hanoi. Therefore I could talk with a freedom which a diplomat would not possess. The same held true on the other side. When I returned to the United States, it was possible for me to talk to Washington with the same frankness and lack of reserve that had marked my conversations in Hanoi.

It seemed obvious both in Hanoi and in Washington that each side was aware of the critical moment which had arrived. If the turn toward negotiation were not taken, what was the alternative? On Hanoi's side, the deterioration of the situation in its rear would bring an inevitable turn toward radical expedients. On the American side, the pattern surely would follow the channel of escalation to higher and higher force levels. What specifically would we do? I was in no position to guess. But the speculation in military quarters had been fairly precise: intensification of bombing, sustained air attacks on Hanoi, blockade or bombing of Haiphong, land operations north of the 17th parallel, amphibious landings in the Gulf of Tonkin—all of the ominous developments which would produce the entry into the war of the "volunteers." Chinese volunteers.

The options were epochal. Peace or a land war, very possibly a nuclear war, with China. Possible Soviet intervention. To say that events had arrived at a turning point was an understatement.

I returned from Hanoi convinced that a settlement of the Vietnam war by negotiation lay within our grasp. I was convinced it would not be easy to negotiate, and I was by no means convinced that we were prepared to understand or undertake this difficult and complex task. But that the ingredients of a settlement—one which would be viable, enduring, and relatively favorable to our objectives in Asia, at least as I understood them—now had come within reach I had no doubt.

This, I must say, came as something of a surprise to me. I had explored the ground in Southeast Asia with some care only a few months earlier, in the late spring and early summer in 1966, in a trip which led me all around the periphery of China. I had gotten the impression then that the establishment of a secure and comparatively stable Southeast Asia might be impossible on terms which Washington would consider acceptable. As I understood our objectives in Southeast Asia, they comprised the following:

We had no desire to overthrow the Communist regime of North Vietnam. We accepted the continuance of Ho and his successor in that country.

We had no territorial aspirations in Vietnam and none in Southeast Asia. We had no desire to remain in South Vietnam or any part of Vietnam.

We desired the establishment in South Vietnam of a viable regime which would not be Communist-dominated, Communist-oriented, or Communist-threatened, but we did not insist that this regime be necessarily that which now held power in Saigon.

We desired to reduce the Communist threat to all Southeast Asia and to increase the security of the area, particularly that of Laos, but we had not spelled out specific aims so far as this point was concerned.

We were prepared, once peace and stability had been restored, to withdraw our armed forces and to offer economic and technical assistance on a massive scale, which would help to create the material foundations for a rapid advance in standards of living and development.

We were prepared to assist in cooperative multi-nation projects such as the Mekong River development.

If these were, in fact, our objectives in Southeast Asia it seemed to me, on the basis of my conversations with representatives of the Hanoi Government and of the National Liberation Front, that with hard bargaining we could come reasonably close to fulfilling them.

So far as the public record went, the chief difficulty concerned the future status and regime of South Vietnam. The problem centered on Hanoi's support of the Front as the appropriate spokesman for the South. We did not recognize the Front, although we had said cryptically that there would be "no difficulty" about a place for the Front at the negotiating table. The existing Saigon Government of Marshal Ky was our ally-of-record, and while we had not committed ourselves to perpetuating his regime, our inclinations naturally went toward the Saigon Government, with all its faults, rather than the Front, with which we had done mortal combat.

Was there room for maneuver on this point? I suspected there was, although I did not expect the Front or Hanoi to put this on public record or even to agree to it in the first round of private discussion. But both sides had publicly agreed that they would back a "coalition" government. The Front had spelled this out to include members of South Vietnam's Constituent Assembly and some members of the Ky Government (but not Ky). We had not gone so far, but the Saigon Government had at least intimated that it looked toward a coalition. The sentiment for a coalition certainly was strong among members of the Constituent Assembly.

The problem here was balance. Who would have the majority? Was there some nonaligned or moderate figure around whom a coalition government might be constructed? Would a coalition government possess durability or would it, even if headed by a non-Communist, quickly fall apart or succumb to Communist intrigue? We did not wish to see repeated in Southeast Asia the history of Eastern Europe's postwar coalition governments, which quickly fell under Communist pressure.

I believed that the vital ingredients of the Liberation Front program (at least as described in Hanoi)—a mixed economy, free rights for all parties, neutral foreign policy, no alliances—would permit construction of such a government. Its stability could be insured by United States economic aid, guarantees by Asian powers and the Great Powers, and guarantees by Hanoi. There was an armory of factors which could be utilized to give the structure strength if it possessed the vital ingredient of political virility.

What about the North? It seemed clear that the moment was appropriate to restore the North to the situation which had been envisaged by the Geneva agreements, to try to cut its military links to Peking and to Moscow. The divisions within the Communist world favored such neutrality. It would ease the pressures on Hanoi enormously. Of course, Hanoi, even more than Saigon, would require guarantees. Not only of support (against Chinese intervention) but of economic aid and assistance in rehabilitation. The situation had developed in an appropriate manner for the achievement of aims which had been far beyond the horizon of possible diplomacy a year earlier. It was an unequaled opportunity for the United States, one which might not recur and which might slip away in certain eventualities, such as the reduction of political tensions in Peking or a rapprochement between Peking and Moscow, both of which might occur.

But establishment of neutralized regimes in Saigon and Hanoi would be only the start. It seemed to me that Laos represented an equally dangerous problem. Laos had become a mere fiction—a land which was in the hands of an uncertain number of guerrilla operations, some sponsored by the United States, some by the Communists, and some of purely Laotian origin.

Unless Laos could be quieted and sanitized, the whole theater of struggle might simply shift westward from Vietnam, with the warriors of the CIA and the Chinese International going at it hammer and tongs (or hammer and sickle). This would undermine the area dangerously. Cambodia had managed to stay out of the war, but it needed economic and probably political support as well. Thailand would be in trouble if it lost its burgeoning war-boom prosperity. Many considerations dictated the creation of a strengthened International Control Commission with a broader mandate and genuine powers not merely to police these countries but to aid and guide development. What political form this might take I did not know, but it should not lie beyond the competence of American diplomacy to establish a structure in Southeast Asia which would make the region a going concern.

This would create what the United States had so long hoped for—a strong and viable Southeast Asia, resistant to the spread of Chinese influence and Chinese Communism. Certainly China was going to be a power in the area. It always had been. It was unrealistic to suppose it could be shut out. But if we built on the strong factors of nationalist sentiment such as had been invoked in North Vietnam, such as would surely develop in South Vietnam—the same force which had caused Indonesia to throw off the Chinese and the Communists—we would see emerging not a series of poor, weak client countries, not a region dependent into infinity upon a huge American military garrison and the expenditure of United States funds, but a progressive group of countries, internally strong and resolutely independent. Independent of us. Independent of China. A healthy Asia, it seemed to me, must be an independent Asia.

This was the chance which had been created by the unexpected developments in Peking and their repercussions in Hanoi. It might well be the chance of a century. But I was not certain that Washington could grasp the opportunity. Washington was tired and Washington was stale. Washington, I feared, was filled with too many men who had committed themselves to so many past mistakes that they lived only for some crowning disaster which would bury all the smaller errors of the past. Washington was filled with politicians who were concerned with what would bring in votes in the next election or what would discomfit a possible election opponent. In that atmosphere it was difficult to get men to indulge in imaginative statesmanship. Too many were afraid to take a chance. The old policy might be a mistake. It might lead to catastrophe. But change was dangerous and uncertain. And there were competing counsels.

For instance, there was the military. The military, not unlike the French who had been there before, had not had a good time in Vietnam. Their record was poor, partly because it was not a situation which yielded readily to the application of military power and partly because the politicians were always trying a teaspoonful of this, a teaspoonful of that. When a general finally got the dose increased to a tablespoonful this was not enough and he should have recommended a swig. No general won glory by telling his President to turn the job over to the diplomats. So they called for more of whatever it was and hoped for the best. If the Vietcong were stubborn this year, maybe double the force next year would do the job.

I was told when I was still in Hanoi by someone who had been very recently in Saigon that the American military establishment there would not accept negotiations at this time, no matter what Hanoi said. "They think they have Hanoi on the run," said this man. "They are not going to quit now. They want to pour it on. If it is poured on hard enough, there won't be any Hanoi to bother with."

I didn't know if that accurately reflected the thinking of the American military establishment in Saigon, but I encountered this line in some quarters in Washington on my return. The reasoning was simple. If Hanoi was in trouble, if China was about to blow up, if the North Vietnamese were about to lose their supply line—why talk to them? They will have to crawl to us later on. Let's hit them with all we've got.

From the standpoint of total military victory I found a grim honesty in this argument. But—and this was a large "but" to my way of thinking—this policy led straight to the confrontation which was most dangerous of all—confrontation with China's land forces, and quite possibly involvement with the Russians. We might crush Hanoi only to find ourselves locked in a fatal nuclear embrace which would eliminate all problems in Vietnam by eliminating the world of which Vietnam was a part. I thought this to be a counsel of utmost recklessness. But, of course, its advocates never mentioned the cataclysmic potentials. They limited themselves to talk about clobbering Hanoi. But, curiously, Hanoi could have been clobbered at any time in the last two years. And it had not been. Why do it now when Hanoi was ready to talk peace? A strange way to reason. Or so I thought.

But perhaps there lay behind this reasoning a hidden factor which governed our whole Southeast Asian strategy. Or a half-hidden factor, one which was often discussed by the Pentagon strategists and the ideologists of war-game theory, the men who created the logical structure against which much of our strategic air policy was elaborated. This was the line that the real enemy in Southeast Asia was not North Vietnam: It was China. We were there not because we worried much about the regime in Saigon or that in Hanoi but to draw a line against China. This was what much of Asia thought.

I had heard this thesis advanced in Asian capitals in the summer of 1966. The Asians simply did not believe that the United States was investing the sums we were putting into Vietnam, or the manpower we were stationing there, or the enormous bases we were building in South Vietnam and Thailand simply to fight Ho Chi Minh. No. China was the objective. That was the way they calculated it. Some thought we were trying to provoke China so that we would have an excuse to bomb it, to destroy its nuclear facilities. After all, had not some of our generals proposed that line? Did it not possess a certain grim sense? If we were going to fight China ultimately, would this not be a good time to do it—before China got too strong, when we could still be sure of knocking out its atomic production centers?

If this was, indeed, our basic, secret, unstated strategy, if Vietnam was a holding operation or a maneuver to try to draw in China, if we were going through the motions of fighting North Vietnam but really were preparing for an assault on China, then, of course, the question of peace in Vietnam became moot. What was the point of it? It would run counter to our genuine intentions and would make it more difficult to cope with China.

For those who believed along these lines—and I had no doubt that many thoughtful men in the Pentagon and perhaps some not-so-thoughtful men in the Senate shared these ideas—there was nothing more strongly to be resisted than talk of peace or of ending the conflict in Vietnam. Each time peace talk arose it must be strongly rebuffed. We must not take yes for an answer. We might indulge in a little rhetoric to soothe the ruffled feelings of the world. But we must not let it interfere with the war. This must be remorselessly pressed and escalated to the limit. China must be compelled to intervene. According to this thinking, the very thing which Hanoi most feared—the possibility of Peking's moving volunteers over the frontier—was devoutly to be hoped for since this would enable us to trigger the nuclear offensive which would eliminate China from the map.

It seemed preposterous to suppose that men like President Johnson, Secretary Rusk, or Secretary McNamara considered the war in such terms. I had no doubt that they were as eager as anyone to find a solution. But they were also determined that it would be a solution which would stand the test of time and trouble. They did not wish, having made so major a commitment of American treasure and manpower, having so deeply staked their prestige and reputation, to enter a cul-de-sac which would lead to another Panmunjom nor to embark upon a negotiation which would create a ramshackle settlement from which would emerge the next world crisis.

Skepticism was natural. Outright antagonism was another thing. There seemed to me to be one great difficulty about getting talks going. Both the United States and North Vietnam were still in the ring. Neither side was staggering toward collapse. The dangers which Hanoi envisaged were dangers of the future, not the present. In such a situation it was difficult for either side to give the ground which would make compromise possible.

Yet it was plain that the situation had reached precisely the point of development at which the most effective kind of solution could be achieved. It was not easy to end a war, and it was remarkably difficult to end one without laying the trail for a new war only a few years in the future. This we had done in our settlement of World War I. It was the ruthless terms ruthlessly imposed on the Central Powers which set the stage for World War II. I was not convinced that the unconditional surrender imposed upon Germany and Japan at the end of World War II did not contain the seeds of World War III, although this might have been averted by the extraordinary aid rendered by the United States. Yet in Europe many observers felt that if World War III came, Germany would again be the instigator and that the cause would lie in the World War II settlement.

We now were at a striking point in history in Southeast Asia. Hanoi had not been defeated. The United States had not been defeated. Each was conscious of the strength of the other. Each had suffered. But not irretrievably. We could, therefore, if we utilized our instincts for statesmanship, construct a settlement which would have the elements of equity, honor, and reasonableness and which might endure.

Were we to follow the course of obliterating Hanoi, of hitting it with everything in the book, of driving North Vietnam back to the caves, would we not create a vacuum—even if we escaped nuclear war with China and/or the Soviet Union? Might we not then find ourselves with nothing but a vast gray land in which not even Marshal Ky would manage to reign supreme? What of neighboring Laos and Cambodia? Would not total defeat in Vietnam, even if obtainable, create a situation in which for a hundred years we would be committed to maintain costly and numerous garrisons to police the marshes of the devastation which we had created, the vast and ever-growing jungles, uninhabited by man, beast, or bird, which would be our inheritance? These speculations arose inevitably as one pondered the alternatives.

To my way of thinking the arguments ran strongly toward an effort at negotiation. The task of negotiating a durable Southeast Asian settlement was difficult. But it was a fascinating one, the kind to evoke a challenge to any diplomat, the kind which would be a monument to the statesmanship of the man who accomplished it, something far beyond the transient triviality of so many postwar diplomatic settlements. This could be the foundation for a whole new epoch in Asia, one which would contribute to the strength and stability of a world which would endure whatever passing crises might come to China or even to India.

I hardly needed to think about the consequences which would flow from it: the release of American energies and resources to cope with the problems of Latin America and Africa, to turn once again to the raveled threads of Europe, to the critical negotiations over the atom, to the détente with Russia, to the world population explosion, and, finally, to the problem of China itself.

Perhaps those generals were right who believed the only way to deal with China was to atomize it. But I thought that there must be another way. China was the world's most talented nation, the reservoir of more human skills than any other existent, a people of infinite capabilities, possessor of the world's longest history and most complex culture, inventor of so many of the great technologies of the human era. Was it true that we could not find a way to live with China? Must the globe be turned into a poisonous desert because of China? I did not believe so. Surely America's heritage, Yankee ingenuity, and the democratic imagination of our great people could devise a better course.

EXTEND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING LAWS TO FARMWORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the union movement on the farms is accelerating at a pace which can leave no doubt as to its strength or the determination of those engaged in this effort.

The events of the past 2 years, first in California and later in other States, indicate that farmworkers are ripe for unionization.

Moreover, the desperate economic plight of farmworkers and their efforts to raise themselves by their own bootstraps has engaged the sympathy and support of many elements in our society.

Recently, for instance, it has become clear that organized labor is going to devote large amounts of money and manpower to this effort.

Inevitably, there will be some farm operators who will resist unionization.

Within this impending conflict, lie the seeds of trouble.

At present, the collective bargaining provisions of the National Labor Relations Act do not cover the agricultural industry.

There are no established rules of procedure to cover the organizing and bargaining processes.

The result is predictable—disputes which will flare into strikes, picketing, bad feeling on both sides and, perhaps, violence.

The residue may well be years of mutual distrust and distaste.

Over a period of many years, we have established and codified rules to govern both sides in these situations. They may not always work perfectly, but they are far better than simply relying on the law of the jungle to settle disputes between employees and employers.

Indeed, it was the bitter economic warfare of the thirties which brought these rules into being and resulted in their being written into law.

In a very real sense, we are faced today in the farm industry with many of the same conditions that we faced in the factories in the thirties.

There are fewer people involved. But

the economic and social issues involved are every bit as grave as those which resulted in sitdown strikes and picket line warfare 30 years ago.

If any doubt the deep determination of farmworkers, once embarked on a campaign to win union representation and the right to bargain collectively, to see that campaign through, let him look at the 18-month struggle involving the DiGiorgio Corp. in California which has just been successfully concluded.

If any doubt the deep determination of some farm operators to resist unionization, let him look again at that same example.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt in anyone's mind on which side of this issue I stand. I believe that industrial unions have been good for employees, good for employers, and good for this country.

I believe that the same will be true in the farm industry.

Moreover, the appalling poverty in which migrant farm families spend their lives is arousing the conscience of America.

The churches are taking the lead in this movement. Most recently, every Catholic bishop in the State of Texas joined in issuing a statement supporting the right of farmworkers to form unions and urging national legislation to protect this right.

But, no matter whether your sympathy and your economic or political interest lies with the workers or the farm operators, the reality of the situation facing us calls for enactment of this legislation.

Already this year we have had serious labor disputes in California, Florida, and Texas. This is only April. What will August be like?

There is also a purely economic argument for the passage of this legislation.

Without uniform laws governing all the States, the labor movement on the farms will fall unevenly on different parts of the country.

While some farmers will be paying union wages, others will be operating under the old system of paying as little as possible to obtain workers.

And while some farmers will have to deal with a union movement without the benefit of established procedures and laws, others will be left alone for the time being.

Mr. President, unless we abolish the law of the jungle and enact a rule of law in the farm labor field, it may well be a long, hot summer of strife and economic inequality on the farms of America.

ELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING DEVICES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, any observer of American society in 1967 should be aware of the threat to our freedom posed by the unbridled use of electronic eavesdropping devices.

This danger, and the opportunity for its abatement contained in the Right of Privacy Act, was clearly stated in an editorial published in the Washington Post on Monday, April 10.

I believe most observers will agree with the statements of this editorial, although I would not go so far as the Post suggests in proposing to deny a closely supervised electronic surveillance in cases involving national security.

Nevertheless, the editorial constitutes a thoughtful exposition of a grave problem which confronts the whole country and which this year Congress is being called upon to solve.

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

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1967]

PRIVACY ACT

The ugly excesses of official eavesdropping are being exposed anew by the current hearings of Senator Edward Long's Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. Bugs and taps have been employed with reckless disregard of rights of privacy by the Internal Revenue Service as well as by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and one can hardly help surmising that other Federal agencies as well have resorted to this sort of surveillance when it suited their interest or curiosity. We do not, however, share Senator Philip Hart's disheartened conclusion that the disclosures demonstrate the "absolute uncontrollability" of such eavesdropping. We believe that Internal Revenue Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen has brought the practice under control by resolute administrative measures in his own agency. And we are hopeful that the Attorney General's proposed "Right of Privacy Act" will put an end to much of the indiscriminate, intrusive, un-American snooping that is now so prevalent.

President Johnson and Attorney General Clark deserve high praise for their courage in grasping this nettle and seeking to protect cherished concepts of privacy. For three decades a succession of Attorneys General have subscribed to a strained and silly gloss upon Section 605 of the Federal Communications Act. They have persisted in pretending that Congress, when it forbade any use or divulgence of the content of any intercepted telephone conversation, did not intend to forbid the interception itself. Happily, Attorney General Clark has abandoned this subterfuge.

The privacy bill proposed by the Department of Justice would flatly forbid telephone interception without the consent of one of the parties to the communication. And it would do the same with regard to the use of electronic, mechanical or other devices to eavesdrop on a private conversation. In addition, it would put severe restrictions on the manufacture, shipment or advertisement of devices useful for wire interception or eavesdropping. It seems to us that these proposals embody the very essence and purpose of the Founding Fathers when they composed the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution prohibiting unreasonable searches for the sake of protecting privacy.

The Justice Department bill contains one large loophole. It would allow the President to authorize wiretapping or bugging whenever he thinks the national security is at stake. In our judgment, the arguments against eavesdropping apply with equal force in all situations. They are, in brief, that the injury done to freedom of communication by official snooping outweighs the benefits to public safety. And the dragnet character of the process inevitably involves all sorts of innocent people and all sorts of noncriminal conversations. It is true that some criminals may be caught and some spies thwarted by letting law-enforcement authorities listen in on private conversations; but it is also true that a dangerous damper will be put on private conversation.

The Justice Department proposal, apart from this loophole, goes a long and splendid way toward bringing the twin values of order and liberty into harmony. It recognizes that the role of law enforcement is not alone to protect the community from crime but to preserve the kind of community in which free men can live and find fulfillment.

WALTER REUTHER'S PLEA TO SAVE OUR CITIES

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the March issue of Agenda, the magazine of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO, contains excerpts from the testimony of IUD President Walter P. Reuther before the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization last December 5, along with portions of the colloquies between Mr. Reuther and the subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. Since the printed hearings of the subcommittee have not yet appeared, I ask unanimous consent that these important extracts from Mr. Reuther's appearance be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, no amount of paraphrasing on my part could substitute for the eloquent testimony of Mr. Reuther. Nonetheless, I would like to note several of what I believe to be the most salient points Mr. Reuther makes.

First, Mr. Reuther advocates a private national nonprofit housing and development authority to serve as the mechanism for rebuilding our cities on a massive scale.

Second, he recognizes that providing decent housing is itself not enough. We must move simultaneously to develop aspiring neighborhood communities in which people work together to overcome their common problems.

Third, he emphasizes the value of homeownership for poor people, who have or can develop the capacity to accept its responsibilities.

Fourth, he calls for a dynamic new role for the American labor movement, in cooperation with government, business, and other groups, in meeting and overcoming the challenges of our cities.

I commend this brief but stimulating article to Members of the Senate:

SAVE OUR CITIES

The following pages contain excerpts of both the prepared testimony and the question-and-answer discussion when Walter P. Reuther appeared before the Ribicoff Committee of the U.S. Senate.

The date was December 5, 1966. The technical name of the Senate group is the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Under the leadership of Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D. Conn.), it has been conducting a searching and thoughful examination of the many problems that confront the American city.

Reuther appeared on behalf of three organizations: as president of the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO; as president of the UAW; and as chairman of the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty.

EXHIBIT 1

Cities have two basic resources—people and land. Everything is built by the people—on, over, or under the land.

It is outrageous and maddening, then, that land use decisions which affect the lives of millions—and determine the destiny of the city, itself—are usually made either by a handful of speculators or by local zoning boards whose thinking so often bears little relationship to the total, long-range, human and physical needs of the community.

Real estate speculation artificially inflates land values to a point where it becomes impossible to construct reasonably-priced housing. Huge profits for a few becomes the yardstick they use to dole out to us our allotment of parks, playgrounds, greenbelts and open spaces.

Almost every day one of our thousands of local zoning boards makes a decision about population density, industrial activity, or transportation facilities which conflicts with or paralyzes the plans of a neighboring community. And all too frequently we read about spot zoning which can change the face of a community almost overnight.

Before we can begin to plan and build the urban areas of the future, our cities must obtain firm control of that most precious substance—the land under and around them. . . .

MODERN HOME BUILDING TECHNIQUES

Senator RIBICOFF. Mr. Reuther, your statement that you could reduce by modern techniques the cost of the average unit from $16,000 to $8,000 has been repeated time and time again by many people who have studied the problems of the cost of housing.

It has been said that the most outmoded method of production in our society is building. How should society go about it—government, industry, finance and labor—to get the most modern tools and techniques, and the most modern materials? How does society, which is apparently helpless now, go about producing an $8,000 unit instead of a $16,000 unit?

REUTHER. To begin with, I suggest we create a mechanism that can tackle the total problem. This is what I would hope a national nonprofit housing and development authority or corporation would take upon itself. It would get people to work on research and development in the housing field on the question of design.

Senator RIBICOFF. Do you conceive of this corporation as being completely free of government?

REUTHER. That is correct. I think that this corporation, if it were supported by government but free and independent of government, would have maximum latitude.

Senator RIBICOFF. How would it be supported by government and still be free of government?

REUTHER. Suppose the corporation said: "One of the first things we want to do is to take upon ourselves the responsibility of finding a way to design and engineer a $16,000 dwelling for $8,000."

I think that is the kind of a thing that the government can give a grant to. The government does this in private industry all the time. Do you think the North American Company would spend their money to make the new rocket engine they are making? No, the government gives them a grant. I propose that the government give this corporation a grant for the purpose of study and research to develop an $8,000 house which will have the value of a $16,000 house.

WHAT KIND OF CORPORATION?

Senator RIBICOFF. You would rather see this corporation than the Comsat* approach? You think it is more practical than the Comsat approach?

REUTHER. I think it has more operational flexibility.

Senator RIBICOFF. David Rockefeller of the Chase-Manhattan Bank was here as the opening witness last week, and there was some hesitance on his part about a Comsat approach. He did not reject it.

REUTHER. I do not reject it. I just think this is the better way to do it.

Senator RIBICOFF. None of us knows. We are just trying to determine where we stand. Now, he indicated that he thought there ought to be more private investment in the rebuilding of the city, and he put a figure of $1 government to $5 private. Does that figure sound like a pretty good balance to you?

REUTHER. Yes, I would agree with Mr. Rockefeller on that. That is the approach I favor.

I would hope that Mr. David Rockefeller would be one of the allies in the implementation of this concept. I have talked to him about this problem. I believe that if we structured this kind of a private instrument properly we could draw into the total effort very substantial private investments. I think a five-to-one ratio would be a minimum. We might even go beyond the five-to-one ratio in terms of the private contribution.

But private investment is not going to go into troubled and uncharted waters, unless it knows where it's coming out on the other end. We have no right to take other people's money and speculate with it.

In the task of totally rebuilding our cities, we know the market for decent housing is there. It is not like building something nobody is going to buy. If we plan it so that it is within the reach of millions of people who need low-cost housing, it is a guaranteed market. That kind of market will attract private funds, because the private funds will be secure.

Senator RIBICOFF. Do you look at this corporation as a brick and mortar operation? What is this corporation sociologically and psychologically? For example, you have someone moving off the farm. He never lived in a big city. Who teaches him how to live in a city?

REUTHER. Not the corporation.

REBUILDING THE SLUMS

Senator RIBICOFF. Basically, the private investor is not going to build a group of new homes, if within one year after they are built, they are destroyed and become a slum. Now, who manages the housing that is being built?

REUTHER. This is an area in which a great deal of very careful work must be done.

To begin with, I think we have to accept the fact that a slum is not just a bad house. It is a part of the total living environment which has destroyed the will that is essential for a group of people to maintain a decent neighborhood. We have to regenerate that will.

We have to start at the community level by creating groups, by organizing people, by developing leadership. This is one of the things that the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty is working at—to develop leaders from the slums who will go back into the slum areas. We have to organize neighborhood groups. We have to give the people pride.

We also, I believe, have to try to make a large proportion of these new housing units privately owned, so that these people will have a direct economic incentive to maintain their own house in good repair, in a total neighborhood that is attractive. It seems to me that we can create this. . . .

The practical facts are that unless we start with the proposition that we can elevate the attitude of people who live in the slums, unless we can stimulate motivation relating to building and creating and maintaining a decent neighborhood—unless we do this, the problem is hopeless.

Senator RIBICOFF. Now, you would recommend, I assume, that everyone who occupies a unit should be an owner, whether he owns a single house, whether it is a condominium, whether it is a co-op. You would prefer to see owner occupancy?

REUTHER. I would put as much emphasis upon that as possible, while recognizing that in the transition period we will not be able to move people from the lowest economic level into that status. But I would hope that in the long range planning we do, we would be moving towards the time when the number of nonownership units would be relatively small, in terms of the total.

Senator RIBICOFF. You say you have talked to David Rockefeller. Did he evince an interest?

REUTHER. I do not want to violate a confidence, but I feel reasonably hopeful.

IT'S A BIG COUNTRY

Senator RIBICOFF. We have big labor, big finance and big foundations, and you are going to have to involve all three.

REUTHER. I quite agree.

Senator RIBICOFF. Big money, big industry, big foundations.

REUTHER. Big problems.

Senator RIBICOFF. The problems are big . . . Are the techniques known for better building on a mass basis?

REUTHER. There is no question about it. The technology, the know-how, is no problem. It is the problem of the will. Are we prepared to use it?

Senator RIBICOFF. How do you get the will of labor? There has been much criticism concerning the unwillingness of the building trades to use modern techniques. How do we involve the building trades to go along with this concept?

REUTHER. . . . The building trades in the past have had a great deal of insecurity, and it is a perfectly natural human response for people to try to defend themselves against insecurity. I think we have to say to them: First, no group in society can stop the forward march of technology; and second, they ought to enlist in the effort to modernize the industry, because they have a great deal more to gain. . . . Every building trade union will be a bigger union in terms of membership, and their membership will have fuller and more secure employment.

LABOR'S ROLE IN THE CITIES

Senator RIBICOFF. What role do you envision for the American labor movement in the regeneration of the cities of America?

REUTHER. I believe that if the American labor movement operates exclusively in the narrow circle of collective bargaining and is interested in just getting a few more nickels for its members, it will fail in its historic responsibility.

American labor cannot find answers to its problems in a vacuum. Automobile workers' children go to unsatisfactory schools. They buck the traffic. Their children are breathing polluted air.

Therefore, if we are going to solve the problems of our members, we have to work with the other people in the community to find answers to the problems of the whole community. . . .

Senator RIBICOFF. You talked about some of the union pension funds being used for seed money in the Detroit project. One of the largest sources of capital today is union pension funds. Would you advocate the use of union pension funds in either a corporation that had many interests, or union pension funds in different methods and different approaches in rebuilding the cities?

REUTHER. I make a very sharp distinction between seed money—development money—and mortgage money. Pension funds are in the field of mortgage money. First of all, the law would not permit it to be used as seed money or development money. I think it would be very unwise if the law did permit it.

* The Communications Satellite Corporation—established by Congress as a mixed corporation, representing government, communications corporations and individuals who purchase stock.

We are talking about pension funds as they relate to mortgage money, which is secured and would meet legal requirements. Any pension funds so invested would be secure as far as the pension trust funds were concerned.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Senator RIBICOFF. Senator Kennedy asked me to relate to you how sorry he is that he could not be here this afternoon. He was very anxious to ask a few questions, but he had another engagement that he had to keep. He has left with me a series of questions and I will ask these questions of you on behalf of Senator Kennedy:

"As you probably know, I have advocated the formation of community development corporations at the local level, using the leadership of labor and the people in the neighborhoods together with private enterprise capital and federal funds to undertake an interrelated attack on the problems of the ghetto. What is your reaction to a proposal of that kind?"

REUTHER. As I said earlier, I very much favor that approach. We would pull together the broad resources of the community on a private nonprofit basis and create an instrument so that we can work together. This is precisely what we are going to do in Detroit. I am very much in favor of this idea, and I hope that what we are doing in Detroit can be repeated in many other communities throughout the country.

Senator RIBICOFF. But I assumed that what you are talking about was a national corporation.

REUTHER. Both. In Detroit we are doing this at a local level. It is a six-county area. I am in favor of having a national nonprofit corporation to deal with the total, the overall, and have them back up, support and work with, provide technical assistance, et cetera, to the local nonprofit groups.

Senator RIBICOFF. The local nonprofit groups would then be composed of community leaders, funds, private industry, labor, finance and interested citizens. But somewhere along the line you are going to have the motivation and drive of the private enterprise system working for a profit. Not everybody is going to work in every community on a nonprifit basis, are they?

REUTHER. The nonprofit authority is the instrument that gets the thing moving.

Suppose we are planning a thousand units. Well, some private developer will get access to that land. He will submit plans which have to be in harmony with the total plan. He gets the opportunity then to acquire that land and to build those thousand units.

There is the profit motive. The free enterprise system motive takes over in the building of those houses.

In another situation we may want to build a community facility. That will be up for bids. Some private contractor is going to build that. The profit motive is going to drive him, but the overall thing is the total community effort, and the reward there is not the profit motive. The reward there is to build together a good community.

That is sufficient in Detroit to get us working together. We have the Big Three (GM, Ford, Chrysler). We have Detroit Edison, Michigan Consolidated Gas, the banks, the J. L. Hudson Company department store, the UAW. We are working together.

I think it is good for the souls of people to be a part of a nonprofit corporation.

A PRESIDENTIAL ASSEMBLY

REUTHER. As a practical matter, you could not assemble this kind of broad community group encompassing these diverse groups, except around the concept of a nonprofit corporation.

Senator RIBICOFF. You know, your suggestion has a lot of value, and I think it is a very important one.

There is only one man, in my opinion, who could assemble such a group on a national basis and have the confidence of all the American people, and that is the President of the United States. I would respectfully suggest that this is something to be considered as a very practical matter by the President of the United States.

REUTHER. I think you are right. If the President did extend an invitation to a representative group of people to jointly launch and create such a corporation, I believe he would find their response overwhelmingly favorable.

DAIRY SITUATION DESPERATE IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Marquis Childs, the noted syndicated columnist, in a recent article accurately assesses the plight of our Midwest farmers, particularly our dairy farmers, who are faced with a desperate situation: falling prices, high cost of farm machinery, a shortage of labor, and, the depressing effects of increasing dairy imports of butter fat-sugar mixtures and cheeses—milk equivalents—coming into the United States from Western Europe.

In his article appearing in the Louisville Times of April 4, Marquis Childs recounts the battle of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] with Secretary Freeman on behalf of the farmers. Senator NELSON has found that Wisconsin dairy farmers are leaving their dairy farms at the rate of 84 a week because they cannot support their families. Like Senator NELSON, I am gravely concerned about the rapid increase of milk-equivalents imports, which in 1965 were at 2.7 billion pounds—three times the amount imported in 1964. This year's total may exceed 4 billion pounds.

This is a bitter situation to our dairy farmers, and as Marquis Childs states:

As the farmer sees it, he alone among all other producers is getting less for his toil than he did 20 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD. I hope that Congress will act in fairness to the dairy farmers by passing Mr. PROXMIRE's bill, S. 612, of which I am a cosponsor, in order that we may limit dairy imports before we lose all our dairy farmers.

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

A PRAIRIE FIRE THAT IS SINGEING THE DEMOCRATS

(By Marquis Childs)

MADISON, WIS.—The prairies are on fire. That trumpet call out of the Populist past is heard in a new context today.

Politicians of every persuasion agree that the farmers have rarely been angrier than they are today. That goes not only for dairy farmers, members of the National Farmers Organization who are dumping their milk, but pretty much across the rural spectrum.

Nothing quite like this has been seen since the early 'thirties when embattled sons of the soil, armed with shotguns, stood off sheriffs' foreclosures. Today, however, these are not farmers on the ragged edge of poverty. They are younger men out of World War II and the Korean War who chose to go back to farming as a way of life. They invested anywhere from $50,000 to $100,000 or more in the machinery essential to an efficient dairy operation.

With falling prices for milk during the past year they say they are going broke. Wisconsin farmers are leaving dairying at the rate of 84 a week, according to a current estimate. This decline is reflected on the main streets of small towns across the state as feed stores and processing plants close down.

It is reflected, too, in the growing revolt against the Johnson administration. A poll taken by The Wisconsin Agriculturist last fall showed that Gov. George Romney of Michigan would get the farm vote by a margin of more than two to one over President Johnson. While the president did better with 29 per cent in a trial heat with Richard M. Nixon as the Republican candidate, the latter got 40 per cent with 31 per cent undecided.

Even more striking was the result when Johnson was pitted against Sen. Robert F. Kennedy of New York in a presidential primary. Farmers and farm wives in Wisconsin gave Johnson 15 per cent to 47 for Kennedy, with 38 per cent undecided; of those who voted for Johnson in 1964 roughly 55 per cent preferred Kennedy as the candidate in 1968. The belief is that a similar poll taken today would go more heavily against the president.

While farmers are about 14 per cent of Wisconsin's population, more than twice the national average, in a state in which elections are normally decided by three per cent or less of the total vote cast a massive farm protest could determine the result next year. Johnson carried the state in 1964 by a majority of 400,000 out of 1,600,000 votes cast. In neighboring Minnesota, Iowa and the Dakotas the signs are that this same rebellion is blowing up a political storm.

The farmer, and particularly the dairy farmer who gets up at 5 a.m. to milk 50 or 60 cows, has a lot of time to think and a long memory. Over the past 18 months statements have come out of Washington leading the farmer to believe that the Johnson administration had come down on the side of the city consumer and the devil take the farmer.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, whose name is a dirty word in these parts, pointed to low-cost food and declining farm prices as a boon to the city consumer. The president in a speech advised consumers that if pork chops were too high they should not buy pork chops. As an embittered farmer put it, "What if when the price of a Ford car went up $50 or $75 he told folks not to buy Fords? Why, he'd have been damned to hell and back as a socialist."

In a letter to Freeman, Sen. Gaylord Nelson, a Democrat who is up for reelection next year, cited the milk dumping in 25 states and the campaign of the National Farmers Union to stop buying new farm equipment and autos as a dramatic demonstration of the farm unrest throughout the country and particularly in dairying. What really hurts, as Nelson underscored in his letter, is the record-high imports of dairy products. In 1965 some 900,000,000 pounds of milk equivalent were shipped to the United States. This went up to 2.7 billion pounds last year, with the total for the current year estimated to be four billion.

That 2.7 billion pounds, Nelson noted, was the same as 300,000 additional dairy cows producing milk in the United States or 6,000 more dairy farms. But instead the nation lost twice that number of cows and more than seven times the number of dairy farms.

The bitter truth, as the farmer sees it, is that he alone among all other producers is getting less for his toil than he did 20 years ago. Today's farm prices are nine per cent lower than they were in 1947. And while the dairy farmer still gets only eight to 10 cents for a quart of milk the housewife pays three times that much in the cities.

The rumor is that the administration intends to cut back the quota on dairy imports. This would have happened before if it did not

seem to be in response to the campaign of dumping which in a world with so much hunger has an evil look. But anxious Democrats are wondering whether it will not be too little and certainly too late for 1968.

MAINTAINING STABILITY AT HIGH EMPLOYMENT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the Center for Strategic Studies, at Georgetown University, has made an important contribution to better economic policy for the coming year.

Its report, entitled "Maintaining Stability at High Employment; U.S. Economic Policy in 1967," is particularly timely. Deep divisions exist on the economic outlook and on the appropriate policy response.

A distinguished panel of economists, led by Prof. Henry C. Wallich, of Yale University, produced the report, which covers a wide range of economic problems. Perhaps its most important conclusion is that the economic outlook is not sufficiently strong to justify a tax increase to take effect at midyear. Two members of the panel, John T. Dunlop, of Harvard University, and former Treasury Under Secretary Robert V. Roosa, favor the enactment of the President's tax increase proposal, largely because of a more optimistic appraisal of the economic outlook.

The report makes an important contribution to improved economic policymaking. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Special report series No. 4 from the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., March 1967]

MAINTAINING STABILITY AT HIGH EMPLOYMENT: U.S. ECONOMIC POLICY IN 1967

PREFACE

The security of the United States clearly rests on the strength of its economy. This strength must be measured not only by the economy's ability to provide ever-expanding domestic prosperity and ever-rising levels of private well-being. It must also be gauged by its ability to sustain international burdens and responsibilities that are truly awesome.

Most of the world's finance and trade depends on the integrity of the dollar, which, in turn, depends on the health of the U.S. economy. Beyond maintaining a worldwide, highly sophisticated defense establishment, the U.S. has undertaken commitments to preserve the independence of scores of nations. These far-ranging promises, full of unforeseeable contingencies, can be kept only by preserving the balance of the economy, so that a safe margin of available resources can be maintained. This is particularly important in view of the heavy claims being made on the economy by the conflict in Vietnam.

As the means of pursuing goals and fulfilling commitments, the state of the economy obviously deserves close consideration by those concerned with U.S. strategy. An informed reading of the prospects for the economy is especially needed now, when the longest expansion in U.S. history is visibly slowing down and perhaps drawing to an end. There are disquieting signs of continuing inflation and pessimistic forecasts of recession. Should the economy indeed be faltering, the effects will be felt at home, to be sure, but the most serious consequences may occur abroad, in the global arena of U.S. strategy.

To assess the present economic situation and immediate prospects, the Center has called upon a panel of distinguished experts, whose widely varied experience embraces the top levels of policymaking in the government and private sectors of the economy. The Report is the outgrowth of vigorous and prolonged discussion by the panel members, and it is solely the expression of their independent views and judgments. On behalf of the Center, I wish to thank Chairman Henry C. Wallich and those who participated so constructively in the panel's deliberations.

ARLEIGH BURKE, *Director.*

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

Henry C. Wallich, *Chairman;* Professor of Economics, Yale University; former member Council of Economic Advisers.

Edward M. Bernstein, EMB (Ltd.) Research Economist.

Henry W. Briefs, Associate Professor of Economics, and Chairman, Department of Economics, Georgetown University.

John T. Dunlop, David A. Wells Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University.

Robert Ellsworth, Attorney at Law; former United States Congressman from Kansas and member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Robert V. Roosa, Partner, Brown Brothers Harriman & Company, N.Y.; former Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Murray L. Weidenbaum, Professor of Economics, and Chairman, Department of Economics, Washington University, St. Louis.

INTRODUCTION

As economic prospects for 1967 unfold, the stable and growing prosperity of recent years can no longer be taken for granted. Crucial questions must be answered, difficult decisions must be made. Is there a danger of recession? Does inflation continue to be a threat, perhaps combined with a slowdown in the economy? Will a tax increase be needed to maintain stability, or would its enactment possibly provoke the downturn we must seek to avoid? Will the dollar be under further pressure from the gold drain?

The President has given his answers to these questions in two major economic messages: the Budget, and the Economic Report. He foresees continued strength in the economy, so much so that he believes a tax increase to be necessary by midyear. He anticipates rising war expenditures and proposes a large increase in Social Security and a small one in Great Society programs. He hopes to reduce inflation without expecting to end it. On the crucial question of the gold drain, his expectations are not spelled out.

Economic planning inevitably becomes more difficult as the economy reaches full employment. Since 1961, the American economy has enjoyed a virtually uninterrupted uptrend, which has raised our total output by almost one-third. Living standards have been raised dramatically. Policy making during most of this period was facilitated by the evident need for expansion.

In 1966, however, the economy lost the balance that it had enjoyed throughout the long upswing and that until then had assured stable progress. Overheating manifested itself in rapidly rising prices and a worsening of our international trade position. The Federal Government failed to use appropriate fiscal policy to counteract this threat. Hence, the Federal Reserve System had to tighten monetary policy drastically. in the words of the President's Economic Report, ". . . Monetary policy was probably as tight as it could get without risking financial disorder. Any further increase in overall demand could not have been effectively countered by general monetary policy. In such a situation, the flexibility of overall stabilization policy is impaired." (p. 60)

One result of this imbalance in our economy and our policies was a collapse of the housing industry. Another was a 3.3 percent rise over the year in the cost of living. A third is the uncertain outlook for the economy in 1967.

THE OUTLOOK

In contrast to what has become the rule in recent years, economic forecasts for 1967 differ markedly. They range from continued expansion to a slowdown ending in recession. The forecast made by the President and his advisers, upon which the Budget and all other publicly available Federal Government economic planning rests, is one of the more optimistic.

We believe that fears of recession are exaggerated. It would be the first time that national policies had led us into a recession in the middle of a war, and we do not believe that this is ahead now. Yet we do feel compelled to raise questions with respect to important parts of the President's forecast.

The President's Report sees as one of the principal elements of weakness the top-heavy inventories that business accumulated during 1966. A reduction in inventories, relative to sales and perhaps in absolute amount, surely is ahead. Residential construction is already depressed and consumer expenditures on durable goods are no longer rising. Business spending for plant and equipment may level off, while Federal spending will soon slow its recent rapid rise. Profits declined in the fourth quarter of last year and margins are likely to be under sustained pressure from costs. These factors plausibly suggest that the first half of 1967 will not exhibit great strength.

For the second half of the year, the President's Report foresees a resurgence sparked by the ending of the inventory correction, a revival of housing, and a rise in consumer spending thanks to the proposed 20 percent boost in Social Security benefits. Here the uncertainties are greater. The predicted rapid correction of the inventory imbalance would be a remarkable achievement; at a minimum, it would imply very drastic inventory cuts in the first half of the year. Whether the housing industry can recover quickly and substantially depends mainly on whether credit can be eased greatly. A substantial lowering of interest rates might cause a reversal of the inflow of foreign capital that occurred last year in response to high rates. The delicate state of the balance of payments therefore leaves uncertain how far credit can be eased. Some doubt also remains whether the housing industry, after a period of near-paralysis, can resume expansion with little delay. Finally, the gain in consumer spending out of increasing Social Security benefits depends on whether, and on what scale, such legislation will be passed, as well as on the effective date of the added benefits.

TAX POLICY

In view of these uncertainties, most of us believe that the outlook is not sufficiently strong to justify Congress now voting a tax increase to take effect even as late as midyear. This view implies recognition that the prospective budget deficit will be substantially larger than now shown in the budget, a consequence that we do not consider adverse in its economic impact. Enactment of the increase, in this view, would heighten the danger, if not of a recession, at least of excessive unemployment. This possibility would be increased if the balance of payments should impede substantial easing of monetary policy.

Two members of our group,[1] however, favor enactment of the tax increase proposed by the President. They base their view on a more optimistic appraisal of the economic outlook, on the need to strengthen our international trade balance, and also on the moral

[1] *John T. Dunlop and Robert V. Roosa.*

value of financial sacrifice in wartime. They believe that given the realities of the political process, a tax increase is necessary to preserve in the budget a number of essential social programs and foreign aid.

Nevertheless, we all recognize the need for flexibility in fiscal policy. If the Congressional review of Federal spending programs should lead to major cuts, such as proposed later in this document, or if for other reasons the economy should show unexpected weakness, countervailing stimulus will be in order. This could take the form of an easier monetary policy, if the balance of payments permits, or else some mild form of tax action. The President has taken one action of this type by proposing reinstatement of the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation allowances. We regard this action as desirable, not only in view of present trends in the economy, but also because the existing deadline can be expected to have an adverse effect upon placement of capital goods orders.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Although it is not generally recognized in the United States, the balance of payments position is serious. The gold reserve fell by $570 million in 1966. This was somewhat less than in the preceding year, but it followed upon a large and uninterrupted decline that began in 1958. With the gold reserve dwindling, further losses must be a matter of grave concern.

Last year's $1.4 billion payments deficit, on a liquidity basis, was nearly the same as that of 1965. The payments deficit measured in this way was held down by the acquisition of large amounts of dollar claims by foreigners which are in fact liquid but are not technically defined as such. The balance of payments on a reserve transactions basis was in surplus by $270 million in 1966 compared with a deficit of $1.3 billion in 1965. The decline in the reserve transactions deficit is attributable to the inflow of about $2 billion in foreign banking funds, drawn to this country by the high interest rates that accompanied the tighter credit policy. Foreign official holdings of dollars have been declining for more than two years, so that the U.S. payments deficit on a reserve transactions basis has actually been settled fully (and even more than fully) by gold sales and by drawing on the International Monetary Fund. This in itself is an indication of the danger to the dollar in a continuation of the U.S. payments deficit.

We would deceive ourselves if we regard such decline in the payments deficit as has taken place over the past two years as reflecting an improvement in the U.S. payments position, particularly because the degree of success attained required the imposition of added controls. The inflow of foreign banking funds to this country cannot be expected to continue and there is a real danger that this hot money will leave when domestic interest rates decline relative to those abroad. The important aspect of the U.S. balance of payments that must be emphasized is the serious deterioration in the surplus on goods and services. This surplus has fallen from $8.5 billion in 1964 to $7 billion in 1965 and $4.8 billion in 1966. The surplus on goods and services is the only source from which the United States can, in the long run, finance the net outflow of private capital and U.S. economic aid. By allowing prices—especially wholesale prices of industrial goods—to rise over the past two years, this country has dissipated the fruits of fiscal and monetary restraint and the accompanying price stability of the period from 1958 to 1964.

The current need to keep foreign banking funds from leaving would limit a movement toward substantial credit ease, if that should become appropriate for domestic reasons. There is evidence that the lowering of interest rates in the United States will be accompanied by a decline of interest rates in other countries. Central bank discount rates have already been lowered in the United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, Sweden and Canada and Eurodollar rates in London have followed the decline in money market rates in the United States. Nevertheless, now that U.S. banks are better provided with reserves as a consequence of an easier credit policy, they will be more reluctant to pay high interest rates to retain foreign banking funds.

The most important action we can take to improve our long-run balance of payments prospect is to halt inflation. The great danger is that inflation will be allowed to continue while we enmesh ourselves deeper and deeper in controls. The proliferation of "voluntary" controls over U.S. capital movements—controls that are in fact semi-compulsory—must be resisted. Impediments to tourism and to the free flow of goods must likewise be avoided. If a case can still be made today for a tax increase, it is principally on balance of payments grounds. Recent developments within the domestic economy tilt the scale against this action in the near future.[2] But the payments deficit greatly limits the leeway that exists on the inflation front and the possibility must be kept in mind that the economy may have to be restrained further to protect the dollar.

The anguished payments position should not distract attention from the immediate need to renew the reciprocal trade legislation in some form this year. Due largely to special conditions in the European Economic Community, the effect of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the probable results of the Kennedy round on increasing U.S. exports are less promising than had been hoped. Protectionist pressures are mounting throughout the world. It is, therefore, all the more important to demonstrate that the United States is not disposed to retreat from the goal of freer trade.

Recent discussions of international monetary reform have brought a wide measure of agreement that the creation of a new reserve asset will be necessary in the near future, and that it should be in the form of a Reserve Unit backed by the leading currencies. Reform should involve a minimum change from the present reserve system based on gold, dollars and other foreign exchange, and the International Monetary Fund. Needless to say, a new reserve asset would have to be fully equivalent to gold and it should facilitate the modernization of the gold standard.

Although the proper functioning of the international monetary system requires the creation of a new reserve asset to supplement gold and foreign exchange, it would be a serious mistake to assume that this could in any way diminish the obligation on the United States and the United Kingdom to restore their balance of payments. Indeed, the best way to assure the early implementation of the proposal for a new reserve asset is to strengthen the dollar and sterling by eliminating the deficit in the balance of payments of these countries.

The continued decline in U.S. gold reserves together with domestic monetary expansion has brought closer the day when the free gold reserve, over and above the minimum required by law as backing for the currency, will have been exhausted. At the height of the 1966 Christmas shopping season, with its peak demand for currency, these free gold reserves were well below $3 billion. Because the United States can no longer use its gold reserve as an objective measure of the appropriate quantity of money, it would be more realistic to face this fact now and to terminate the legal gold requirement against currency. This should not, however, affect the basic principle that monetary policy must take account of our balance of payments as shown by changes in our gold and other reserves.

MEASURES TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

The President's Economic Report expects a continuation of the present low level of unemployment at 3.8 percent. The Report does not propose to reduce this level by measures that would increase aggregate demand. We regard this as a wise decision. Last year, an unemployment level of about 4 percent was associated with substantial price increases. In part, these increases may have been attributable to the sudden burst of speed with which the 4 percent level was approached and to the rapid shift of resources from civilian to military uses. But the level of unemployment probably was another factor.

Quite likely the President's Report is too optimistic in its unemployment forecast. *An unemployment rate of 4.5 perecnt during at least part of 1967 seems a distinct possibility.* This could happen despite a continued rise in the Gross National Product. In that case, proposals very likely will be made to regard such a condition as a recession, or a quasi-recession. *We regard as unwise efforts to redefine recession in terms of an upturn of the unemployment rate unaccompanied by a downturn in real GNP, unless the rise in unemployment were substantial.* Fluctuations in unemployment are likely to be shorter than those in GNP. An unemployment criterion of recession would call for expansionary action more frequently than a GNP criterion, thus generating an inflationary bias. Moreover, the lags in monetary and fiscal policy would probably be too long to catch such ups and downs. Minor fluctuations in the rate of unemployment should not trigger major policy reversals.

The prospect that unemployment will not soon be reduced to its purely frictional level of perhaps 2–2.5 percent calls for *structural action to combat and alleviate other forms of unemployment. The unemployment insurance system* needs to be improved. This should be done by deliberate planning and not, as often in the past, by hasty action improvised in the face of rising unemployment.

As the President's Report observes, prolonged unemployment in an economy enjoying high and rising employment is almost necessarily a sign of need for retraining of individuals who do not find work. We must strengthen and expand the programs that help increase the employability of the long-term unemployed, including education, training, retraining, improved job information, and aids to mobility. In the year ahead, an important task is to consolidate the many well intentioned but ill coordinated manpower programs now scattered through numerous government departments and agencies.

We should reject as fallacious the idea that a still lower rate of unemployment could permanently be obtained by tolerating a higher rate of inflation. Even if inflation were regarded as entirely costless, this proposal would be unworkable. The proposal can be made only on the assumption that people are money-blind, i.e. unaware of inflation. In that case they would not realize that a 5 percent wage increase with 2 percent inflation is no better, in real terms, than a 3 percent increase with stable prices. If such money-blindness ever existed in the days before price indexes and financial journalism, it cannot exist today. Even if it were to exist on a small scale, to exploit it would be no more moral than to exploit ignorance in any other way.

Nominal wage increases in excess of pro-

[2] *John T. Dunlop and Robert V. Roosa: We would qualify these two sentences because we find the case for a tax increase persuasive on domestic grounds as well.*

ductivity gains are possible for a limited time and to a limited extent. But they will also raise prices, except as profits can be squeezed. Rising prices cut real wage increases back to the level of productivity gains. *Over many years it has been documented that real wage increases do not exceed productivity gains.* If they had done so for any length of time, the share of profits would have shrunk, which has been the case only to a very minor extent. This approximate stability in income shares has been made possible by a relatively high rate of unemployment. Lower unemployment would have caused labor to ask for higher real wage increases. Since the productivity gains that were achieved did not permit these, unemployment over the years has had to fluctuate around a level at which available wage gains were consistent with labor's demands. Price inflation, with lagging wage increases, might temporarily permit lower unemployment. But as soon as labor sheds its money illusion, the supply of labor is bound to shrink enough to restore the equilibrium rate of unemployment. The possibility of trading more inflation for less unemployment exists only transitorily, and the effort to exploit it is bound to generate instability.

The proper conclusion to be extracted from the fact that a larger supply of labor would be forthcoming at a higher real rate of wage increase is not that some higher nominal rate should be offered and then nullified by inflation. It is that labor and business should bargain in such a way as to increase the amount of labor forthcoming at noninflationary wage increases.

GUIDEPOSTS

To reduce labor's real wage demands and to discourage employers from bidding for labor at inflationary rates so that unemployment can be reduced, is a major task. The present attitude of labor and business confronts the nation with the prospect of a choice between an intolerably high level of unemployment or periodic inflation.[1] As this is increasingly understood, there will be growing public impatience with the institutions and processes that produce this dilemma. The present behavior of labor and business is a threat to their own freedom to determine wages and prices.

The U.S. must learn to live with full employment. What needs to be learned is that full employment is not the exception, but, with good management, can be the rule. Business and labor then will have to learn that the high demand and labor scarcity accompanying full employment should not be regarded as the fleeting golden moment that must be snatched to raise prices and exact maximum wage bargains. By acting on the presumption that the moment, unseized, will vanish, business and labor in fact are driving it away.

The guideposts on wages and prices have been the Administration's chief instrument for dealing with this problem. The future of the guideposts, as a policy instrument, is obscure. Their demise in this role will not alter the economic fact, however, that labor cannot get more than its productivity gains if the share of profits is not to be reduced and investment seriously restricted.

At a minimum, an effort should be made to salvage the economic truths underlying the guideposts. There is little point in raising the guideposts to what seems to be the currently fashionable rate of wage increases, whether 5 percent or some other figure, and then claiming that this is noninflationary. Neither should the principle be compromised that nationwide productivity gains are the proper wage guide in most conditions. There is no basis for reverting to industry productivity as a standard. The President's Report is to be commended on the position it takes in these respects.

Meanwhile, monetary and fiscal policy will have to be brought to bear against the cost push inflation that seems ahead. They are not ideal instruments. But neither is it true that they are helpless. The size of the forthcoming wage increases will depend to some extent on whether they are negotiated in an environment of slightly rising or falling unemployment. The same observation holds true for the response of prices to whatever wage increases are negotiated. Because price increases in 1967 will influence wage increases once more in 1968, there is an evident need to stop this reciprocal levering early.

One use that could be made of the guideposts is to apply them to the incomes of Social Security pensioners and, in some categories, government employees. It seems undesirable to escalate these incomes by the price index, although cost of living adjustments will have to be made from time to time. Price escalation would undermine resistance to inflation. To escalate such incomes in terms of productivity gains means to let these pensioners and employees share in the overall advance of the economy.

EXPENDITURE CUTS

Quite aside from the effects of public spending on the level of economic activity, there are good reasons for taking a critical look at government programs. Both defense and civilian expenditures have been rising very sharply. Administrative Budget expenditures, which as late as fiscal year 1965 were held well below $100 billion, are now budgeted at $135 billion. The Cash Budget shows outlays are rising from $99.5 billion in fiscal year 1961 to $172 billion in fiscal year 1968. This is a more rapid increase in the size of the public sector than seems desirable in present circumstances. While part of the increase is due to war, experience shows that the postwar public sector share does not revert to its prewar proportion. Restraint therefore is needed even now.

It would be a tragic mistake, nonetheless, to let this restraint fall exclusively upon the Great Society programs. Some of these are the programs most in tune with our present needs. Insofar as they are intrinsically well conceived, these are among the best expenditures we can make. To be sure, organizational and management improvement seem necessary to increase the return on the taxpayer expenditure in these areas.

The majority of the panel believes that the same applies to the space and supersonic transport programs. These may be the great, forward looking investments in the future of our nation for which our age will be remembered. Twenty years from now, few will care how much the American people consumed in food, liquor, and cigarettes, nor perhaps even whether the rate of unemployment was 3.8 or 4.5 percent. But if, to gratify our desire for present consumption, we now default on the great technological challenges and yield world leadership to others, the effects will be felt for generations.

The budget-paring knife can be applied over a wide area. The Federal budget is permeated with accepted spending programs that will not stand the most lenient cost/benefit test. Subsidies to high-income farmers, to the inefficient ship-building and ship-operating industries, to fishing vessel owners and operators, to veterans without service-connected disabilities; irrigation and reclamation expenditures increasing the amount of farm land on which surplus crops are grown, payments to keep down output of wanted food stuff—there are areas where several billion dollars could be cut if the political will can be rallied. Such *a reallocation of public resources from low-benefit subsidies to high-benefit investment areas* could be a major improvement in the fundamental efficiency of government spending.

BUDGET REFORM

The textual presentation of the fiscal year 1968 budget gives heavy emphasis to the so-called National Income Accounts (NIA) Budget. This presentation has advantages compared with the traditional Administrative Budget. It is not the best form of budget statement, however, and the shift from one budget form to another at this time raises questions. We welcome the President's recommendation for a bipartisan review of the budget presentation.

The traditional Administrative Budget suffers from important defects. A principal one is that it omits the receipts and expenditures of the Federal Trust Funds, such as the Social Security and the Unemployment Trust Funds. Thus the expenditures in the Administrative Budget for fiscal year 1968 are only $135 billion, against $169.2 billion in the NIA Budget.

The Cash Budget, which includes the Trust Funds, is a third presentation of the Government's accounts that remedies this defect of the Administrative Budget. It includes the Trust Funds and arrives at total expenditures close to those of the NIA Budget, with a 1968 total of $172.4 billion. The Cash Budget differs from the NIA Budget by its greater comprehensiveness—it includes certain financial transactions of the Government—and by recording all receipts and expenditures at the time they occur, i.e. on a "cash" rather than accrual basis. The NIA Budget excludes these financial transactions and "accrues" revenues and, with certain qualifications, expenditures. Tax receipts, for instance, appear in the NIA Budget at the time taxpayers earn the taxable income, instead of some months or quarters later when the actual payment to the government is made. Thus the NIA Budget records more accurately, in this respect, the economic impact of Federal finances.

In recent years, as individual and particularly corporate tax payments have been speeded up, the difference between the cash and accrual basis and hence between the Cash Budget and the NIA Budget has shrunk. Thus, the NIA Budget no longer has important advantages over the Cash Budget in this respect.

The NIA Budget, however, has serious defects of its own. It records Federal purchases of long lead items, such as heavy defense equipment, not while they are being produced, but when they are delivered to the Government. In the meantime, these "goods in process" appear as part of business inventories, even though substantial amounts of Federal expenditures are being made in the form of "progress payments" to defense contractors. In 1965 and early 1966, therefore, the NIA Budget failed to signal the great impact that accelerated defense spending was having on the economy. If defense spending should slow down suddenly, the NIA Budget would again fail to catch promptly the fading away of governmental support to the economy. The Cash Budget is superior in these respects, because it does record the progress payments that the Defense Department makes to its contractors before the equipment is delivered and entered in the NIA accounts as a Federal purchase.

A second defect of the NIA Budget is that, in technical terms, it is not a budget record of actual receipts and payments but an eco-

[1] *Henry Briefs: This way of putting the issue points the fingers somewhat unfairly at the manufacturing sector. Recent price history and income increases in the services imply that the service sector contributed the major share to the inflation so far. As matters stand, the guideposts for wages and prices do not apply to services. I believe that the guideposts themselves stand in need of reform.*

nomic projection, i.e. an exercise in statistical analysis. No government department can be run by the NIA Budget, no purchase authorization signed, no audit of expenditures made. It thus fails to perform one of the basic functions of a government budget.

Compared with the Cash Budget, therefore, the NIA Budget has few advantages and several major disadvantages. In the January 1963 Budget Message, it was stated that the emphasis was being placed on the Cash Budget because it is the most comprehensive measure of Federal finance. We strongly believe, for these reasons, that if the Administrative Budget is to be replaced by another, which we agree is desirable, it should be the Cash Budget and not the NIA Budget.

The Cash Budget should be supplemented by a statement of the Government's financial transactions as a borrower and lender. (This would be true also of the NIA Budget, if it were chosen as the basic form of the budget.) Although the Cash Budget covers these transactions more completely than the NIA Budget, it tends to show only the net flow rather than the total of loan disbursements and repayments. The Federal Government makes a variety of loans, which means that it acquires financial assets. It also insures and guarantees private loans. At the same time the Government is a heavy borrower, under its own name and in the name of its agencies. Without passing judgment on how far the Government ought to go into the banking business, we believe that today the Government plays the role of a tremendously large bank. These finanical transactions ought to be brought together and presented in a form that permits appraisal of the impact of government financial transactions upon the economy. It should be clear that this proposal has nothing to do with what has been called a "capital budget." The latter implies a segregation of the Government's current and investment expenditures, regardless of whether they are financed by taxes or borrowing. Our proposal is for a financial statement that would disclose the totality of the government's lending and borrowing transactions, showing whether they finance public or private investment. No such distinction is made at present.

The emphasis of the NIA Budget in the President's recent Budget Message calls for another comment. The estimated $2.1 billion deficit in the NIA Budget for fiscal 1968 is somewhat smaller than the $4.3 billion deficit in the Cash Budget and very much smaller than the deficit in the Administrative Budget of $8.1 billion. This is due in part to the way in which the NIA Budget records the continuing buildup in defense expenditures. Even so, the Administrative deficit is held down primarily by various financial devices as the sale of participation certificates in Federal holdings of mortgages and other loans and the speedups in tax collections, which have so little impact on the economy that the NIA Budget does not reflect them at all. It goes without saying that efforts to minimize the apparent deficit should not influence the Government's budget presentation. Even the semblance of such motivation should be avoided. For this reason we regret that an otherwise desirable de-emphasis of the Administrative Budget exposes this year's Budget Message to possible misinterpretation.

Budget reform along the lines proposed need not disturb the principles of income distribution built into the present budgetary structure. The earmarking of payroll taxes for Social Security and unemployment is one of these principles. A clear line must be drawn between an accounting reform and a budgetary decision to redistribute income, such as would be involved in shifting Social Security to financing by the progressive income tax. The Cash Budget would show, of course, which receipts are recorded in the Trust Funds accounts and which in the administrative (General Fund) accounts.

FLEXIBLE TAX CHANGES

The experience of 1966 shows that it would be very useful to have a method whereby anticyclical tax changes could be made expeditiously. The experience of the year also shows, insofar as unique incidents can demonstrate anything, that if this power is placed in the hands of a Chief Executive, he may not see fit to use it in an election year. Conversely, if a tax cut instead of an increase were at issue, the opposite contingency would have to be contemplated.

As an alternative to Presidential discretion, the Congress might decide in principle the kind of tax increase or cut that should be instituted when the need arose. The legislation could be prepared to the point where only the magnitude and the timing, as well, of course, as the direction, remained to be decided. Action in case of need could then be as prompt as under a system of Presidential discretion. The danger of error or political motivation is always present, to be sure, but the way of democracy is to face up to these risks where a worthwhile cause is at stake. A subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Economics Committee has made constructive proposals in this direction.

REVENUE SHARING

The proposals for revenue sharing with the States will probably have to be postponed until the occasion for a "fiscal dividend" again presents itself. But further exploration could go on now.[4] The many attractive aspects of these proposals are well known: greater decentralization, matching of the great Federal revenue sources with the great state and local expenditure functions, improvement in the allocation of resources by allowing the states freely to allocate the money to the areas they consider of greatest local priority.

The proposal may also bring about a redistribution of incomes, both geographically and among income brackets. The decision to set tax rates and the allocation to states in a manner designed to redistribute funds should be taken deliberately. It should not be allowed to come about fortuitously or as the concealed result of decisions ostensibly aiming at other purposes. Better and more lasting decisions will be arrived at if these issues are faced clearly and openly.

If no tax increase should be enacted, a very large Administrative Budget deficit will have to be met. It will be necessary to face it realistically. A large deficit as such does not demand a tax increase, if the state of the economy does not require it. If strong inflationary pressures are present, taxes should ordinarily be raised, or government spending reduced, whether or not there is a deficit to be covered.

What is important is that the deficit, whatever its magnitude, be soundly financed. It should be financed by borrowing from the banking system only to the extent that an increase in the money supply, not forthcoming from credit to the private sector, is called for. The rest should be financed from genuine savings.

The deficit should be honestly stated. The rise in spending should not be concealed by treating as a reduction in expenditures the receipts from sales of Federal assets. Such transactions may be desirable, but the revenues should be clearly identified on the receipts side. When these operations take the form of sales of certificates of participation in Federal assets, moreover, they should not be made to appear as sales of the assets themselves. Many persons who favor asset sales because, rightly or wrongly, they want to get the Federal Government out of the banking business, would not approve of sales of participation certificates at higher interest rates, which are an expensive way of mortgaging assets that continue to be held by the Government. Furthermore, the sale of Federal agency securities should be discontinued when these sales increase the cost of borrowing to the Government or threaten to disrupt financial markets.

CONCLUSION

The year ahead poses unusually delicate problems. An economy at high employment may turn down, or it may tend to inflation, particularly in war economy setting. This suggests caution in all actions to be proposed. It does not mean inaction, and it should not mean resignation. It would be unwise to conclude that nothing can be done about inflation on the grounds that this year's inflation is the inevitable response to last year's. It would be unwise to yield control of the budget to the forces of inertia and conclude that nothing can be done about taxes, or spending, or the size of the deficit. All policy variables are in some measure amenable to guidance, and there is none that we can afford not to guide.

[4] *Robert Ellsworth: I believe that the need for starting on a new future for Federalism is so great that action ought not to be delayed on budgetary or economic grounds.*

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROBLEMS FACING THE FOREST INDUSTRY IN OREGON AND THE WEST

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate early this year, I did so with the thought that I would begin my term by listening and observing for some time before speaking—but recent events make it necessary that I speak now.

I am addressing myself to the Senate, as I believe this body should be apprised of one of the most significant problems facing my State and other Western States in which the economy is inextricably tied to land and natural resources.

Most of the lumber, plywood, and other wood products manufacturing plants in the West, now depend, for the most part, upon federally owned timber for logs—the raw material necessary to sustain their operations.

The ever-increasing demands for logs from Federal lands for domestic and foreign use has caused abnormally high prices for this log supply.

The health of the forest industry in Oregon, which has one-fifth of the timber resources of this Nation, has a direct bearing not only on the economy of my State and the prosperity of its citizens—it also has a direct bearing on the economy and prosperity of this entire Nation.

The tree is the source of many things. Logs are the raw material that provide the lumber for homes, schools, churches—for paper, containers, and more than 4,000 items which contribute so much to the pleasure and well-being of our citizens wherever they work and live—whether in the crowded cities here in the East, on rural farms and ranches, or in small communities throughout this Nation.

I am bringing this situation facing the timber industry to the attention of the Senate for another reason. The executive branch of Government has apparently refused to accept the responsibility for actions required to solve some of these problems and has demonstrated its indifference to its economic impact.

Failure on the part of the administration to act, its tendency to postpone, to drift, and to settle for consensus rather for specific solutions, is at the root of the problems facing Oregon's forest industry.

For many months the forest and homebuilding industries have had to bear more than their fair share of the results of the fiscal policies and manipulations of the present administration. As the log supply and price problem become more aggravated, there will be more lumber and plywood mills forced out of business in Oregon and the West unless definite corrective measures are soon applied.

The time for action to solve the problems facing the forest industry in Oregon and the West is past due.

The existing high cost of logs from Federal lands in Oregon has, in itself, become a serious problem, and these high prices do not stem from a physical lack of log resources as much as from Government practices which unduly limit their availability to the market.

Even as high interest rates and lack of mortgage moneys this past year drove the cost of home financing beyond the reach of the average family—a situation which I am happy to report is beginning to change for the better—the administration continued programs which drove still higher the price of Government-controlled timber in Oregon and the West.

While I was Governor of Oregon, I became seriously concerned with the situation facing the State's forest industry, as well as the inequity in Federal Government administration of the same resource as between the several States, and I engrossed this concern directly to the President.

In that letter written last October, I pointed out that the most serious problems facing Oregon's forest industry related to:

First. An alltime high cost of logs from Federal lands in Oregon;

Second. Policies concerning allowable cut which are inconsistent and inadequate;

Third. The need for faster development of primary access roads in the 13 national forests in Oregon; and

Fourth. The need for some concrete action at the Federal level to relieve the high cost of the Federal log supply in Oregon resulting from the impact of log exports to Japan.

In that same letter to the President, I offered four specific recommendations to ease the timber problems just outlined. These were:

First. That the President direct a review, at the executive level, of the philosophies and policies of Federal agencies as they affect the control and administration of the same types of federally owned timberlands in different States;

Second. That the President request the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to speed up reviews now underway within their agencies aimed at increasing the regulated annual allowable cuts from Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management timberlands in Oregon—also that these agencies put up for sale, without delay, the additional 469 million board feet of unregulated cut in thinnings and mortality salvage the agencies were then capable of selling last year over and above their regulated annual allowable cuts;

Third. That the President direct that the Federal budget for fiscal 1968 include funds enough to complete, with the least possible delay, the underdeveloped primary access roads in the national forests in Oregon; and

Fourth. That the President arrange for the earliest possible high-level, decisionmaking conference on log exports between the appropriate representatives of the Governments of Japan and the United States, along with the Governors of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, to discuss candidly—and in a spirit of cooperation—the problems for some and the benefits to others from log exports to Japan and to work toward solutions which will satisfy all involved or affected without decreasing the balance of trade between countries, and without imposing any Government interference on private industry trading.

My letter to the President of October 1966 was never acknowledged. Therefore, after arriving in Washington, and when the situation had worsened and more men had lost their jobs, I again called this problem to his attention. I received a letter dated February 7 from Mr. Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, replying for the President and answering both of my letters, the one in 1966 and the one in 1967.

Mr. Ackley's letter acknowledged the number and complexity of issues involved with regard to log supply and indicated that a review of alternative plans is underway to increase the volume of timber for sale from national forests. He also advised that discussions are underway in the Bureau of the Budget between the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management with a view toward achieving closer harmony between policies of the two agencies.

It appears that the administration is beginning to recognize at least this part of the problem. However, the reply to my recommendation for a high-level decisionmaking conference on log exports was that the proper course at the present time was to keep the situation under constant and careful review, and that any international conference would be premature.

Log exports, one of the most serious problems facing the timber industry in Oregon and the Northwest, was simply brushed aside by the Johnson administration.

I stated in my October letter to the President that this issue is one that transcends political party lines, and one that requires prompt attention. I urged the President to intercede personally and forcefully to move the subjects outlined from discussion to solution.

The evasive and negative answers to my specific recommendations for action to alleviate the distressing situation facing the forest industry in my State and the West leads to the obvious conclusion that there will be little action at this time by the executive branch of Government. I am, therefore, alerting you to a serious situation that has been ignored by the President and Federal agencies.

The subject of log exports to Japan requires immediate attention.

During the time of my letters to the President, the Japanese were announcing an expected doubling of their log imports. According to figures compiled by the Pacific Northwest Forest Range and Experiment Station, the research arm of the U.S. Forest Service, log exports for 1966 from Oregon and Washington to Japan were 32 percent greater than in the preceding year of 1965. Softwood log exports from the two States reached 1.1 billion board feet in 1956. The doubling of log exports to Japan will not only add to the existing problem of inadequate and high-priced log supply now facing most of the lumber milling industries in the Northwest, but which will also add to other problems as well.

It cannot and should not be assumed, however, that the log export issue is the sole issue in creating the present critical situation now facing the Northwest's timber industry. It is an important factor and should be dealt with as such.

At this time, I question the proposing or placing of legal restrictions on log exports. It seems that this would be attacking a symptom rather than the cause of the ailment. But I do believe that a frank evaluation of our problems and those of Japan in a conference of the two nations would be mutually beneficial in avoiding a severe crisis which will inevitably come unless we act and act now.

The most serious threat in the rapidly developing timber crisis in the Northwest is not so much to the large organizations which have their own timber resources, but it is to the small and middle-sized milling operators having no timber supply of their own and who depend entirely upon the Government-controlled log supply. These are the mills that, while providing thousands of jobs,

encourage full participation of the small businessman in the economic mainstream in communities throughout the Northwest. The threat of a further decline in these types of operations is far more than to just the individuals and their mills. The threat is to the competitive system that has given strength to the growth of this Nation.

The crisis in timber supply in the Northwest has been developing over a number of years. The demands upon the forests of Oregon and Washington during World War II were enormous, when some 45 billion board feet of lumber were cut in these two States alone during that war period. Of the 45 billion board feet cut, less than 3 billion board feet came from national forests due to the inaccessibility of forest timber. The result was that the readily accessible privately owned timber was harvested first thereby turning the industries' present demands to the Government timberlands for raw material supply.

To illustrate recent trends, approximately 9 billion board feet of timber was harvested each year in 1964 and 1965, of which 5 billion board feet came from public timber lands and 4 billion board-feet from privately owned timberlands. It is now estimated that the commercial timber reserves in private ownership in Oregon will shortly be able to produce less than 3 billion feet per year.

The further reduction in timber supply from private lands in Oregon, coupled to an increase in log exports to Japan, presents the probability of a staggering imbalance between timber demands and supply in Oregon unless the supply from Federal lands is increased.

Permit me to emphasize, and reemphasize, the point that Federal policy in management of timber is the key to the health of the timber economy, and, therefore, the entire economy of Oregon, for one very basic and very simple reason—the Federal Government owns well over 80 percent of the existing commercial timber in our State, and over 51 percent of our geographic area. The large scale of Federal ownership in Oregon makes it obvious that the solutions to forest industry problems of demand and supply must come from the Federal Government. There are solutions to these problems and one part of a possible two-pronged solution is to find a way to increase the available supply of logs. The other part is to develop a policy on log exports within the framework of free trade and existing treaties between this country and other nations.

The first part of the solution—finding a way to increase the available supply of logs—bears serious consideration on the basis that the two Federal agencies controlling most of the commercial timber in Oregon have annual allowable cuts which vary, as between the two agencies, as much as 100 percent.

A study completed last fall for the Oregon Department of Commerce showed that in Oregon the annual allowable cut of the Bureau of Land Management is well above that of the Forest Service for similar lands in similar geographical parts of the State.

In a letter written to me while I was Governor, the top Forest Service official in Oregon commented on the specific amount of difference in the allowable cut of the Bureau of Land Management and of the Forest Service in western Oregon.

He stated that this was difficult to determine because of the differences in measurement systems, differences in growing sites and productivity of lands, differences in allocation of acreages for experimental purposes, and the differences in marketability of species.

Forestry experts and others tell me that no matter what the extent of the percent of difference in annual allowable cuts may be, the Bureau of Land Management is still well above that of the national forests in getting its lands into high production.

The basic question is: What is the factual justification for the wide difference in allowable cuts from comparable lands administered by different agencies of the Federal Government?

Regardless of the exact amount of percentage difference, and this is the important point when considered in terms of volume, this percentage difference could be measured in billions of board feet, and could conceivably go a long way in providing a log supply which could begin to meet the needs of both the domestic market and the log exports to Japan.

I must emphasize that I am in full accord with a properly coordinated and balanced sustained-yield program for our natural resources that insures the maximum continued renewal of these natural resources. This is the highest concept of conservation.

I have noted that the Forest Service revealed just recently it expects to sell an additional 217 million board feet of thinnings and salvage timber in the Northwest by June of this year. These will be selective cuttings to allow better growth or to remove diseased or fallen trees.

I have asked for funds to permit the sale of an additional 252 million board feet of thinnings and salvage timber which is available now over and above the annual allowable cut.

I am also in accord with a program whereby Congress will provide funds to allow the fullest and fastest development of its access road system in all national forests in the country. Access roads are urgently needed to harvest overripe timber in Western States. During the past several years, Senators from other Western States have testified to this urgent need.

Recent congressional action increased the authorization for the development of forest roads. Since the Federal Government receives 75 percent of the revenue from the sale of Forest Service timber, a speedup in road construction will increase returns to the Federal Treasury and at the same time provide access to the needed timber. I emphasize at this point the need is to extend the access road system, not necessarily merely to improve existing roads.

It must be remembered also that such roads not only open the forest for harvest operations, but are used for recreational purposes and as access routes to protect the forest from insects, disease, and fire.

The second part of a possible two-pronged solution to the problems facing the forest industry in the Northwest is to undertake steps now that will provide the most practicable and equitable settlement of the issue of log exports to Japan.

Two of Oregon's leading newspapers, the Oregonian and the Eugene Register-Guard, in recent editorials very clearly brought the subject of log exports into sharp focus. I ask that the editorial entitled "Persistent Problem," from the Oregonian of February 20, 1967, and the editorial entitled "It Is Time To Talk Turkey With Japan," from the Eugene Register-Guard of February 24, 1967, be included in the RECORD with my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HATFIELD. While the damaging impact of log exports to some in the forest industry has been the subject of almost continuous dialog between industry and Government for a number of years now, a new wood product—woodchips—is now being exported to Japan to the advantage of others in the forest industry. Woodchips are manufactured from the portions of the log that were formerly waste and are used in the manufacture of pulpwood.

According to figures compiled by the Forest Service, the volume of woodchips to Japan from Oregon in 1966 totaled more than 180,000 cords. This is double the 1965 volume and is expected to continue to rise. Woodchips and logs must, therefore, be viewed in the context of the total forest products exports to Japan.

Another subject related to the log export issue is the difference in Federal rules as they apply to the different States. The Federal Government controls over 80 percent of the commercial timber in Oregon and places no restrictions on where this timber may be marketed. Yet under the provisions of a Federal law enacted 40 years ago, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior have imposed certain restrictions on the exporting of timber cut on any public lands in Alaska—even to the extent of prohibiting the export of logs from the State of Alaska to the States of Oregon or Washington.

The restrictions on log exports from Alaska to Japan mean that the bulk of Japanese demand for export logs must come from the States of Oregon and Washington, and some contend that the spiraling price of logs from Government-controlled timberlands in these two States results, in part, from this restriction on log exports from Alaska.

I realize that the law prohibiting log exports from Alaska was designed to protect a timber supply for the development of Alaskan industry—and I am in full accord with the buildup of industry in Alaska. It seems, however, that this 40-year-old law designed for this particular purpose might now be detrimental to competitive and full utilization of our natural resources, as it is my understanding that a sizable amount of the annual allowable cut from the public

lands in Alaska has been unsold each year and is, in effect, wasted. Such being the case, it could be argued that inconsistent Federal policies have inequitably prohibited the export of logs from public lands in a State where logs have been plentiful and contributed an artificial log shortage, and abnormally high prices for these logs, in neighboring States.

As the Governor of one State, I realized at the time that an attempt to resolve what appeared to be an inconsistent administration of the same type of federally owned lands in another State was certain to be a sensitive matter. For this reason, and since Congress had by law delegated authority to the Federal agencies for the handling of the matter of log exports from national forests, I recommended to the President last October that he take whatever steps were required to review an inconsistent Federal policy by the States as it related to the same natural resource.

Since the administration has virtually turned its back on the log export issue, I call upon my Senate colleagues to join me in requesting an early meeting between appropriate representatives of the U.S. wood products industry, Federal and State officials of the United States, Japanese business interests, and Japanese Government officials to review all aspects of the log export issue with a view to uniting the effort needed for remedial action.

This type of conference, I believe, can point the way for resolution of this vexing problem.

The crisis confronting the timber industry in my State illustrates the tremendous impact of Federal policies upon the State and the need for the State's voice to be heard in the shaping of policies relating to one of its great natural resources. The situation that I describe in Oregon can well illustrate what can happen in other States and to other natural resources.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me remind you and all the Members of this body that the forest lands in Oregon and the West are a source of richness for all of America. From these lands flow an abundance of benefits granted no other nation on earth. The custody of these benefits demands no less than the combined national efforts in assuring their maximum and equitable use forever.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Feb. 20, 1967]

PERSISTENT PROBLEM

The Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station has revealed that log exports to Japan from Oregon and Washington last year were 32 per cent greater than in 1965. Japan took 1,023 million board feet of logs, accounting for nearly all the exports. Canada got 59 million board feet, not quite half as much as in 1965.

Japan also more than doubled its imports of pulpwood chips from Oregon to a total of 182,651 cords.

Log exports provide jobs for loggers and longshoremen. The good prices the Japanese are willing to pay bring profits to both private timber owners and the federal government, which has the largest supply of timber.

But Japanese competition for logs raises the price American industry must pay for its raw material. Export of raw logs also cuts wages and profits running into millions of dollars which would go to U.S. workers and mill owners if lumber were exported instead.

The log-export issue, which has boiled and simmered for years, is about to boil over again. Recent low prices for lumber and plywood have placed the Pacific Northwest industry in a serious squeeze. Much of this can be blamed on the slump in home building. But the ever-increasing export of logs is a factor which makes a large segment of the domestic industry see red.

Those who profit from the log trade naturally have a different perspective. They contend that the Japanese mainly buy logs which are too small for the domestic market or are of species not in great demand here. Douglas fir accounted for only 11.5 per cent of last year's exports and Port Orford cedar 3.1 per cent. The remainder was made up primarily of hemlock and true firs.

That the export trade is valuable is shown by the $91.9 million price tag the experiment station placed on last year's business. This was 30.5 per cent greater than that for 1965.

Some foresee a doubling of Japan's demands on this region's principal raw material. This, they fear, would tighten insufferably the price squeeze on U.S. wood processors and would make even more ridiculous the position of a region fully able to manufacture finished products which, nevertheless, is sending out much of its resource in a raw state.

How can log exports be controlled within a free-trade framework and without endangering other highly valuable trade with a friendly nation? Many suggestions have been made but as yet none has proved effective when adopted.

Oregon law (ORS 528.805 to 526.835) provides that all timber, except Port Orford cedar, sold by the State of Oregon or any of its subdivisions shall be "primarily processed" in the United States unless the State Forestry Department has issued a permit for processing elsewhere. Issuing of a permit depends on a finding that there is no reasonable local market for the logs. A similar proposal is before the Washington Legislature. British Columbia has strict controls on export of raw timber and Alaska forbids it.

State timber is a small part of the supply in Oregon and Washington. To have much effect on log exports, the Forest Service and the federal Bureau of Land Management would have to establish primary processing or other controls. Such proposals have been rejected in Washington. Export quotas and distribution of export purchases over a wide region so that no locality takes the major brunt have been suggested.

Sen. Mark Hatfield has again asked President Johnson to call a conference of high-level United States and Japanese officials to consider the problem. As he did last fall as governor of Oregon, Sen. Hatfield requested that policies affecting government timber be made consistent, i.e., that export of Alaska logs be permitted on the same basis as those from Oregon and Washington.

Whether U.S. and Japanese cabinet-level negotiators could arrive at a solution acceptable to both sides and to interests within the U.S. industry is problematic. However, it is worth a try and Mr. Johnson should get such a meeting under way.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 24, 1967]

IT IS TIME TO TALK TURKEY WITH JAPAN

Eventually, so why not now?

That familiar line has become the keynote in arguments by Oregon and Washington lumbermen for federal action to limit log exports from these states to Japan.

Citing constantly increasing Japanese purchases of logs taken from Oregon and Washington forests, the lumbermen are proving a point that sooner or later reasonable controls must be adopted. Otherwise, the forest products industries of these two states will be drastically affected. To an impractical and unreasonable degree, Oregon and Washington will lose economically if they become too much raw material suppliers for Japan and mills in these states are forced to close down because they can't match prices the Japanese are willing to pay for logs.

A Seattle publication predicts that Japanese log purchases in Oregon and Washington will be "well over 1 billion (board) feet" a year by 1970. That volume is greater than Lane County's annual log harvest ran prior to the close of World War II and not significantly larger than the greatest log harvest made in Lane County since the war.

Next to Douglas County, Lane is the largest log-producing county in the United States. So, in this perspective, Oregon and Washington lumbermen cannot be accused of exaggerating their claims that controls must be worked out to keep log exports to Japan within bounds.

British Columbia, whose mills export large quantities of finished lumber and plywood to the United States, permits hardly any exporting of logs to Japan. And Alaska, where timber growth easily exceeds mill demands, enjoys federally imposed prohibition of raw log exports. Consequently, Alaskan mills—some partly capitalized with Japanese money—sell practically their entire lumber output to Japan.

Why Oregon and Washington lumbermen ask, shouldn't the Japanese be required to buy more finished lumber and plywood from these states—in return for negotiated rights to continue making controlled-rate log purchases?

The Japanese are reasonable, wise in the ways of business. It should not be hard to convince their government that a quid pro quo agreement involving Oregon-Washington logs and lumber would be to the long-range advantage of both Japan and the United States.

Eventually, something will have to be done to prevent ruination of Oregon and Washington forest products industries. Even if regulations are changed to permit Japan to import some Alaskan-grown logs, as Oregon's Senator Mark Hatfield has suggested, policies governing exports from Oregon and Washington must be thoroughly reviewed. It is senseless for the United States to import Canadian manufactured lumber and plywood on the one hand, while, on the other, Oregon-Washington mills are going broke and releasing workmen because they can't afford logs grown virtually within sight of them.

Again, the Japanese are realists. They would not sacrifice their own best economic interests as the United States is doing in this instance. Nor, honestly and fairly dealt with, would they believe they were being discriminated against if their log-buying opportunities were sensibly controlled.

Senator Hatfield has asked President Johnson to call a high-level conference of U.S. and Japanese officials on questions in this area of the two nations' trade relations. Delay of such negotiations can only lead to aggravation of the questions involved and make their sensible solution more difficult.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am privileged to commend the junior Senator from Oregon on his maiden speech. I know how he feels in not wanting to rush into this endeavor, but I think when he has a problem as vexing as this is, affecting a great State and a great industry, and he sees that action must be taken and is not being taken, he has an obligation and a responsibility to speak as he has.

I think that in the junior Senator from Oregon we have a degree of exper-

tise in a complex field that is unique. He was Governor of his State for 8 years. He has a profound understanding of the interrelationship that must exist between States and the Federal Government. With the Federal Government controlling 80 percent of Oregon timber, it is not possible for the people of that State or the industry to solve the problem unless the Federal Government is responsive to the wishes of the people.

Second, the Senator from Oregon has with great foresight looked ahead to the problem that we will be facing and that will be much more critical in the years ahead. Too frequently the Federal Government deals with immediate problems and does not concern itself with ultimate problems. I think that we in the Senate should look ahead and solve problems that are not yet crises, with the thought of warding off crises by timely action.

Third, in indicating that it will be necessary to work with our friends in Japan, I would hope the Senator would find a responsive audience. I would be pleased indeed if I could be of assistance in this regard. My own relationship with the Government of Japan goes back many years. I felt the camera industry should be encouraged in that country following World War II. I worked, in the reciprocal trade agreements, to reduce tariffs on cameras into this country, so that Japan and Germany could have an equal opportunity to compete with the domestic camera industry. I saw the expertise of the competition result in the "heat getting hotter in the kitchen." I stood firm on the idea that we should allow our friends to compete with the domestic industry, and that we should develop our own research and development and expertise. I stood firm for that principle rather than the principle of withholding their access to our markets.

I think the Japanese people are cognizant of the fact that we have been firm friends and ought to think of being amenable to helping us work out the problems that we find in the great lumber industry.

Lastly, I should like to commend the Senator from Oregon for his contribution to a better understanding on the part of all of us a very complex subject which I, from the Midwest, did not fully understand or comprehend. The quality of his analysis provides understanding of an effort toward solution. It will enable us to look ahead to a solution that will be of aid not only to the people of Oregon and the industry, but to the entire Nation as well.

Mr. HATFIELD. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY]. I would add one further thought concerning this particular problem, which goes far beyond even the borders of this country.

About 2½ years ago, it was my privilege to join with a group of business leaders of my State in what is commonly referred to as a trade mission to Japan. We had the privilege of visiting one of the largest pulp paper mills in the country of Japan, the Oji Paper Mill at Tomakomai, in northern Hokkaido.

While going through the mill with the plant manager, we fell into a discussion about the need for the natural resource to continue their paper production. He readily and frankly acknowledged that they had to find the resource somewhere. They were hopeful that they could continue to obtain it from the Pacific Northwest of the United States, but he stated that if they were forced to do so, they would have to turn to the Soviet Union.

He then commented, I think very profoundly, in a rather facetious tone and manner, but yet communicating a very important idea. He said:

I have long believed that red pulp tends to lead to red newsprint.

I think it is of major importance us that we seek to have friends throughout the world. We cannot isolate ourselves with trade barriers and obstacles that prevent the flow of goods and services. At the same time, we have a responsibility to our own domestic producers and to the people who depend upon prosperous domestic companies for their employment. But I believe all these things can be accomplished beneficially both to our neighbors in the world and to our own people, as we work together to solve these problems, which are not insoluble. That is why I feel strongly about such an avenue of approach to this problem as a conference. We found a warm response to such suggestions when we were in Japan, talking with its business and political leaders.

Japan is our friend, and wants to continue to be our friend; but the Japanese must also produce jobs for their people and must seek natural resources to provide such jobs. That is why the Pacific Northwest States—and I believe we are unanimous in this—are deeply concerned, and invite the interest and support of other States as well.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. I add my congratulations to those expressed by the junior Senator from Illinois for the excellent presentation of a complicated and certainly widely misunderstood subject, with which the junior Senator from Oregon is so intimately familiar.

The Senator has contributed mightily to a better understanding of the problems that confront the Nation in the presentation he has made this morning. I say that because, coming from the West as does the distinguished Senator, I believe the Pacific Northwest has an important role to play in the strengthening and the full development of the country. Certainly if we do not use all of our natural resources, particularly our renewable natural resources, of which timber is a most important one, we cannot hope to make the contribution that otherwise would be within our power.

I shall not add much to what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has already stated about the importance of strengthening the ties between the United States and Japan. I was in Japan about a year and a half ago, and I, too, appreciate the tremendous contribution which that country is making toward the extension of a democratic way of life in Asia, and the added strength that is thus given to our determination and our convictions in all of the Orient.

Certainly newsprint is an important commodity, one that is becoming more important as time goes on. I, too, come from a State which has some timber stands. Because I do, I would say to those from the East who are not as aware of the fact as some of us are that with the ravages of insect disease, the problem with timber is not simply a matter of storing or keeping a resource for use at some future time. Timber has a lifespan; it has a life cycle; it grows up. If it is not used at the time when it becomes ripe, it is often felled by insect diseases, and it can be scourged by the ravages of fire.

That fact lends a special importance to the wise observations made by the junior Senator from Oregon as to taking advantage now of the opportunity to institute a national program that will contemplate the use of these resources on a sustained yield basis, and which would permit the great capability of the State of Oregon and other States in the Pacific Northwest to utilize better this important renewable resource.

As we do that, as we make more jobs available, and as we add to the income, to the industry, to the prosperity, and to the tax base of the States in the Pacific Northwest, we will contribute to the strength of America and make possible places for Americans to find homes where the air is clear and the streams are clean, and we do not have all of the problems that exist in some of our metropolitan areas.

What the Senator from Oregon has said this morning is of great importance. I compliment him for his keen understanding of the many ramifications of the problem, and I urge that the Senate heed and consider carefully the important message he has given us.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] for his comments and observations. I had the privilege to serve with him as a fellow Governor and am completely aware of his great leadership in the area of natural resource development. I am proud to sit with him now in the back row of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I join my fellow Senators in commending the junior Senator from Oregon. Although I did not have the privilege of being present when he made his remarks, I did hear the statements by the junior Senator from Illinois and the junior Senator from Wyoming in relationship to his remarks. I know of his great ability, how articulate he is in expressing himself, and how dedicated he is to his State of Oregon. My State, too, is vitally interested in the problem to which he referred; so I shall be eager to read his statement. I again congratulate him for his outstanding services to his State and to the Nation.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I am pleased to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon for his timely and informative remarks concerning the crisis confronting the timber industry in the State of Oregon and in the western part of our Nation.

I sincerely trust that we in the Senate will join with Senator HATFIELD in requesting an early meeting of United States and Japanese Governments and industry officials to review all aspects of the log export issue with a view to uniting the effort needed for remedial action.

Senator HATFIELD is to be congratulated for bringing this important matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

THE ABM—LET US BEGIN

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, years from now when historians sit down to write a treatise on the 90th Congress they doubtless will emphasize its concern with foreign policy and military affairs. For this Congress, more so than most other Congresses, it seems to me, has focused its attention on efforts to secure and construst a meaningful peace in the world.

Admittedly, our efforts to secure man's oldest dream, his natural right to be his own master, have been strikingly dissimilar. On one hand, we have substantially increased military aid to South Vietnam, a small Asian nation struggling for the right to determine its own destiny. And at the same time, we have entered into another agreement with the nation that, by deed no less than word, is our principle adversary; and we have done so in the hope that it might somehow be a step toward peace.

Needless to say, these were not easy decisions to make, either for the President or for Congress. Nor were they unanimously made. They involved complex and interrelated problems and men of good will supported each side of both issues, as they do even today.

Some years ago Yale classicist Richmond Lattimore observed that the essence of Greek tragedy is not that it is between good and bad, but that it is between good and good—an observation that applies equally well to the present situation. No one knows with certainty that his choice is necessarily correct, for wisdom and truth and right are rarely 100 percent on one side. But the decisions have to be made, and—differ though we do—we make them.

It is important, Mr. President, that we remind the world that our differences never reflect a fundamental disagreement on the basic issue of peace. That matter is never contested. There is no one among us who does not desire the cessation of hostilities, not only in Vietnam, but also throughout the world. There is no one in this Chamber who does not pray for better relations among all nations. Nor is there a responsible American who does not long to curb the worldwide aggressiveness of what Edmund Burke, in another age, described as an armed doctrine.

But, as Professor Lattimore suggested, the choice open to us is not clear, neither black nor white. And those who view these decisions in terms of "war or peace" or "Red or dead" or "hawk or dove" do a great disservice to the Nation.

But still the euphemisms are hurled about carelessly, often maliciously.

This dilemma can best be illustrated in the present controversy of whether the United States should proceed to install an antiballistic missile—ABM—system. To some, principally spokesmen for the administration, the deployment of such a network, even though it is purely defensive in design, is viewed as a needless escalation of the nuclear arms race. To others, including many military experts, some of whom are Members of this body, the ABM system is viewed as the best deterrent to a nuclear war. Surely, no one can say with assurance that those who support the second proposition are less concerned with peace than those who support the first; neither can one logically argue that those who endorse the initial proposition are less concerned with national defense than are those who support the second. The issue is not that deducible.

Personally, although I am neither a military expert nor a scientist, I am convinced of the superiority of the second argument: that the United States must undertake immediately to develop and deploy an effective antiballistic missile system.

I take this position for two reasons. First, according to intelligence reports, Soviet Russia is already beginning to deploy a defense system designed to protect its major cities against attack by intercontinental ballistic missiles. And, second, increasing amounts of reliable evidence suggest apparent advances in the Soviet's offensive capacity, notably in the area of multiple warhead technology.

Since the beginning of the nuclear age, approximately two decades ago, the United States has preserved an uneasy world peace by its unquestioned superiority in strategic offensive weapons. We have made it clear to would-be aggressors that any sneak attack they might initiate, however damaging to the free world, would invite an automatic response so terrible as to be intolerable to them. And our strategy has worked. Nuclear peace has been maintained. But we are faced now with a different set of circumstances. We are confronted with the realization that a potential enemy—convinced his scientists and engineers have built a practically perfect defense against retaliatory attack—need no longer restrain his belligerence and might in fact be encouraged to unleash a nuclear attack that would rain fire and death and destruction across the length and breadth of our land.

Clearly, the decision to develop and deploy an antiballistic missile system is a painful one for the administration to make, but it is a decision which must nevertheless be made, and made now. We stand once again at a crossroads in our efforts to deter a major nuclear war, and the decision to act cannot be held any longer in suspension.

So far the administration has resisted every attempt to speed up the deployment of an antimissile defense network, arguing that to do so would touch off the biggest and most expensive arms race the world has ever known. And, according to this argument, when the balance of military strength is again stabilized, on the new plane so expensively purchased, the world will be less secure than ever. Consequently, the administration has sought to end the arms and defense spiral through diplomatic efforts, through negotiation. It has attempted to persuade the Russians to enter into an agreement banning the deployment of antiballistic missiles by both the United States and the Soviets. But its efforts so far have been in vain. In fact, only 7 weeks ago in London, Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin apparently ruled out a ban on antiballistic missiles.

> I believe that defense systems, which prevent attack—

Said the Premier—

> are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people.

Yet even if the Soviet Union were to express interest in such an agreement, the agreement itself must be suspect. Surely, the Soviet Union will not enter into an accord that provides for verification and inspection, particularly when verification in this field would involve disclosures even more sensitive than those involved in inspection of thermonuclear explosions. And, from the standpoint of the security of the free world, an agreement without verification is totally unacceptable. Also, there is the important point that my knowledgeable colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] raised when he said:

> A piece of paper with the name of the Soviet Union on it is not an acceptable alternative to an effective ballistic missile system.

It is not that the distinguished Senator, or myself or the majority of American people would not like to believe the Russians and to take these agreements at face value. It is not that at all. It is rather that history has proven, by example after example, that Soviet officials will honor agreements only as long as they serve their sinister purposes to rule the world.

But even if we share the administration's opinion and optimism that Russia is interested in halting the arms race, that it will open its country to inspection and verification, and that it can be trusted to abide by the terms of the treaty, even if we grant all these improbabilities, where does that leave the United States in the face of Red China's growing nuclear threat? What could be more foolish than to agree with the Soviet Union on a treaty banning ABM's if it meant eventually facing a Communist China armed with sophisticated nuclear weapons and protected by an ABM system of its own? And Red China's threat as a nuclear power must not be dismissed lightly. Indeed, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has conceded that the Chinese probably will launch a long-range, nuclear-tipped bal-

listic missile before the start of a new year.

Therefore, any agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. not to deploy a ballistic missile defense system would be of questionable value. To be truly effective, such an agreement must bind all nuclear nations; and there is little likelihood that China, given its present bellicose nature, is in any way interested in it.

I am not suggesting the United States abandon its efforts to reach an acceptable agreement. These negotiations should continue. Yet the fact remains that while we agonize over what to do, and while the administration speaks hopefully of an effective anti-ABM system treaty, the Soviets are deploying an ABM system throughout the U.S.S.R. and, at the same time, are enlarging their offensive arsenal.

Reliable intelligence information proves that the Soviets' missile defense system is not limited to the Moscow area, as spokesmen for the administration have thus far insisted. Rather, the Soviet system reportedly rings several large cities and is stretched throughout the northeastern regions of the country, the corridor which U.S. land-launched missiles must travel to hit vital Russian targets. In fact, less than a month ago leading Soviet military leaders, including Gen. Pavel F. Batitsky, a deputy defense minister, boasted unqualifiedly that missiles fired at the Soviet Union would never reach their targets. While that claim doubtless is an exaggeration, it nevertheless indicates, or certainly implies, that some Soviet officials are convinced they could protect the most vital parts of their farflung territory from attack.

I need not remind anyone, Mr. President, that the Soviets never stopped to consult with American authorities before beginning to deploy their missile defense network. Unquestionably, they had previously concluded that the antimissile missile would in some way enhance their overall strategic military posture. Authorities are of the opinion that the Soviets' decision to start production on an ABM system was made in 1964, after they had time to analyze the results of their A-bomb tests of 1961–62.

It is worthwhile to remember that with those tests, which were designed in part to gage the effectiveness of antimissiles at various altitudes, the Soviets broke a pledge to the United States by ignoring a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

But, however, the Soviets arrived at the decision to proceed, by doing so they clearly rejected the assumption that U.S. reaction to such deployment would negate its strategic importance, whether that value is viewed in political, psychological, or military terms.

However, it is in terms of the U.S. strategic requirements—not the Soviets'—that the issue must finally be resolved. It is useful, therefore, to examine the question of an antimissile defense system—Nike X—from the following three viewpoints: First. Would it save lives? Second. Would it strengthen our deterrent force? Third. Would it enhance our overall strategic position in a meaningful way?

As for saving lives, it must be acknowledged that the very best defense system man can ever hope to devise probably will be inadequate against a nuclear attack. And in this regard the ABM is no exception. But in light of the unavailability of a better defense network, and with full recognition of the fact that many millions more would die if left unprotected, the Nike X system offers Americans an element of hope—at least until such time as we can effect a change in the international situation or, better yet, in human nature. An adequate defense system is necessary because all men have not accepted the teachings of the prophet Isaiah, who warned that lasting peace will come only when men "beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation neither shall they learn war any more."

In the United States alone, it is estimated that an ABM system could cut deaths from 130 million—the estimated number who would die in a surprise attack if no such system were in force—to 60 million—thus a saving of 70 million American lives. Such an estimate cannot be dismissed lightly. James Burnham, a highly respected military analyst with whom I mostly agree, argues against an antimissile defense by writing that there is no significant strategic difference between 130 million and 60 million casualties. And perhaps he is right—strategically. But Americans by and large have been conditioned by Hawthorne's belief that each and every individual is important in some respect, whether or not he is important strategically. Fortunately, the Nation's value system is not so disjointed that it will carelessly write off the lives of 70 Americans—to say nothing of 70 million.

No, we can never hope to save the lives of all Americans, or perhaps even the majority of Americans; but that does not mean that we should not safeguard however many lives as possible, within our capacity to do so.

As to whether the ABM system would strengthen our deterrent force, the answer is again an unqualified "Yes." No matter how good its own defense, no nation would be so foolish as to unleash an attack against another nation whose defense it could not hope to penetrate and whose retaliatory capacity it could not hope to immobilize. To do so, would be, at best, to fight a nuclear stalemate; at worst, to commit nuclear suicide. Conversely, if one assumes a relative balance in strategic offensive forces, and then introduces a defensive component on only one side, it is entirely conceivable that the defensive capacity might, in a given situation, swing the balance to such a degree that the favored nation would initiate a nuclear exchange, knowing that the damage it would inflict would be far greater than it would sustain. Thus, possessing the same approximate offensive weapons as the Soviets, the United States is benefited by the ABM deterrent factor in two situations: either when we alone have such an operational system, or when we have as effective a system as they have. It is only when we lack the protection that another nuclear nations has, or thinks it has, that the true danger of nuclear war is maximized.

More significantly, U.S. military policy relies heavily on what has been characterized "extended deterrence"; that is, our strategic capabilities have a restraining influence on Soviet foreign policy generally. This vital role could be seriously, perhaps irrevocably, impaired by an effective, comprehensive Soviet ABM system. In the final analysis, deterrence is a state of mind, a euphoric condition that could lead a would-be aggressor, who is himself protected by antimissile missiles, to conclude he could support a more aggressive foreign policy at an acceptable level of risk. If he were correct in his assumption, the U.S. strategic position would be eroded; if he were wrong, a confrontation of fateful consequences could follow. But in either case, U.S. security—in fact, the free world's security—would be impaired. It seems to me that this possibility could best be avoided by deploying the ABM as one element of a comprehensive defense network.

This leads, then, to an analysis of the third proposition, whether a missile defense system would materially strengthen the overall strategic position of the United States. And here the answer also is "Yes"—it would. In this instance, the question is not simply whether an ABM system would save lives or preserve what one news magazine called the "balance of terror" in the world. Rather, the question is whether the Nike X would strengthen the U.S. strategic position to a degree that would enhance our foreign policy generally.

However distasteful the thought might be, the fact nevertheless is that America's greatest foreign policy successes have occurred during periods when the balance of strategic forces—geography, economic strength, psychological considerations, military strength, et cetera—clearly favored the United States. For, beyond their function as a deterrent to nuclear attack, the forces serve also to limit a would-be aggressor's freedom of action by posing an ultimate threat. And the true measure of superiority is the degree to which they limit or support other courses of action, military and political alike.

As I previously indicated, the United States has enjoyed a strategic superiority by reason of its massive offensive capability. And while this capability remains of continuing importance, its significance may come increasingly to depend upon our capacity to protect the Nation from nuclear attack, if for no other reason than to reduce the potential for nuclear blackmail. Conversely, the Soviet deployment of a high-confidence anti-missile-missile system might lead them to conclude, however, erroneously, that the balance of power had been altered in ways to justify foreign adventures, an illusion which could produce decisions damaging to our foreign policy interests and threatening to the nuclear peace.

Both Secretary McNamara and James

Burnham, to cite two ideologies, argue that the best way to meet the threat of a Soviet missile defense system is to increase the Nation's offensive capacity, its deterrent force. Their argument is persuasive. Without question, our offensive forces must be strengthened, particularly our ability to penetrate a sophisticated missile defense. But we should no more increase our offensive punch at the expense of an adequate defense than we should build that defense system without concomitantly increasing our offensive capacity. It is not a "one-or-the-other" proposition. A strong nation, like a good football team, depends on a relatively balanced attack, offensively and defensively.

It would appear almost axiomatic that the United States must maintain a position of strategic superiority vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. And while a potent offense is important, the defensive component of strategic forces will become increasingly important, not only as a means of neutralizing the Soviet ABM system, but also because a missile defense would strengthen U.S. position generally. In many situations, this defensive capability could provide the crucially important margin of strategic superiority necessary to the attainment of U.S. foreign policy objectives and to the maintenance of world peace.

It is for these reasons, then, that our Nation should proceed without delay to deploy the Nike X system and to undertake related damage-limiting programs—particularly fallout shelters. Such a move will strengthen our overall strategic position, contribute to our national security and save lives if the deterrent fails. It is the only prudent course.

No one can deny that the nuclear defense program, of which the Nike X is a major component, is very costly, or that the money could not be put to better use. But national defense was willed by our forefathers to succeeding generations of Americans as their first and foremost responsibility. And it is. I doubt very much that anyone who favors deploying the Nike X system would suggest that the Nation commit itself at this time to the entire missile defense program, whether it costs $10 billion or $40 billion.

Certainly, I do not take that position. I merely suggest that—while searching all avenues to ban defensive missiles through a negotiated treaty, as the administration is doing—the administration spend the money Congress has already appropriated as the first step toward a comprehensive missile defense program, should one be necessary. We cannot afford, either militarily or monetarily, to delay further the decision to begin. Secondly, I suggest that the President set a deadline for negotiating the treaty ban, and in that way provide the Nation some measure of assurance that the Soviets, who as I said are presently deploying their own missile defense network, will not use the period of good will to our disadvantage.

Undoubtedly, there will always be a basis for rationalizing the deferral of the ABM system—if for no other reason than to admit its need is to acknowledge, in effect, that nuclear war is possible. But failure to deploy the ABM, failure to take the first step, risks a shift in the balance of nuclear power with potentially fateful consequences. Yes, we should begin, leaving the question of "how big a missile defense program is enough" for subsequent determination. At the very least, we should begin by providing the only possible insurance against the failure of deterrence and by strengthening the overall strategic position of the Nation.

It is an agonizing decision for the President. But it is one that he can no longer afford not to make.

DMZ DEFENSE LINE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just read the first clearcut, detailed article on the possibilities of a mile-wide, fortified barrier across the demilitarized zone and extending into Laos with its terminal point either at Savannakhet or Thakhet, both on the Laotian-Thai frontier.

This proposal has been suggested many times as a means to really confine the war to South Vietnam and to accomplish the stated objective of air raids on North Vietnam, to wit: to stop the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam along the Ho Chi Minh Trail. This objective, as we know, has not been accomplished because infiltration of men into the south has continued along the canopied Ho Chi Minh Trail, and I believe I am correct when I say that Secretary of Defense McNamara has stated that infiltration has increased.

In my opinion, a defense line along the DMZ extending into Laos would not only have the effect of shortening the war but I believe it could be done at less cost than what was originally anticipated. Furthermore, when we consider that at the present time there is a total of 1,200,000 allied troops in South Vietnam alone, it would appear to me that South Vietnamese divisions should take on a far greater share there, a greater degree of responsibility in defending their own country and should be the ones in large part on the defense line in that area.

While I am not at all certain, I am assuming that the Pentagon has given this proposal consideration.

Not only would such a defense line cut drastically, if not eliminate entirely, the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam, it would also isolate the conflict to South Vietnam. It would be of great assistance in the maintenance of the neutrality of Cambodia, and it would place us in a more understandable position in the eyes of our own people and the nations of the world.

May I say, Mr. President, that this is not a proposal which originated with me, but I do think it is a suggestion worthy of consideration and to that end I ask unanimous consent that an article by John Randolph entitled "A Fresh Concept: Clear Jungle Zone, Seal Out Hanoi Support" which was carried in the Los Angeles Times of Sunday, April 2, 1967, as well as in other newspapers, be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

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

A FRESH CONCEPT: CLEAR JUNGLE ZONE, SEAL OUT HANOI SUPPORT—MILEWIDE FORTIFIED BARRIER ENVISIONED

(By John Randolph)

SAIGON.—There is little disagreement that if direct support from North Vietnam could be cut off completely, the Viet Cong revolt in South Vietnam would collapse—not immediately, of course, but inevitably.

There are still some occasional arguments to the contrary, but they are not convincing. Whatever may have been the case in previous years, it is a fact today that most weapons, ammunition, critical supplies, senior officers and overall direction come to the Viet Cong from the north. It is hard to see how the Viet Cong could long continue against a reviving South Vietnamese government and the now really powerful American presence without this help.

Moreover, the Viet Cong now require direct troop support from North Vietnam. American estimates say that out of the total of 280,000 armed Viet Cong, about 160,000 are informally organized, full- or part-time neighborhood guerrillas, and 120,000 are well-trained and highly organized "main force" or "local force" fighting companies and battalions. Of this 120,000 hard core, the Americans estimate that 36% of 43,000 are North Vietnamese regular army soldiers, and that about 7,000 more of these enter South Vietnam every month to shore up the Viet Cong. It is true these are only estimates, but cut them in half and it is still a lot of North Vietnamese soldiers for what is presented as a local, popular revolt.

NORTH'S SUPPORT ESSENTIAL

Historically, also, the evidence indicates that North Vietnamese support is essential to the Viet Cong. The record of all significant "peoples' wars" for the past 200 years shows a revolt can hardly fail when it has sustained, significant outside help, and can hardly win without it.

There seem to be no exceptions to this rule, and it applies with equal rigor to Communist revolts as to any other kind.

Why, then, do the allies—the Republic of Vietnam, the United States, Korea, Australia and New Zealand—not concentrate on cutting off this support with their huge army of 1,200,000 men—most of it infantry—instead of bombing North Vietnam and increasingly chasing Viet Cong bands around the jungle like a man fighting bees?

This is a legitimate question because cutting off North Vietnamese support would seem to be the most simple, straightforward and certain way to win the war—and in the long run perhaps the quickest, too.

Up to now the allies, that is, principally the American military and political strategists, have hoped to win the war more quickly and economically and possibly with less bloodshed. This is by trying to stop North Vietnamese support by air bombing, to reduce Viet Cong fighting power by short, sharp search-and-destroy missions and to rally the South Vietnamese villagers by pacification, which means restoring government control and winning the villagers' active cooperation by improving their welfare with material aid.

Unfortunately, this strategy has done little more than arrest and partly restore the alarming declines of 1964 and 1965.

BOMBING HASN'T HALTED FLOW

Bombing has not been any more effective in stopping the flow of essential supplies to the Communist fighting forces in South Vietnam than it was in stopping the flow of essential supplies to the Communist front line army in the Korean War. Search-and-destroy missions became less profitable after the Viet Cong tested American firepower and

have since avoided battle except when trapped or when the odds are right.

As for pacification, it turns out that the basic ingredient is ironclad protection so a cooperating villager will not get his throat cut at night by a Viet Cong murder and vengeance squad. Since this degree of security requires complete military superiority and occupation of the area, pacification has not moved ahead quickly.

So it is a good time to consider a new strategy, especially with all these 1,200,000 troops on hand and relatively little fighting going on. Sealing off South Vietnam from all Communist contact and support seems like a worthy project and one that offers the greatest assurance of success for the lowest possible degree of risk.

It might also appeal to President Johnson, who must feel very keenly the political need to get the war moving along toward victory more quickly than it is moving. This not only a reference to his own problem in the approaching 1968 election, but to a sensitive stateman's knowledge that the longer a war drags on, the more risk the stronger power runs of losing friends and adding enemies. If protracted war is good for guerrillas, as Mao Tse-tung maintains, then it is surely poison for the other side. America's problem and the President's problem go hand in hand.

The extension of a defensive position across the northern part of South Vietnam and into or across Laos has been proposed by Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield of Montana, who views it as a better way to stop infiltration from the north than bombing.

To clarify what sealing South Vietnam means, we can quickly throw out some distracting ideas and side issues.

1—If this were a simple old-fashioned war, a quick invasion of North Vietnam from the sea would be the simplest and easiest way to settle the matter—like Gen. Douglas MacArthur's landing at Inchon in the Korean War. But in this war, an invasion of Communist home territory would probably bring Communist China into the war directly and provoke the Soviet Union into some unpredictable but probably unpleasant reaction.

Instead of settling one war, you would wind up with two, or perhaps three. Invading North Vietnam seems quite out of the question unless there are some really major changes.

2—As for South Vietnam's 1,000-mile sea frontier, much work has been done to control it, but it is still somewhat open to gunrunning. But this problem will be solved automatically when the allied navies summon up enough excitement, energy, equipment and ingenuity to break down the remaining self-imposed restraints and treat the problem as a vital war measure to be pushed through ruthlessly, even if some fishermen have to be ordered around a bit. On this frontier, the enemy is not communism, but an excess of restraint.

3—The 500-mile frontier with Cambodia, half of it through delta plain, half through mountain jungle, is a genuinely troublesome Communist sanctuary and supply source. But it is secondary to the much more dangerous infiltration route through Laos. In any case, Cambodia is a political weather vane, and it may be that if the allies really start to win, Prince Sihanouk will start to be friendly again and clean up his neutrality. Even at the worst, this is still the second border to seal, not the first.

This clears the way for a discussion of the real problem—stopping the heavy Communist infiltration and supply across the northern 250 miles of South Vietnam's land frontier with Laos, and the 50-mile demilitarized but partly Communist-occupied zone separating North from South Vietnam.

INTENDED FOR LOCAL ACTION

North Vietnamese troops and supplies that cross the narrow demilitarized zone between Laos and the South China Sea are primarily intended for local action. The long-range support leaves North Vietnam at a point farther north, makes an end run around the west of the zone through the illegally Communist-occupied parts of the southern panhandle of supposedly neutral Laos, continues on south and then turns back and crosses the South Vietnamese border at various points in the very rugged mountain jungle along the northern 250 miles of frontier. This is the famous Ho Chi Minh Trail.

This frontier can be closed by two different tactics—by actually putting infantry along the border to intercept, fight, destroy and discourage the Communists or by clearing part of the jungle and building a fortified barrier zone that would let a much smaller number of soldiers do the job, with backing by mobile reserves for emergencies.

It can also be closed in two different places. One would be directly along the actual demilitarized zone and the northern 250 miles of the South Vietnamese land frontier—a formidable task in view of the length and the terrain, but not completely impossible. The other location, much to be preferred, would start at the sea just south of the zone, and generally follow former Colonial Route 9 westward to the Laotian border and continue on through Laos (directly cutting the Ho Chi Minh Trail) to the town of Tchepone, part way through the panhandle. From here, the remainder of the line could continue on to either of two Laotian towns on the Mekong River boundary with friendly Thailand, either Savannakhet at the end of Route 9, or Thakhek, 60 miles north. Either way, the line would be about 180 miles long—much shorter than the actual frontier line.

However—and this is the key point—to go into Laos on the ground would require an important modification of American policy, and very likely there would be some consequences that would have to be foreseen and prepared for.

GUARANTEED LAOS' NEUTRALITY

In 1962 the United States signed an idealistic treaty with 12 other nations guaranteeing the neutrality of the Kingdom of Laos. North Vietnam violated the treaty on its first day, and has been violating it ever since by illegally occupying parts of Laos. The treaty foolishly did not provide for any clear-cut positive action (only consultation) in case of such a violation. However, under basic international law, the North Vietnamese violation automatically gives both South Vietnam and the United States an unassailable right to take equivalent counteraction. That is, if the Laotian government can't throw the North Vietnamese out and close the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the United States and South Vietnam have a perfect right to enter Laos, drive out the North Vietnamese, and close the trail themselves. This of course is common sense—a breach of contract either voids the contract or entitles the injured party to reasonable damages.

So far, the United States has not used this privilege except to bomb the Ho Chi Minh Trail without much result. But the allies can use ground forces legally whenever they want to. The Communists would put up a howl of violation since they have never acknowledged their own violations, even though the International Control Commission, the inspector under the treaty, has confirmed them.

More seriously, there is the possibility of more North Vietnamese intervention, and possibly even Chinese intervention, since China shares some of Laos' northern border. At the least, North Vietnam might make its existing occupation in the eastern provinces of Laos more open.

Diplomatically, it is possible that the Laotian government of Prince Souvanna Phouma could be induced to ask the United States to intervene to protect Laos. Or perhaps there is an even simpler way. What if landlocked Laos should ask for American aid to build a modern road or railroad from, say, the capital of Vientiane, across the panhandle, to some point on the South Vietnamese coastline? What could be more wholesome and peaceful? If the road were built without incident, the Ho Chi Minh Trail would be automatically cut.

Some years ago a Pentagon survey estimated that to hold a line through Tchepone with only troops, not field fortifications, would call for six divisions. This is not an impossibly large number, but it is more than desirable.

FORTIFIED ZONE PRACTICAL

The only practical solution is a fortified zone wide enough to be comfortably defended again guerrilla forces by a relatively small garrison or against major forces by quickly arriving reserves. Such a zone would have to be at least a mile wide, with excellent heavy field fortifications—not a Maginot Line or a Chinese Wall, but something more like the present front line in Korea, which is almost as long—155 miles.

To build it, the jungle would have to be ripped out, the trees burned, the ground graded, ditches, barbed wire and minefields installed, mutually supporting blockhouses built and night illumination provided. On the south side of the line would have to be an all-weather, heavy-duty military road, suitable for tanks and convoys, with landing strips and helicopter pads at suitable intervals.

This would be a big project and not cheap, but it is nothing exceptional by modern engineering standards, and once built it would be a simple and economical military project to man and defend it. Like all fortifications, it would be useless unless it was defended vigorously, but like good fortifications, it would greatly increase the defender's power of defense. It is hard to see how a small force could attack or cross it successfully, while a large force would have to concentrate to attack and thereby expose itself in the open to devastating allied air and artillery attack.

The advantages of such a barrier zone would go far beyond its immediate purpose of isolating South Vietnam from Communist penetration.

On the world front, after the first Communist yowls of violation, it would be recognized as a truly defensive, absolutely nonaggressive project in the great tradition of imaginative American engineering—like the Panama Canal, Grand Coulee Dam and the Alcan Highway. Since it would actually isolate North Vietnam from South Vietnam, the bombing of North Vietnam—except in local reprisal for attacks on the line—would be totally unnecessary and could be stopped immediately. This would not only relieve a great deal of world tension, but it would end a costly drain. By the end of 1966 the United States had lost nearly 450 aircraft over North Vietnam, representing a financial loss of almost $700 million—almost what it would cost to build the barrier zone.

ISOLATE CAMBODIA FROM REDS

The zone would also isolate Cambodia from the Communists except by sea, with a probable improvement of relations. The zone's highway would provide a valuable military and commercial link between the South China Sea and South Vietnam and Thailand and Laos. It would go a long way to stabilize the extremely soft Southeast Asia frontiers between the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

Militarily, such a line should be easily defendable by a permanent garrison force equivalent to three light divisions against anything up to a battalion attack. A multi-battalion or larger attack would require support from mobile ground units and air. The line would not have to be an absolute barrier, because even if it were occasionally penetrated the enemy would have revealed his

position and exposed himself to devastating counter-attack.

As for a major war offensive, such a barrier zone would be an ideal front line for the defending army that would be required.

To the Viet Cong, it would be a shattering blow to their actual support, their hopes and their morale.

For the South Vietnamese, it would symbolize a tragic division of their country, but it would also be a shield to provide their first real security in a generation and let them rebuild their nation in peace.

INFANTRY DIVISIONS NEEDED

During construction, one or two infantry divisions would be needed to screen and protect the big construction crew required. As the completed zone extended behind, this part could be held by fewer troops. It is possible that the North Vietnamese, recognizing the deadly threat of such a move, might choose to fight it out quickly in the zone area. This would be a major battle of the kind long sought by American commanders. As for the immediate effect in the south, and project would probably make itself felt quickly by absorbing North Vietnamese effort and reducing supplies to the south. But a vigorous Viet Cong diversionary campaign could naturally be expected and would have to be beaten down.

The prospect of such a barrier zone is so intriguing that this writer consulted one of the several top American engineering firms now working on huge engineering projects in South Vietnam and asked for an estimate of feasibility and cost. The firm's response, summarized below, is interesting and encouraging reading:

"It would be a large but relatively simple and straightforward engineering project. If it should ever be approved by the government we would like to do it. We have the big land clearing and other equipment this project would need.

"On costs, we estimate—probably fairly accurately—that the total would require not less than $720 million and probably not more than $1 billion. This is about the cost of 1,000 miles of average four-lane highway in the United States. From date of contract, it would take us six months to get organized, and from one to two years after that to complete it. We would need a large troop screen to protect our work crews, and we would like to use some men from the Army Corps of Engineers and the Navy's Seabees.

"The only unusual technical problem we can see would be disposing of the jungle trees after they were cleared off. Clearing them would be no problem. We would bring in 300 to 400 horsepower land-clearing machines such as are used in the deep southern swamps. These would just rip the jungle out—it is not as hard as it looks. But the trees would not dry naturally enough to burn. We would have to bring in some kind of cheap oil to burn them.

"We would go at it in this order: First defoliate or napalm the trees to simplify clearing. Then use the big machines to rip them out. Then burn the cleared trees with oil.

"Simultaneously, we would be building a four-lane highway along the south edge of the zone for our own use during construction and for support later. Such a highway could be used for medium landing strips for aircraft.

"The total work force would have to be about 5,000 men. If the project could start from the Thailand side at the same time, it would go almost but not quite twice as fast. It would probably be a good idea to build a small deep-water port at Cua Viet where the zone would meet the sea below the military zone. Then we could bring ocean ships right up to a wharf and off-load equipment and supplies. This port would have military and commercial value later as an ocean terminus for the road. The cost of the port is included in the estimate, and so are all engineering-type fortifications, such as blockhouses and barbed wire, less military items such as mines.

"To repeat, there's nothing particularly hard about it. It can certainly be done. The main job would be coordinating procurement and logistics."

If the concept is right, if the estimate of risk is right and the engineering forecast is right, then this is a bold, big project to sweep the Vietnam war along to a certain and not too long delayed defensive victory.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post illustrating the military position along the DMZ and the five northern provinces comprising the First Corps area be inserted also.

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

THE OUTLOOK FROM VIETNAM: MARINES STRETCHED TOO FAR

(By Ward Just)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM, April 11.—The military situation in the First Corps of Vietnam is deteriorating, with no sure formula for reversal in sight. Military and civilian officials here expect a renewed Communist military and propaganda offensive in the wake of the bold and successful attacks on Quangtri City and two Vietnamese regimental outposts last week.

There appears to be no question of an American military defeat, or of actual Vietcong occupation of any of the five northernmost provinces. The effort, in any case, appears to be directed against Vietnamese troops and the Ky government.

Aside from the known deficiencies of the Vietnamese, the central military reason for the slippage in the First Corps is the fact that the 3d Marine Amphibious Force is undermanned and underequipped in the face of the relentless build-up of enemy forces.

Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, the Marine commander, told Gen. William C. Westmoreland on Saturday that he needed more troops. Westmoreland, Walt's boss as commander of American forces in Vietnam, has agreed and requested them. But neither man knows what President Johnson will do.

Estimates vary on precisely what Walt wants, but most observers here think he wants a full Marine division, or some 24,000 men. That would augment the 75,000 Marines—two divisions, one regiment, an air wing, and sundry armor and support elements—already on line in the First Corps.

The military situation here is extremely subtle and complicated, and "deteriorating" is a judgment that will be hotly—and maybe rightly—denied by the Marine command. But as matters stand today, the Marines—supported by one Korean brigade, and two Vietnamese divisions of no better than average tenacity—are strung as taut as a piano wire over an area bristling with well-armed main forces from the North and the provinces themselves, and a rock-hard political infrastructure.

OPPOSITION TO SAIGON

The First Corps, unlike the other corps areas, is thoroughly unfriendly. Even Thuathien Province, whose capital is Hue, which has talented province chief, and the most efficient government administration in the entire country, is riddled with eccentric politics and a posture of opposition to Saigon. This stands apart from the Communist threat, an increase in main forces which has brought Thauthien to a dangerously low level of security—low enough so that Vietcong freely infiltrate Hue at night.

The First Corps is to extremist politics in Vietnam what California is to extremist politics in America. It is a center of opposition—from the rightwing Vietnam Quoc Dan Dang (Vietnamese Kuomintang) in Quangngai Province in the south to the left-wing militant Buddhists in Hue to the north.

Because of a bureaucracy and an army that are riddled with politics, favoritism and inertia—let alone the sheer lack of ability—the Marines have become, in fact, the main force for stability in the First Corps. In many places, the Marines are the government—a vulnerable position that has more than once opened Gen. Walt to criticism.

But, as one of the most open-minded civilians in the Corps has said, "What else can the Marines do?"

BATTALIONS SHIFTED

A thorough understanding of the Marine position requires a province-by-province rundown of the Marine order of battle. Because Walt's 18 maneuver battalions are shifted without regard to divisional tactical area, there is no firm and unswerving order of battle. But give or take a battalion, the position is roughly the following:

Quangtri. Ever since the heavy enemy infiltration—Walt now calls it an invasion—through the Demilitarized Zone last fall, the Marines have been obliged to keep four battalions on security duty, strung from Dongha west to the Laotian border. With the heavy influx of North Vietnamese, province security—in the district towns, the villages and in the capital itself—has steadily deteriorated.

Thuathien. Knowledgeable sources here say that the troubles in Quangtri have heavily and adversely affected Thuathien, never a government stronghold to begin with. Repeated attempts to clear the area called "the street without joy" north of Hue, the province capital, have been unavailing—except when the Marines clear and hold. So, typically four—sometimes only three—battalions are in place in Thuathien, at least one of them on security duty at the air base and the 3d Marine Division command post at Phubai.

Quangnam. Marine headquarters is at Danang, and it is the point of greatest progress. Walt decided last year to mount a truly concentrated surge against the so-called "twelve-village priority area" from the Danang airfield 30 miles south of the province capital, Hoaian. There are now an estimated five battalions in place in Quangnam, but critics contend that progress is too slow, and the pacification itself too uneven.

Quangtin. This province vies with Quangngai as "the worst province in the country" in terms of security. The province capital, Tamky, and the Marine base at Chulai are frequently shelled with mortars. Normally, three battalions would be in place in Quangtin, plus some of the Korean forces.

Quangnai. One Marine battalion is located at the southern outpost of Ducpho, and it is—to Walt—an indication of the potential of this rice-rich area that about 10,000 refugees have quit the Vietcong-dominated countryside and rallied to the Security" of Ducpho. Quangngai City, like Tamky, Hoaian. The Danang air base, and Quangtri City, is occasionally under mortar attack. Security in much of the province is nil.

EFFECT ON VILLAGERS

The primary impact of an attack such as the Vietcong launched in Quantri is psychological—not in terms of world headlines, but in terms of rumors among the Villagers themselves. When the Vietcong hit a province capital, it indicates to the countryside that the government is incapable of even holding on to its home base, and the blow to prestige is considerable.

It is a madman's exercise to attempt to list a precise enemy order of battle. It is sufficient to note there are three North Vietnamese divisions above, in, or under the demilitarized zone, and a provincial regiment

south in Quangtri. There are five battalions in Thuathien, and probably close to an equal number in Quangnum and Quangtin. Quangngai is so insecure that when American military authorities in Quangngai City give briefings on the enemy order of battle they call it "the horror hour."

The main-force confrontations—the last large one was in March when an estimated six battalions attempted to infiltrate across the DMZ—have resulted in appalling enemy losses, something on the order of 8700 dead since the start of the year. In the six-week period between Feb. 12 and March 25, the Marines alone killed more than 5000.

WE CAN STOP THEM

"We are not worried about the main forces," Walt says. "We have shown that when we can find them, we can stop them. We did it last summer and we did it last month. We can do it anywhere in the Corps."

This is not Marine bravado, but an accurate reflection of what has happened. But there is a corollary, which is not often mentioned in the First Corps: as the bodies have piled up, very little has changed; if there has been any change, it has been negative. The North Vietnamese have met escalation with escalation (or vice versa, depending on the viewpoint) and therefore as the fighting has grown more vicious it has also grown increasingly irrelevant as an index of change.

"They can't take this," senior officials in Danang say. "They've got to quit sooner or later." But there is no evidence they are about to quit, either sooner or later, and no evidence that the hurt has become painful enough to pull back.

Walt knows this, although he puts it into a slightly different context: "We could kill main-force units from now on and we wouldn't be a step closer to winning the war."

MARINE STRATEGY

This is a reflection of the Marine strategy in the First Corps, a strategy that has sought to confront the enemy at all three "phases" of the celebrated three-phase theory of guerrilla war as enunciated by the North Vietnamese Clausewitz, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap. At root it is a strategy designed to wear down the enemy in all his military and political postures, to force a return to small-unit actions and thus a "withering away" of insurgency.

None of this has been prosecuted without cost. The Marines have lost 522 men killed, 4488 wounded since Jan. 1, an average of six per day. Total American combat deaths in the Vietnam war in the first four months of the year are 2110. Marine casualty percentages are far higher than their numbers would indicate, and no one who has even watched them fight would declare it is because they are poor soldiers. It is because they are fighting all the time, on all three fronts.

And they appear to be fighting under difficult conditions.

It has long been a prideful piece of Marine reverse-snobbery that they were "always at the end of the supply line" (and always on the front pages of newspapers), but in Vietnam the complaint appears to have some truth. Helicopters are a case in point.

COMPARISON MADE

The 75,000 Marines have only about 200 helicopters, of which about 70 are Korean War-vintage Sikorsky H-34s, the workhorses of the Vietnam war. The rest are heavy-duty troop carriers capable of lifting 30 or more men.

By contrast, the 1st Cavalry Division (air mobile), a 15,000-man division, has some 435 helicopters, the bulk of them Hueys. According to sources here, Walt intends to ask for two more squadrons, or about 50 new helicopters.

Walt could not assemble the support for an operation like Junction City, which began in War Zone C with about 32,000 American infantrymen, according to the publicity releases, even if he had the troops, which he does not. And in any case, the Junction City way is not the Marine way.

The questions the critics are asking now, with what appears to be a renewed enemy offensive in the First Corps, is whether the Marine strategy, given the nature of the area, is the right strategy. The critics, some of them military and some of them civilian and all of them in Saigon, have grave doubts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would suggest to my colleagues in the Senate that they read these two articles if they have not already done so because there is much food for thought in both of them and they present to us a realistic assessment of the situation which confronts this Nation and its allies in Vietnam. Neither article makes pleasant reading but I think it is in our best interests not to delude ourselves about what confronts us in Vietnam and to disabuse any ideas one may have that there is a quick, a cheap, or an easy way out of the difficulties in which we find ourselves in that struggle.

THE USE OF BATTLESHIPS IN THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, one of the paradoxes of the war in Vietnam is that the more we employ our sophisticated weaponry, the more aware we become of the role of more conventional armaments. I think the expanding role of naval gunfire supports this premise.

Despite our arsenal of supersophisticated and largely untried weapons, we are finding in Vietnam a naval war more suitable to the gunnery and tactics of World War II and Korea.

Beginning on a small scale in May of 1965, the employment of naval gunfire for support, interdiction, and destruction has gradually expanded.

According to the U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, over 41,000 rounds—3-inch, 5-inch, 6-inch, and 8-inch—of projectiles and rockets were fired by U.S. ships during the month of November 1966 alone.

There have been a number of excellent statements made on the Senate floor and in committees, particularly by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. RUSSELL, and by my colleague from New Hampshire, Mr. MCINTYRE, with respect to the employment of naval gunfire.

It would appear that these Senate statements and the incisive questioning of Secretary McNamara by Senator RUSSELL during Armed Services Committee hearings, led to the recent decision to employ the long rifles of our naval ships for the bombardment of targets in North Vietnam. This initial effort is apparently directed principally at interdiction targets, although there are clearly other potential targets that could be brought under attack by ship-based guns of all sizes.

I should like the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes to discuss briefly the possible expansion of the use of our immense naval artillery capability and to suggest that the Pentagon ought to consider taking out of mothballs at least two of our largest ships of war—the battleship.

I want to make clear at the outset that I am not speaking as an authority on naval affairs, but as a Senator who had access to the same information and research facilities available to other Members of this body.

Most of what I shall say is taken from the public record.

I think it fair in view of the extent to which naval gunfire is now being employed in Vietnam, and in consideration of the acknowledged operational advantages of this type of fire support, to inquire—

First, whether the capability of U.S. naval forces to provide this type of support is sufficient for prospective tasks; and

Second, what steps might be taken to rectify any inadequacies?

When I visited Vietnam as Governor of Wyoming, it occurred to me that in our enchantment with the glamour of supersophisticated weapons in this nuclear age, we have tended to downgrade the importance of the more traditional weapons of war.

We have concentrated on sophisticating the atomic bomb when our actual need has been reinstating the iron bomb. We have concentrated on refined missile development on the sea, in the ground and in the air. This emphasis has been at the expense of conventional artillery, both land- and ship-based.

I am not prepared, Mr. President, to discuss the overall question of naval weaponry now and in the decades ahead. But there is one particular area of concern in the field of naval gunfire which is appropriate for discussion at this time.

In exploring this particular problem, it is useful to analyze the Korean experience, and the role of naval gunfire there. Over and above its primary role of attacking targets at sea and supporting amphibious operations, naval gunfire performed three important roles during the Korean conflict.

It was employed against fixed targets along the battlefield. It was used to secure the flanks of the United Nations battle line, and it was committed to the interdiction campaign, especially the rail lines and roads along the northeast coast of Korea. I am informed that in one 10-month period during 1951–52, naval guns carried out almost 25,000 fire missions.

Naval gunfire proved its worth in the Korean war. And yet upon the conclusion of that war, we resumed the process of deemphasizing naval gunfire. This deemphasis reached the point of a true gun gap, an often-heard term in naval circles. Had it not been for congressional and other concern over the deficiencies, we would probably be in an even worse position today than we actually are. The question is, have we done enough?

I think in our present preoccupation with operations in Vietnam, there has been an understandable tendency to examine our defense questions entirely in terms of that particular situation.

Certainly new requirements for naval gunfire support of operations in southeast Asia are an important consideration

in determining the level for naval forces in various categories. But they are by no means, however, the sole determinant, if for no other reason than the continuing character of these operations cannot be forecast with any degree of certainty. And there is always the possibility of contingency operations in other areas, even if peace were to break out in Vietnam.

Historical experience and the logic of our strategic position would argue that we have not assigned sufficient propriety to naval gunfire generally. It would suggest further that we have elected not to exploit opportunities for augmenting our presently limited capability through the recommissioning of ships from the reserve fleet.

We presently have four battleships in mothballs—the *Iowa*, the *Missouri*, the *New Jersey*, and the *Wisconsin*—and in my judgment, at least two of these ships ought to be brought to operational status in the shortest possible time and at least one of them employed in Vietnam.

There are at least four sound reasons for this recommendation.

First. Many young airmen now dead would have been home safe, and many millions of dollars worth of aircraft production and pilot training would not have been wasted had appropriate targets in North Vietnam been brought under naval gunfire, rather than aerial attack. Certainly, 8-inch guns could have reached some of these targets. But even if our smaller ships had been employed they could not have packed the wallop of a battleship projectile.

Second. There is also the question of the soldier on the ground. I contend that not only could naval gunfire have saved the lives of aircrews but we could have driven the Vietcong from areas of infantry conflict and saved many of the lives lost in ground fighting. In no respect is this more important than in support of amphibious landing.

Third. Further, if we do not soon employ capital ships with their 16-inch guns and heavy armor, we may soon be losing our cruisers and destroyers to coastal gunfire.

Fourth. There are other military considerations of all-weather reliability and staying power, and psychological impact.

AIR STRIKES

First, to elaborate on the question of air strikes: I think it particularly tragic, Mr. President, that many of the 500 aircraft and crews we have lost over North Vietnam became casualties in attacks against targets that were within range of the 16-inch guns on American battleships. The exact number of such losses is classified. We have lost enough aircraft and had enough men killed in strikes against targets within battleship range to have justified the commissioning and manning of at least three battleships.

Statistics make rather cold reading, in comparison to bloodshed, and lives lost, but I feel that a few facts are in order to put the battleship question in proper perspective.

Depending on the aircraft for which he is being prepared, it can cost nearly $400,000 to train a jet pilot. The attack jet he will fly in Vietnam will cost about $2 million.

Best estimates are that it would cost between $16 and $27 million to recommission a battleship—the maximum equivalent of six to 10 planes and their air crews.

Annual operating costs would vary between $13 and $17½ million, depending upon the manning level and the degree of automation that might be employed in a newly recommissioned ship. This sounds like a great deal of money, and of course, it is. But it is a relative figure.

It is estimated that we are spending in the neighborhood of $70 to $75 million a day to control Communist aggression in Vietnam. On that basis, the activation of a battleship and its operation off the coast of Vietnam for a full year would carry a price tag equal to about one-half day of the war at its present level.

Mr. President, pilots flying over North Vietnam have told of the excellence of Hanoi's air defenses. In a truly remarkable speech that received surprisingly little national attention, Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, told the House something of the state of these air defenses. Speaking on March 23, Congressman LAIRD said:

> There are about 120 Mig fighter planes in the North Vietnamese Air Force. Of these, about 20 are the latest version Mig 21 supersonic aircraft. Roughly comparable to our A–4, these Mig 21's would cost a minimum of around $1 million each. The less sophisticated Mig 19's would cost well over a half million dollars each.
>
> Let us consider the surface to air missiles supplied by the Soviet Union. The SA–2, which is largely the type presently deployed in North Vietnam—though some more sophisticated SAM's are beginning to come in—would probably cost $3 million for each SAM battery emplacement.

Mr. LAIRD went on to point out that:

> Public sources indicate conservatively that the surface to air missiles in North Vietnam are controlled by 20 to 25 radar units and are launched from 120 to 150 SAM launchers. A recent newspaper account—Washington Evening Star, December 18, 1966—told of 100 of these missiles having been fired during one raid. Estimates are that there have been more than 1,500 such missiles fired during the last year.
>
> On top of this, there are a minimum of 5,000 to 7,000 anti-aircraft guns in place in North Vietnam. Of these, some 3,000 represent the most modern Soviet installations of this type.
>
> Shells for these guns are not particularly expensive but they are used in very large quantities as our combat pilots can testify.
>
> In addition to the gun units themselves, there are more than 1,200 of these guns—ranging from 37 millimeter to 100 millimeter in size.

So spoke Representative LAIRD. Given the state of Hanoi's air defenses, it seems only elementary that in the words of Marine Col. Robert D. Heinl, Jr., writing in the September 1965 issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings:

> The principle of economy of force, even that of cost-effectiveness, demands that air should be reserved for targets of high priority which cannot be attacked by any other means.

THE INFANTRYMAN

As I mentioned, there is a potential for a great saving of lives on the ground through naval gunfire. I quote now from the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings of September 1966, and an article by Lt. Col. James B. Sopper, U.S. Marine Corps:

> It was disturbing to read the news reports of February and March, 1966 which referred to the central and northern coastal valley of South Vietnam that had been occupied by the Viet Cong with impunity for several years; a map clearly shows that most of these areas are within the effective range of the main batteries of the Iowa-class battleship. Undoubtedly, many casualties among the members of the First Cavalry Division and the III Marine Amphibious Force could have been prevented if these valleys had been subjected to months of steady, unremitting around-the-clock bombardment by the battleships prior to the actual assault of these areas by the ground force.

HANOI'S COASTAL GUNS

I mentioned also that several American ships have been hit by North Vietnamese coastal gunfire: The New York Times of March 27 carried the headline, "U.S. Destroyer Is Shelled by Foe." The story went on to describe the fire under which the destroyer *Osbourn* was brought on the 25th day of March. A Sunday's Times headline reported that "Shore Batteries in North Tear Hole in Main Deck of a U.S. Destroyer." The story stated:

> Shore batteries, scoring their second hit on a United States warship in two days, tore a one-and-a-half foot hole in the main deck of the destroyer *Turner Joy*, wounding at least one crewman. The destroyer *Waddel* was damaged Thursday in a similar attack.

Other American ships struck by Communist shore fire include the carrier *Canberra* and the destroyers *Keppler* and *O'Brien*.

American intelligence know the size and capacity of North Vietnamese coastal batteries. It is known that Hanoi's larger guns approximate the fire power of our cruisers and destroyers. But there is no artillery rifle in Hanoi's arsenal at the present time that could approach the maximum firing range of an American battleship. I say "at the present time" because the Chicago Tribune of March 26 carried the disturbing report that Chinese Communists are supplying North Vietnam with heavy coastal guns to counter American naval bombardment.

If North Vietnam achieves the artillery capacity to outslug the medium-weight weapons on our ships of destroyer and cruiser size, we may find the naval war in Vietnam escalating in a bloody and costly manner that we had hardly intended.

PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT

There are additional reasons for the recommissioning of a naval vessel of battleship size. Chief among these is the psychological impact that such action would have in Hanoi. Not since the Korean war have battleships sailed with our fleets.

Hanoi doubts America's resolve to continue a costly and indecisive war. Certainly she predicates her intransiency in part upon the supposition that the Johnson administration will tire of the war and sue for peace. The recommissioning of a battleship, which is a long-range and substantial commitment to a pro-

tracted war, would be a signal not easily misread in Hanoi or other capitals.

MILITARY ADVANCES

Heavy naval gunfire has a wealth of purely military advantages denied to Air Force and Naval planes. Once naval gunfire is locked in on the target it can deliver fire day and night, in fair weather or foul, with a degree of accuracy equaling or exceeding aerial bombardment. A naval projectile hurtling out of the skies onto a Communist target cannot be shot down, as can an aircraft.

Unlike an aircraft which takes off for a strike at a target, the artillery projectile is expended the moment it is fired. Economies are not predicated on its return and reuse. No lives are lost in carrying it to its target.

Naval bombardment, in terms of blood and dollars, continues to be the most economical means for delivering explosives onto a target, but it is a form to which we are giving the least attention in our military activity in Vietnam.

FACTORS AGAINST THE BATTLESHIP

There are factors militating against use of battleships. As has been pointed out by Senators and by the Pentagon, there is the problem of locating personnel with special skills required to man the battleship The active naval establishment no longer includes all the gunner's mates and turret captains required. There are difficulties in connection with the necessary support facilities, such as gun tube manufacture and repair. There seems little doubt, however, that ways could be found to overcome these problems, were it decided to recommission one or more battleships. As acknowledged by Secretary McNamara in questioning by Senator RUSSELL last year:

Activating a battleship presents problems but they are not insurmountable.

The question of personnel to man the ships came up also in another hearing on a defense appropriations bill during which this colloquy with the Chief of Naval Operations took place:

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you have any personnel left in the Navy that would know anything about naval guns?

Admiral MCDONALD. Yes, sir. Even 16-inch men I think, Mr. Chairman.

TIME ELEMENT AND CONTINGENCIES

There is also the question of the time element for recommissioning a battleship as compared to the possibility that peace might break out in Vietnam. I think the argument favors the battleship, regardless of the course of the Vietnam war, because of the other contingencies which could easily arise. Authorities on Asian affairs have pointed out that a second or third Vietnam might occur before southeast Asia is stabilized.

One may hope the conflict in Vietnam might be resolved prior to the recommissioning of a battleship. Prudence demands, however, that we prepare for all possibilities. Moreover, simply by proceeding with the program to reinstate the battleship in our fleet, we are reaffirming our solemn resolve to undertake whatever steps might be required to bring the conflict to a satisfactory settlement, no matter how long this might take.

As we look to future contingencies, and to possible second and third Vietnams, the argument for recommissioning the battleship appears not to be predicated on the present war alone. We should proceed on the basis that heavy naval gunfire is likely to be a standing requirement for the foreseeable future, until such time as other types of ship-based systems are able to perform these essential tasks.

Mr. President, I will yield to no man in my earnest hope that we might someday be able to beat our swords into plowshares and live always at peace with our fellow man. But that day is not at hand. If we look about us at what is probable rather than what is possible, I think we shall see the indices of more so-called wars of national liberation choregraphed by Hanoi, Moscow, or Peking. The so-called underdeveloped world, particularly in Asia, seems to be the breeding ground for this type of conflict. Unless Vietnam should turn out to be the epical war that will end all wars, the rimlands of Eurasia will continue to be an area of principal concern to our military planners.

And it is this area that we should secure, defend and protect by powerful, deep-penetrating naval gunfire. These areas are subject to the influence of maritime power generally, and naval gunfire in particular. First Korea, and now Vietnam illustrate this geo-strategic situation.

One can look at a map of Vietnam and see that the principal highway which connects both halves of the wartorn country, National Route One, could come under naval gunfire for almost its entire length. Indeed there are places where almost half of North Vietnam on a north-south axis could come under the main batteries of battleships.

If a decision is made that we will move against the Communist harbor sanctuary at Haiphong, heavy naval gunfire operating in the Gulf of Tonkin would be one way of closing that harbor. The enormous advantage in range and projectile weight enjoyed by battleships could be crucial if our Navy were ordered to close Haiphong.

As Senator RUSSELL told the Senate on February 23, there are between 500 and 600 targets that could be effectively reached by naval gunfire. Under the present conditions there, this could be done without the loss of a single airplane, a single pilot, or a single American boy. The Senator's remarks were delivered, I might note, prior to the decision by the administration that naval bombardment on a limited basis would be initiated against targets in North Vietnam.

TWO OR ONE

We could contribute greatly to our naval strength in Vietnam through the recommissioning of only one battleship. But I suggest that two be recommissioned for Vietnam now, and for postwar operations with the Atlantic and Pacific fleets. As a first step, I believe a decision ought to be made with the least possible delay to bring at least one battleship to a state of readiness that would permit recommissioning in 30 to 45 days. This could create an option for later determination whether to proceed with activation. The cost of taking this first step seems more than justified based on Vietnam considerations alone.

MISSILES

Mr. President, I have mentioned nothing about the role of the ship-based surface-to-surface missile as a substitute for naval gunfire and I don't think this is the proper place for the full development of this topic. It has been estimated that at certain ranges, it would cost about 50 times as much to neutralize a given area with missiles as with naval guns and bombardment rockets. At such time as missiles are developed to the point where they truly represent an appropriate replacement of ship's guns, this entire matter would take examination. However, this day has not yet arrived and our error in the past has been to eliminate the heavy gun from the active fleet before the successor weapons were at hand.

In contrast, the battleship is available at the end of a recommissioning procedure. The stores of ammunition for the biggest of its guns are available now, although this ammunition would require some reworking. The stocks are ample. A decision now to proceed with recommissioning of the battleship would provide a much-needed military capability over the long haul and at a cost far below surface-to-surface missiles or air strikes.

SUMMATION

In summation, then, Mr. President, I feel that the war in Vietnam and the very likely possibility that there will be future wars of a similar type, indicates the necessity for the recommissioning of at least one and possibly two battleships to join our active fleets. The lives lost in airstrikes against targets within the range of battleship guns and the tremendous cost of such strikes in dollars and cents would more than equal the cost of recommissioning and manning the ships—three such ships, in fact.

The vulnerability of enemy targets in coastal areas would permit naval gunfire to substitute for airstrikes and save both lives and dollars in the air. This, in time, would free our aircraft from jobs suitable for naval rifles and permit their utilization on the proper targets—those unsuitable for a ship's gun.

Heavy naval rifles in our active fleets could save lives on the ground by providing landing support and softening up areas adjacent to the sea which are planned for infantry action.

The presence of battleships and their long, heavy guns in our active fleet could well save our cruisers and destroyers and the lives of naval personnel aboard by providing a match for the heavy coastal batteries which, in all likelihood, will be constructed or perhaps are being constructed along the coast of North Vietnam.

Powerful naval gunfire would provide an all-weather, around-the-clock interdiction and destruction capability which is now beyond the scope of air power. And it could provide continuous, disruptive fire to prevent the reconstruction of targets previously destroyed by air or naval bombardment.

The presence of battleships in our fleet, and the ever-present possibility of heavy naval bombardment along the communication centers of coastal Viet-

nam and other lesser developed countries could provide a powerful psychological impact for the benefit of friend and the intimidation of foe.

Some of these points seem to be supported in an article by the reputable military affairs writer for the New York Times, Mr. Hanson Baldwin, who wrote in an article published Sunday:

Many naval officers say privately that the Navy went too far too fast in converting its gunned ships to missiles and that Vietnam demonstrated conclusively that more guns were needed in a balanced fleet.

Mr. Baldwin states also that "the long range would permit a battleship to stand well off the coast, beyond the range of North Vietnamese shore batteries"; a fact that carries considerable weight as our cruisers and destroyers receive hits from counter battery fire with ever increasing frequency.

I ask, Mr. President, that Mr. Baldwin's article be printed in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, we have the finest men and machines of any military establishment in the world. Our military accomplishments in Vietnam, viewed in the context of our political limitations, speak for themselves.

Until recently, the principal orientation of our Navy under Secretary McNamara, was toward the deterrence of total war.

A navy unprepared to cope with the middle ground between peace and total war can as readily be a magnet for Armageddon as a deterrent to it. A navy designed for nothing less than total destruction is of little value in support of a limited war fought largely on the territory of an ally.

The war in Vietnam makes one fact clear: We need a more flexible and intermediary naval capability. The battleship provides such a capability.

The Pentagon has now taken cognizance of the gun gap which has limited the Navy's role. Now is the time for an extension of this policy by the recommissioning of battleships to deliver the heavy, deeper penetrating firepower presently denied us.

In my judgment, the employment in Vietnam of battleships and their 16-inch rifles would save many lives and in the long run, many dollars.

EXHIBIT 1

BATTLESHIP USE IN VIETNAM CONSIDERED BY MCNAMARA

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Warships from another age of sea power may join United States naval forces off Vietnam after a new study of gunfire support requirements has been completed in the Pentagon.

The new study, just ordered by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, is considering the recommissioning of one of two of the four 16-inch-gun battleships in the Navy's reserve fleet.

A prior Navy study, which was sent back to the Secretary of the Navy for reconsideration recently, had recommended the recommissioning of two more 8-inch-gun cruisers—instead of the battleships—to assist in shore bombardment operations in Vietnam.

The Navy is split on the battleship issue. And the chief of naval operations, a naval aviator, Adm. David L. McDonald, has opposed recommissioning a battleship in the past.

MANPOWER A FACTOR

Various suggestions that some battleships be recommissioned to bring the heavy firepower and long range of their big guns to bear in Vietnam have foundered on the basis of targets, costs and manpower.

One high-ranking naval officer is being quoted in Washington as describing battleships as "antediluvian monsters out of the dark age of naval power."

But other officers, notably Vice Adm. John S. McCain, commander of the Eastern sea frontier, have long urged the recommissioning of one or more battleships for shore bombardment and as commando-type ships.

These would be equipped with helicopters, a small Marine landing force and a command and control communications system—a kind of amphibious landing threat compressed into one ship. The Marines have solidly supported the relatively few naval officers who have urged the recommissioning of a battleship.

However, it was not until the White House gave the Navy permission to use its guns against coastal targets in North Vietnam that the arguments for a 16-inch gun, as compared to the 5-inch, 6-inch and 8-inch naval guns now available, won some support at high levels in the Defense Department.

Proponents of the battleship are encouraged by Mr. McNamara's action in ordering a new study of naval gunfire requirements. Many naval officers say privately that the Navy went too far too fast in converting its gunned ships to missiles and that Vietnam demonstrated conclusively that more guns were needed in a balanced fleet.

However, the yardsticks against which the utility of the battleship will be judged are its targets.

Gunfire can be directed against map targets or fixed grid coordinates, such as crossroads and bridges; or against coastal targets that can be "seen" by radar without the need of spotting aircraft. But against targets well inland—particularly against so-called "targets of opportunity" such as a truck convoy—spotting planes would be necessary to insure accuracy.

SHORE GUNS NEUTRALIZED

The bigger the gun and the longer the range the more targets that can be brought under fire. (The long range, moreover, would permit a battleship to stand well off the coast, beyond the range of North Vietnamese shore batteries.)

The United States has retained four battleships of the Iowa class of World War II in its reserve fleet, each with nine 16-inch guns. The Missouri is laid up in the Bremerton Navy Yard on the west coast; the Iowa, Wisconsin and New Jersey are in the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

Navy sources say there is an ample supply of 16-inch, high capacity, 2,400-pound shells in storage. The powder, which is old, would have to be reworked, but at slight cost. Eight-inch gun ammunition, on the other hand, is still in production, so that the costs of the ammunition would be added to the costs of recommissioning the 8-inch gun cruisers.

Recommissioned battleships would have to be furnished with new electronic equipment, and thoroughly overhauled; the cost for a ship is estimated at $11-million to $25-million.

They would require crews, if fully manned, of about 3,500 men, but suggestions to secure one boiler room and to leave undermanned some secondary battery guns are under study. Some observers believe that the ships could be operated safely with as few as 1,100 men each.

The time required to take battleships or cruisers out of "mothballs"—the Navy's name for the plastic cocoons, the cosmoline and other preservatives that protect inactive ships—to modernize them and to assemble and train their crews would be measured in months, probably more for a battleship than a cruiser.

Navy spokesmen said nine to 16 months might elapse before a battleship could be in action off Vietnam after being recommissioned.

Because of this time element, the Navy is pressing for a quick decision.

CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat. 171), is hereby amended to read as follows:

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. KUCHEL conferees on the part of the Senate.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 6950.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

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

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

MY POSITION ON THE GORE AMENDMENT AND ON THE INVESTMENT CREDIT BILL AND THE GORE AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is well that everyone, both inside

and outside the Senate Chamber, should understand that the effort to hang the Gore amendment on the investment tax credit bill is seriously jeopardizing that bill's chances to become law.

As chairman of the Committee on Finance, I have stated repeatedly to Senators that I am ready to give assurances that the committee will hold hearings in the legislative area of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, as well as proposals to amend or repeal it, and that the committee will report its recommendations to the Senate, provided that the Senate shows the committee and its chairman the courtesy of according us such time as we require to do a responsible and thorough job of considering every Senator's suggestions, as well as the recommendations which can be expected to come from the President.

If no such courtesy is to be shown to me and my committee, then I do not care to make any such commitments as I have mentioned above, nor do I feel inclined to accord to other committee chairmen courtesies which they decline to show me.

By "other committee chairmen," I mean those who are presently chairmen or those who would in the future become chairmen should the Republican side of the aisle provide chairmen to add to the next election.

Should the Senate see fit to run roughshod over this Senator and his committee, then I shall urge the House to decline to accept the Senate version of the bill, and should the House do so, in spite of his efforts, I shall ask the President to veto the bill.

Failure to enact a bill restoring the investment tax credit would indeed be a signal victory for the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who has steadfastly opposed the investment tax credit every step of the way since it was first proposed. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], having opposed the investment tax credit, having opposed efforts to liberalize it, having supported the effort to suspend it, now has before us an amendment which could kill the bill.

Should the Gore amendment be accepted by the Senate, I would deem it my duty to nominate the Senator from Tennessee as a conferee, together with enough Senators to assure that the Gore amendment could not be dropped so long as the Senator from Tennessee remained adamant in his position.

Thus far, the Senator from Tennessee has participated in two major conferences on Finance Committee matters between the Senate and the House of Representatives. One was on a big social security bill; the other on an unemployment insurance bill. In both cases, the bills died in conference. Should the same result occur in this instance, the Senator from Tennessee could, in good conscience, feel that he has accomplished a great national service, having contended for almost 6 years that the investment tax credit was a very bad idea, that it should never have been enacted, and that it should be killed at the earliest moment. From the point of view of the Senator from Tennessee, he would have achieved at least half of his principal objective.

If American business wants the investment tax credit, it would do well to decide whether its chances are better following GORE, who has steadfastly opposed it, or following LONG, who has managed the previous investment tax credit bills. Should the Gore amendment be accepted, it opens the gate to a bevy of other amendments which could provide the final nails for the bill's coffin.

I for one, am going to hold this bill to the limited objective of restoring the investment tax credit, if that is what the Senate wants to do. I am willing to assure Senators the chance to offer extraneous amendments to other bills at a later date, if that is what they want. I challenge any Senator to stand on this floor and say that I have not kept my word when I have offered assurances of this kind. If this good-faith offer finds less than a majority of the Senate willing to accept it, then I shall chart my course to fit the conduct of the majority and open the bill to any other extraneous amendments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator seems to object to the act of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Delaware in offering an amendment to what is supposedly a proposal that meets with general acceptance. Perhaps his condemnation of the effort of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Delaware is sound, but I ask the Senator from Louisiana on what theory he offered the "Christmas tree" amendments to the bill a few months ago that started on a sound base and ended by granting a lot of plums to a lot of privileged taxpayers.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The base for the "Christmas tree" bill was started in just this type of situation: A Senator would come to me with an amendment which he felt was a good amendment. I would say to him, "If you offer the amendment now, it might cause the bill to be delayed. It might imperil the fate of that bill. Please hold off for a while. I promise that at a subsequent date we will find a bill which I am sure the President will sign and to which you can offer an amendment in committee, or we will not object to your offering an amendment to the bill on the floor of the Senate."

Having done that, having asked Senators to keep amendments off the bill to continue the debt ceiling, having asked them to keep amendments off the excise tax bill, or off a number of other major bills, which the President would have to sign, which he believed the national interest required him to sign, and which he would be loath to veto, it was then felt that the foreign investments bill would be an appropriate bill to which to offer amendments. If the President had thought that the Long amendment at that time was a bad proposal, he could have vetoed his own recommendation, the foreign investors bill, and killed the Long amendment with it. It was felt that it was a fair proposal to offer an amendment to a bill which the President recommended, one which he wanted to sign, but one which he could veto if worse came to worse.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did not the Senator from Louisiana offer amendments, which were accepted, providing tax relief to harvesters of clamshells and oystershells and also providing $30 million to each of the two major parties in an election year?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. After the committee considered the proposal. There were hearings on it before the committee. Everyone who wanted to testify on my proposal had a right to testify before the committee, be heard, explain his argument, and have the other side of the argument debated and understood. Having conducted hearings, having studied the proposal, and having recommended it, the committee reported what it thought the Senate should do.

Please understand that we were attaching to that bill amendments which we well understood might kill the bill. I did not explain that bill in any other way. In fact, it was not the amendment which the Senator from Ohio has in mind that most threatened that bill; it was H.R. 10, because that was the measure the administration had been fighting for years. At the same time, it was an appropriate bill to which a Senator could offer an amendment which might get a majority of votes in the Senate.

As far as I am concerned, I would prefer that the pending amendment not be attached to this bill, but that we be given the opportunity to have hearings on it. I do not remember when we have denied a committee chairman the right to undertake hearings. I have never undertaken to deny a chairman that opportunity. I have never attempted to downgrade or chain a committee chairman or deny the right of a chairman of a committee to conduct a hearing and bring before the Senate what a majority of his committee recommended—not necessarily what he wanted to do, but what a majority of the committee wanted to do. That is the principle the Senate has usually proceeded on.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The principle involved is attaching to a much needed bill amendments which are of a doubtful character. The President needed greatly the lifting of the debt ceiling. He had to have it; otherwise, there would have been a default on about $50 billion worth of obligations. But the Senator from Louisiana attached to that much desired bill certain amendments that were of a doubtful or challengeable character. So the President either had to reject his much needed proposal or accept his good proposal with a bad proposal.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is in error. I hope he will follow me carefully, because I thought I had explained the situation previously.

I persuaded Senators not to offer their controversial amendments——

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. On the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about in committee?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In some instances, in the committee, too. Let me try to explain. For a year I steadfastly persuaded Senators not to offer their pet amendments to bills which I felt the President would almost have to sign, such as the bill to continue or to extend the debt ceiling, or the excise tax bill. Having persuaded them not to offer those amendments to bills which the President had recommended and which I felt he would almost necessarily have to sign, I told them I would accord them the opportunity, if they cooperated with me, to offer their amendments to a bill which the President would like to have, but which would not do a great deal of harm to the national interest if the President found it necessary to veto.

Having done that, we then proceeded to say, "All right, here is the Foreign Investment Tax Act. If it never becomes law, it will not do a great deal of harm. The President thinks it is a good bill, the majority of the Senate will think it is a good bill, the majority of the House thinks it is a good bill, but if it should become bogged down with some amendment we think is a terrible or impossible amendment, fine, we can just go ahead and junk the whole thing and forget about it until next year. Or, in the last analysis, if it was a very bad bill, the President could say, "I'm sorry, I cannot sign this bill," and veto it.

What happened on that bill? The amendment to which the Senator refers, with which he disagrees—I hope to amend the bill to make the Senator happy about it, but the campaign fund amendment we are discussing——

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator a question? The amendment providing for the $30 million for each political party to conduct presidential campaigns was offered and accepted in committee, was it not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. After hearings and testimony, and very considerable discussion, we offered it on the foreign investors' bill, with other amendments. We know the foreign investors' bill would be in trouble with that amendment on it, because there is at least one Senator on the committee who could be expected to oppose the bill and do all in his power to impede its passage if that Long amendment were agreed to. But we felt that if the bill never became law, no great harm would be done.

So we brought the bill to the floor with that amendment, and the Senate passed it. When the President signed the bill, he said he thought the Long amendment was a very good amendment as far as it went. I would like to see it improved upon; I would like to see it studied; I would like to see it expanded. That is what I am trying to do. The President said it was good as far as it went, and appointed some political scientists to study the matter and make suggestions to him as to how it might be improved to meet this national problem. Having done that, he then pointed out a number of amendments that he thought were bad amendments, that he regretted having to sign into law. Those were not the amendments I offered. The one he most objected to was one I opposed as strongly as I knew how to oppose it, but it was nevertheless agreed to in the House and in the Senate. The Secretary of the Treasury, who was against that amendment, having fought it through the years, nevertheless urged the President to sign the bill, because he felt the good that was in the bill—which incidentally included my amendment—so far outweighed the mischief of that H.R. 10 proposition that he urged the President to go ahead and sign the bill, stating that he thought, on balance, it was a good law.

From the point of view of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and a majority of the members of the Committee on Finance, it was not the Senator from Louisiana who was forcing the President to sign a bad bill into law; it was those who managed to obtain a majority of the votes for that H.R. 10 proposition with regard to self-employed people, who we thought were already treated fairly well, but who wanted better tax treatment than they were getting.

All I am asking for is that the committee having jurisdiction to study the matter be given an opportunity to look into it and recommend to the Senate whatever a majority of the committee thinks should be done. That is fine as far as the Senator from Louisiana is concerned. If the Senator sees fit to accept my good-faith assurance that if the Senator will accord me that courtesy, which I would accord any other committee chairman, I promise him that if I can bring it about, we will bring a bill out here that represents the best judgment of the men who have studied this matter. That is how the committee system is supposed to work. If we are not to be shown that consideration; if the committee chairman, standing here speaking for himself and a majority of his committee, is to be denied the right to conduct a hearing before someone says, "We will defeat a proposal your committee felt was a good proposal and the President felt was a good proposal, and we will not even show you the courtesy and the dignity of letting you conduct a hearing on the matter," my reaction is that that is going to imperil this bill, because this Senator somewhat resents being subjected to indignities to which he would not subject other Senators. I believe the Senator from Ohio, under the same circumstances, would feel the same way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize the absolute sincerity of the Senator from Louisiana in the views he expresses; but I must point out, Mr. President, that the bill to which the $60 million gift—$30 million to each of the political parties—was attached was a must bill. It had to be passed, and the President could not have vetoed it regardless how bad the amendments which were added to it.

The defense is that the Senator's amendment which gave $30 million to each of the political parties to be used in presidential election years was added in the committee. The moment the Senator from Louisiana added that in the committee, other Senators who had particular objectives began offering their amendments on the floor. They were motivated by the belief that the President had to sign this main bill, regardless of the badness and the weakness of the amendments that were attached to it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. What did we come up with?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have the floor, and I should like the Senator from Ohio to hear my response to what he has had to say.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I listened to the Senator from Louisiana in his lengthy answer to my question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But I thought I had the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that the Senator has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Before the Senator gets carried away with accusing me of doing something, I say that he is of the impression I did something which I did not do, and I wish he would hear my response to what he has already said, which is that it was not my idea to put my campaign financing plan on a bill that the President would have to sign, in the absence of which the country might come to an end. My plan was to study the matter and put it on a bill which the President need not necessarily sign. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] found that the President had recommended to us the $100 deduction plan, so he added it to a major bill, I think it was a bill to continue and extend the debt limit. Without that bill, the country could not have paid its debts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator came out here on that bill and offered his amendment to see that everybody gets a $100 deduction if he makes a political contribution.

I opposed it. I said at that time, "If you will give the committee an opportunity to conduct hearings, we will conduct hearings on the $100 deduction plan; we will conduct hearings on everybody else's plan. While we are at it, I would like to have the committee take a look at my plan to permit everybody to pay $1 into a campaign fund—one person, $1. Why not look at my plan while you are looking at everybody else's plan?" So I submitted my plan and made a speech explaining it.

The Senate voted with me to reject the Williams amendment, so that the President would not be forced to sign a campaign fund rider on a debt-extension bill. Otherwise, the Government could not pay its bills.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That defeated the Williams amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. I kept my word. I conducted hearings on the Williams amendment. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] testified for the Morton amendment.

We said we would invite organized labor and everyone else who thought he had something to offer to come before the Committee on Finance to testify. I am sorry there were not more witnesses to testify. Apparently, they did not realize that I meant business.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What matter was that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The campaign-financing plan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The $1 a year plan?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Whether it was to be $1 or $100. We were going to consider every one of them, so that everybody would have a chance to have his plan voted on. So the committee conducted hearings.

Keep in mind that these amendments had to be attached to a revenue bill, otherwise the Committee on Finance would not have had jurisdiction. The amendments had to relate either to cutting or to raising taxes, otherwise the committee would not have had jurisdiction.

So having conducted the hearings and having studied the matter in great depth, the committee proceeded to discuss the proposal and to vote on it, not as a separate piece of legislation, but as an amendment because, under the Constitution, revenue bills must originate in the House. So it was necessary to find a revenue bill to amend, because we could not originate a separate revenue bill ourselves. Under the Constitution, the Senate is forbidden to do that.

We then looked around and said, "Here is a bill which will carry such an amendment. Amendments will be offered to the foreign investors tax bill, so I will offer the amendment to that bill." I chose that bill as the one which would be the carrier, we might say, of whatever amendment the Senate saw fit to vote for in this area. So we offered the amendment to that bill.

Other Senators had ideas. It was late in the session. As I once put it, this was "the last train through the station." I had been asking Senators to hold their amendments for this bill. If the Senator from Ohio had an amendment that he might have thought was the finest piece of tax legislation that the mind of man could devise, and if he had been waiting for the proper time to offer it, this bill was "the last train through the station." If he did not offer his amendment then, I had nevertheless kept my word to him.

So, I did exactly that and told everyone: "Offer your amendment, if that is what you want to do."

One of the first amendments offered to the bill was that of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The Senator from Delaware offered an amendment that had been known as the Saltonstall amendment for years. Former Senator Saltonstall wanted an accurate accounting of all contingent liabilities of the Government. That was one of the first things we voted on in the committee.

So, on the motion of the Senator from Delaware we added the Saltonstall amendment. We then added another amendment and then another and then others. Each amendment that was added was one that could command a majority vote of the committee.

After they had been voted on, we then reported the bill and the Senate voted time and again on the parts of the bill that it wanted to keep and the parts that it wanted to reject.

After the Senate had done its will, we then took that measure to conference and asked the Members of the House what parts could we agree on. They told us and we agreed to those parts.

We then came back and discussed the matter on the Senate floor and agreed to our own handiwork, the parts that the House was willing to agree to.

At least one Senator was of the opinion that the conference report ought to be filibustered because there were two things in the bill that he found very objectionable. However, we did succeed in bringing the matter to a vote. Everything in the bill was something that could command the majority vote of the Senate, or else a motion to strike it out would have been successful.

Everything in the bill could muster on balance a majority vote in the House, and it did.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how many amendments were offered to the bill in addition to the $60 million gift to the two political parties. There were about 10, were there not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no idea. However, there were a great many of them—probably more than a hundred.

In the Revenue Act of 1964, of which I was privileged to be floor manager, there were more than 100 substantive amendments agreed to, and we rejected approximately 100. There were a lot more amendments to that bill than there are to this bill.

In the Social Security Act of 1965, the one that included the medicare amendment, we had 502 Senate amendments. Many of them were technical, but there were at least 100 important substantive amendments to the social security bill when it was passed.

There is nothing unusual about the Senate amending a bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana cannot escape the weakness of his position. I point out to him that he admits that in the pending bill the provision relating to the $60 million gift, $30 million to each of the two political parties, is weak in its structure, because he is now proposing to amend that provision.

The Senator indicates by his confession that it should be amended; that what was done was done hastily and without adequate consideration.

I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that the Democratic and Republican political parties, after they had received $30 million each from the public Treasury, would still have the unlimited right to solicit contributions from every imaginable source. They would begin with that nest egg.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Senator will not permit me to finish my statement, I will wait until he yields the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should appreciate that. I want to respond to what the Senator has said. He stated that this sum would constitute a $60 million gift to the two political parties.

The law at present provides that every taxpayer may mark on his tax return whether he would like to contribute $1 of his tax money to finance the two major political parties campaign for President or, for that matter, to help to finance a third party if that party can muster more than 5 million votes.

All we have is a mere authorization. An appropriation would still be required. After the taxpayer requested of Congress that $1 of his tax money be paid to help finance the campaigns, Congress would then have to appropriate the money to fulfill the request of the American taxpayers who, after all, own the Government and would pay for it.

Having done that and having said that this is the way to help finance both sides, everything is then spelled out. Every nickel would be accounted for to the utmost detail. We are providing the additional safeguard suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. I am pleased to support his amendment; I think it is a fine idea.

The Senator from Ohio said that this action was taken hastily. The approach taken in this matter is something that I have been studying for 3 or 4 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why is the Senator now proposing major amendments to what he suggested when the bill was passed?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall explain that. I should like to respond to the questions one at a time. The Senator from Ohio makes so many statements that it is almost impossible for me to keep them all in mind or to respond to them unless he will show me the courtesy of allowing me to answer his questions as they are asked.

What was the Senator's last question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The last question concerned why the Senator from Louisiana is now proposing major amendments to the amendment which he offered 2 years ago.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am pleased to respond to the question.

At the time we worked on this measure, we did the best we could.

I spent about 4 years thinking about the matter. We had the benefit of testimony and suggestions, and we had the assistance of intelligent people like former Senator Douglas of Illinois, who said: "It seems to me that it would be better to do it this way."

The committee, working together, agreed to amendments that it thought were appropriate.

When the President signed the bill he said that in his judgment the bill could be improved upon. He said: "It is good as far as it goes, but I would like to see it improved upon." He wanted recommendations on how to improve upon it, and he would then make recommendations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He has not yet made them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He has not made them yet. He appointed an outstanding man, Dr. Neustadt, who is the man that was hired by the Kennedy Foundation to advise the Kennedys.

Dr. Neustadt has been making a study of this matter along with other outstanding political scientists.

I talked to Dr. Neustadt to see what he thinks about the matter.

The two most significant amendments that Dr. Neustadt will recommend—if he thinks when he talks to the President the way he was thinking when he talked to me—will be that it would be a good idea to provide that a candidate would elect whether he wants to accept these private contributions, and if he elects to accept them, he would not have available to him the so-called $30 million gift to which the Senator refers.

So he could not have it both ways. If that is something I have proposed in my bill, S. 1407. I would anticipate that that would be one of the Neustadt recommendations, because that is the impression I gained by talking to Mr. Neustadt informally.

Another recommendation would be that if these parties are going to take $30 million and have no more available to them, then they should know that the $30 million is really going to be there. That is why it has been suggested by some that instead of having this checkoff on the income tax return, it might be well for Congress to provide an appropriation every fourth year and to say that this money will be available. I do not know whether the Senate will wish to do that.

If I were the Republican Party, I would think a long time before I would agree to that method, because in the average presidential campaign year the Republican Party has had about four times as much money to spend as the Democratic Party; and the Republican Party might well be foregoing a very important advantage that it has historically possessed, were it to agree to that amendment.

But that is a suggestion that has been made, and I have suggested it in the Senate. So, here is what we have. We have done the best we could, with 3 or 4 months to study and work on the matter, and it has been studied for 6 months more by some of the ablest people in the country.

With regard to the other improvements that might be made, I believe that one of the recommendations might parallel what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has suggested. Most of the other amendments that would be suggested to the basic legislation would be merely clarifying and technical amendments.

For example, someone asked, "What does this have to do with the $3 million limitation on what a party can spend?"

Nobody is limiting himself to $3 million now. That law is a dead letter, and that law does not affect this act. We have carefully analyzed that law, and our lawyers tell us that it has nothing to do with this legislation. If it will make somebody happy to have in this legislation the statement that the $3 million provision has nothing to do with it, we will do so.

Then they say: "Suppose somebody should steal that money? How would you know that the man couldn't steal it and get away with it—steal his own campaign funds?"

We say: "Here's the law, a statute, that says that you go to jail for 5 years and pay a $10,000 fine if you steal some of that money, in addition to having to restore that money. We put the law in the record for you, but in the event that you still are not satisfied, we will write a similar penalty and put the amendment in the law. If you can't see it and you really don't realize that this present penalty is applicable by reference, we will put one in this legislation. We will write it down three, four, five, or six times, if that is what it takes for you to be satisfied about that particular matter."

Then the question is asked, "Does this act apply to the Vice President as well as to the President?" The answer is, "Yes. We believed that this would be crystal clear from a reading of the act; but since it doesn't say so, we'll write it down here, if that will satisfy you."

At least three important amendments should be considered in connection with this legislation. They should be considered by the committee studying this matter as a responsible committee of the Senate, and then the committee should put forth its best recommendations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that the Senator from Louisiana has rather accurately related the chronological happening of the facts, but he has clearly demonstrated that when the measure was passed, inadequate consideration was given to its far-reaching ramifications.

The Senator concedes that three important amendments are necessary. That concession demonstrates that when the committee adopted the proposal to grant $30 million to each party, it did not search through the labyrinth of difficulties that would arise. He concedes that if a party accepts the $30 million, it should not accept any other money. That provision is not now in the law. One may wonder why it was not included in the bill when it was passed.

In my judgment, the law as it now stands, giving a nest egg of $30 million in presidential election years to each of the parties and allowing them to solicit contributions without limitation from every conceivable source, will make elections corrupt, dirty, and indefensible, and will constitute the worst type of stain upon the American electoral system. Each party will have $30 million to begin with and then the unlimited right to go out and shake down every lobbyist, every industry, and every other segment of the economy having interest in the passage of specific types of legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I did not yield for a speech. I yielded for a question.

The law provides:

> The Secretary of the Treasury shall, with respect to each presidential campaign, pay out of the Fund, as authorized by appropriation Acts, into the treasury of each political party which has complied with the provisions of paragraph (3) an amount (subject to the limitation in paragraph (3)(B)) determined under paragraph (2).

To make the matter crystal clear, section 305 of the act repeats the authorization. It provides:

> There are authorized to be appropriated, out of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments under section 303 of this Act.

This act does not give anybody anything. It is a mere authorization. At such time as the appropriation bill comes before the Senate, if the Senator wishes to do so, he can propose limits on the appropriation—that nothing, for example, will be paid to anyone who has received any private contributions. All sorts of amendments can be proposed.

All we have now is an authorization which would make it possible to go forward and to see if the American people would like to put up $1 each in order to pay the campaign expenses of both major parties, so that neither party may be obligated to those to whom the Senator was referring.

Why was no provision put in the law to prohibit private contributions at the same time that the parties might conceivably have accepted some help from the public money that would be made available? Well, the former Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, suggested such an amendment. The Senator from Louisiana, in the committee, said to the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas:

> I wish you would not offer that now. If we can make this the law, where we can finance the presidential campaign on the basis of one-man, one-dollar, instead of one-man, one million dollars and one-man, zero, if we can put it so that this election can be honestly financed, without any special influence, so that a man has no requirement and no necessity of accepting money from lobbyists, we can then seek to amend it to say that all you can get and all you can spend is what is provided on the basis of one-man, one-dollar.

I am frank to say that inasmuch as the Republican Party has traditionally had available to it about four times as much money as the Democratic Party, that can very well prevent us from passing any bill at all.

While we had the votes to pass a bill in the Senate, we did not have the votes to break a filibuster if the Republican side believed that they were being treated unfairly and were prejudiced and decided that they were not going to put up with it. They would have enough people to mount a filibuster in the late days of the session and defeat the bill.

So we would have to see how much we could do. When you try to get to heaven in one leap, you sometimes find that somebody does not agree with you; and if he has some way of frustrating you, even if it be one man speaking for a week, when the Senate is trying to adjourn, you would fail in what you were trying to accomplish.

Mr. President, I shall read from an article which was published in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor, suggesting some of the things mentioned here. The article states:

> The Long amendment, now under fire, might not help candidates below the presidential level at all, except to the degree it freed other funds for them to tap. The national leaders, however, could trickle some of the money down to favorites at the local level. That is why Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, for example, described the provision as a monstrosity like to destroy local political party independence. It is obvious that he is trying to keep a $30,000,000 fund out of President Johnson's hands. And equally obvious that the President is trying to hang on to it.

Mr. President, I think the Senator is entirely in error about that. I believe that this measure is drafted so that if one thinks that he is being prejudiced he

would have a remedy. Suppose the Senator is running for Governor of Ohio and some of the money is being used in connection with the outcome of his election. The Senator protests to the Election Board that this is being used to defeat FRANK LAUSCHE or BOBBY KENNEDY. The Board would say that it should not be paid out. The vouchers would indicate it is being spent by people to see FRANK LAUSCHE defeated.

If the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] can draw up some other way that this money might be handled, we would be glad to study that. I wish he would. If the Senator from Ohio finds something evil in this measure that he thinks needs to be corrected, I would urge him to present an amendment. We have a proposal whereby a man does not have to accept the big campaign contribution or be one of the robber barons. He can be as completely consistent with his conscience as any person on earth and still finance his campaign if he is the nominee of one of the major parties. My proposal would take care of this. A third party could get similar help to finance its campaigns. In effect, it is provided that one man can put up $1 to help finance the campaign in a way to make it unnecessary for anyone in public life to make any commitment that does not clear with his own conscience in order to be elected to office.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize that the Senator from Louisiana desires, with deep sincerity, to reform the election laws of our country. I concur with him in that objective. I believe, however, that if it is to be done, it should not be done on the floor of the Senate, but should be done in committee, with adequate preparation, adequate consideration, and finally a recommendation of what the remedy should be. Objectively, we are both on the same grounds. From the standpoint of the implement to be used, we differ. I want the Senator to understand that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator. I did not misunderstand his position, but I deeply appreciate his assurance.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, yesterday, I noted the introduction of a proposal by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which he spelled out in detail, to make sure that there would be a listing of all expenditures made in national elections by any committee.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Delaware for his proposal. It is my opinion that he has made a significant contribution toward clean elections, because if each and every committee had to spell out how it spent its funds, we could be assured that there would be no abuses, because there is no substitute for public opinion or for the press, TV, and radio to know how every dollar is spent for national elections.

Let me tell the Senator from Delaware that his proposal will certainly have my support. I shall be more than pleased to vote and work for his amendment.

I think, too, that it should be pointed out the proposal, now the pending business—the Ribicoff amendment—provides for certain, specified ways to spend 75 percent of the funds accumulated.

With the Williams amendment added to the Ribicoff proposal, then each and every dollar which would be spent would be spent in such a way that the public and the candidates for public office would know how the money was being spent.

I should like to mention one thing that is troubling me in this debate. There is constant use of the figure "$60 million." I have tried to figure out where the $60 million comes. For the life of me I cannot imagine, for the 1968 elections, that 60 million Americans would check a box on their income tax form indicating that they want $1 of their money to be used for the 1968 presidential elections.

It is my feeling that both parties would be most fortunate if they were able to share a fund of $10 million. It is difficult for me to see how more than 10 million Americans would check off $1 to be used for this purpose. I can imagine that in the year 1972, we could accumulate that amount, set aside on 4 years' tax returns, but I cannot understand and I do not feel, practically speaking, that 60 million Americans would check off $1 for the 1968 elections.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think that there is some merit in what the Senator has just said. As I recall it, the Treasury Department, in making its estimate of the amount of money that would be available—and, of course, they are moving into an uncharted area—asserted that it could run between $15 million to $25 million per year. As the Senator has pointed out, this fund could accumulate over a 4-year period. The excess over the $60 million would go back into the Treasury.

I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that it is highly doubtful that 60 million of the 70 million taxpayers would check off $1 for the first year. Especially if their opinion is like mine, there would be relatively few check marks. Nevertheless, I think we would all agree that there will be less in the first year.

If the Senator will yield further, I wish to make this additional comment. First, I thank the Senator for his support of my amendments to the Corrupt Practices Act which are now pending. I think they are a necessary part in any clean election program.

Also I want to express my support of the pending Ribicoff amendment. As he knows, I was very concerned, particularly about the 25 percent. Overnight, however, my staff and I examined the question, and we decided that with the full and complete disclosure that will be required under the modifying amendments adopted yesterday, potential abuses will be eliminated with respect to the 25 percent. Together, they make a stronger proposal of the Williams amendment.

I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

I again restate my position. I think this whole question could be worked out better in committee after holding hearings and then arrive at the best formula for governing elections. For that reason I shall support the Gore-Williams amendment, which will repeal the existing $1 tax deduction law and start with a clean slate.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, as I said at the beginning of the debate, I have a great deal of confidence that once we had a base, the Finance Committee, after it started hearings, would come forward with constructive amendments that would finally straighten out the mare's nest that we are operating under. I would feel that the distinguished Senator from Delaware, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I would be on the same side on proposals that would come before that committee for a vote.

My feeling is that the constructive suggestions of the Senator from Delaware need not wait until 1972. I think they should be part and parcel of the 1968 elections, because there should be an accounting, and the proposal of the Senator from Delaware I think is most constructive. I hope to have an opportunity to cast my vote in favor of the proposal of the Senator from Delaware.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am happy to support the Ribicoff amendment. I think it is a very fine amendment, and it is the kind of safeguard that I personally think should be in the bill which I sponsored last year.

I think that some of the best evidence to support the Ribicoff amendment is to be found in the effort made by the Senator from Tennessee when he studied this matter in the 1956 general election. He gave the Senate the best estimate he could of where the money came from and where it went in financing the campaigns of both parties. I think he did a real service to the Nation in doing so.

I note that the kind of expenditures that would be in the 75 percent to be accounted for were detailed by the Senator as to both Republican and Democratic expenditures. For example, he listed radio expenditures, $568,000 for the Republicans and $452,000 for the Democrats. As to television expenditures, the Senator found that the Republicans had spent $2,100,000, and the Democrats $2,039,000. For newspaper and periodical advertising, $954,000 for the Republicans, and $611,000 for the

Democrats. For printing, purchase and distribution of literature, $1,430,000 for the Republicans, and $1,500,000 for the Democrats. Outdoor billboards, $299,000 for the Republicans, and $185,000 for the Democrats.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a chart from the report prepared by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], regarding the 1956 election, appear at this point in the RECORD, and that it include item A, all campaign committees; B, national campaign committees; and C, State campaign committees.

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

EXHIBIT 2

GENERAL ELECTION, 1956, TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS BY CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES SEPTEMBER 1–NOVEMBER 30

The following tables show in detail the information summarized in exhibit 1 about the direct expenditures of campaign committees during the period September 1 to November 30 (excepting "special cases," for which complete information is not available).

Shown in addition are funds transferred to other organizations and individual candidates. The sum of these two types of disbursements, direct expenditures and transfers, constitute the total disbursements of the campaign committees involved.

Money that is transferred from one campaign group to another shows up as a receipt and as a disbursement each time it is passed on. The significant index, therefore, to the financial resources of a political party or other group is the total of direct expenditures made by its campaign committees rather than the total of the receipts of those committees or the sum of their total disbursements.

A. ALL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

	Republican			Democratic		Labor	Miscellaneous	Total
	Regular [1]	Finance	Volunteer	Regular [1]	Volunteer			
Disbursed to other committees, associations, organizations, and individual candidates	$2,800,374	$8,071,711	$767,552	$1,294,337	$404,403	$1,354,451	$68,183	$14,761,011
Direct expenditures:								
Radio	568,006	185,212	124,012	452,116	107,863	41,606	1,736	1,480,551
Television	2,100,710	245,135	660,567	2,039,580	252,648	89,421	47,311	5,435,372
Radio-television (when not separable)						8,901		8,901
Newspaper and periodical advertising	954,612	124,059	295,278	611,887	83,036	48,074	30,268	2,147,209
Printing, purchase, and distribution of literature	1,431,556	360,716	394,927	1,526,913	373,163	246,486	66,453	4,400,214
Outdoor billboards	299,912	70,618	23,375	185,809	9,698	24,382	26	613,820
Other	4,895,922	1,046,731	1,392,318	3,627,093	802,086	349,016	115,672	12,228,838
Unaccounted for [2]	61,575			1,581	10			63,166
Total direct expenditures	10,312,293	2,032,471	2,890,472	8,444,979	1,628,504	807,886	261,466	26,378,071
Total of all disbursements	13,112,667	10,104,182	3,658,024	9,739,316	2,032,907	2,162,337	329,649	41,139,082
Unaccounted for [2]				−1,499				−1,499
Total by party and group		26,874,873		11,770,724		2,162,337	329,649	41,137,583

B. NATIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

Disbursed to other committees, associations, organizations, and individual candidates	$280,457		$168,206	$244,132	$28,303	$924,643	$67,645	$1,713,386
Direct expenditures:								
Radio	54,352		583	167,506	53,703	28,369	1,411	305,924
Television	838,155		512,355	1,217,890	163,676	53,463	47,155	2,832,694
Newspaper and periodical advertising	58,169		13,940	24,100	17,379	129,44	29,849	156,381
Printing, purchase, and distribution of literature	233,839		89,189	489,187	132,495	106,952	66,305	1,117,967
Outdoor billboards			1,989			12,385		14,374
Other	1,157,840		421,566	790,407	194,642	193,237	115,340	2,873,032
Total direct expenditures	2,342,355		1,039,622	2,689,090	561,895	407,350	260,060	7,300,372
Total of all disbursements	2,622,812		1,207,828	2,933,222	590,198	1,331,993	327,705	9,013,758
Total by party and group		3,830,640		3,523,420		1,331,993	327,705	9,013,758

C. STATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

Disbursed to other committees, associations, organizations, and individual candidates	$1,626,857	$6,170,724	$516,474	$646,144	$345,260	$372,144	$198	$9,677,771
Direct expenditures:								
Radio	379,391	171,820	83,816	129,012	51,670	5,796	325	821,830
Television	994,790	157,500	75,453	363,429	82,653	27,046		1,700,871
Radio-television (when not separable)						1,000		1,000
Newspaper and periodical advertising	471,462	58,854	221,527	175,365	59,542	17,569	419	1,004,738
Printing, purchase, and distribution of literature	456,947	180,228	204,853	388,380	213,982	57,334	37	1,501,761
Outdoor billboards	156,879	47,046	15,887	57,044	8,311	2,471		287,628
Other	1,744,461	743,589	757,651	1,037,855	568,049	50,340	10	4,901,955
Unaccounted for [2]	61,573				10			61,583
Total direct expenditures	4,265,503	1,359,037	1,359,187	2,151,085	984,267	161,556	791	10,281,366
Total of all disbursements	5,892,360	7,529,761	1,875,661	2,797,229	1,329,437	533,700	989	19,959,137
Unaccounted for [2]				1				1
Total, by party and group		15,297,782		4,126,667		533,700	989	19,959,138

D. LOCAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

Disbursed to other committees, associations, organizations, and individual candidates	$775,150	$1,900,987	$82,872	$289,085	$30,870	$57,664	$340	$3,136,968
Direct expenditures:								
Radio	54,678	13,392	39,613	56,310	2,400	7,441		173,924
Television	110,184	87,635	72,759	157,880	6,309	8,912	156	443,845
Radio and television (when not separable)						7,901		7,901
Newspaper and periodical advertising	265,316	65,205	59,806	190,187	6,115	17,561		604,190
Printing, purchase, and distribution of literature	556,377	180,488	100,885	409,308	26,686	82,200	111	1,356,055
Outdoor billboards	95,843	23,572	5,499	59,313	1,397	9,526	26	195,176
Other	1,607,282	303,142	213,101	1,459,790	39,395	105,439	322	3,728,471
Unaccounted for [2]	2							2
Total direct expenditures	2,689,682	673,434	491,663	2,332,788	82,402	238,980	615	6,509,564
Total of all disbursements	3,464,837	2,574,421	574,535	2,621,873	113,272	296,644	955	9,646,532
Totals by party and group		6,613,788		2,735,145		296,644	955	9,646,532

See footnotes at end of table.

E. SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

	Republican	Democratic	Total
Disbursed to other committees, associations, organizations, and individual candidates	$117,910	$114,976	$232,886
Direct expenditures:			
Radio	79,585	99,288	178,873
Television	157,581	300,381	457,962
Newspaper and periodical advertising	159,665	222,235	38,900
Printing, purchase, and distribution of literature	184,393	240,038	424,431
Direct expenditures—Continued			
Outdoor billboards	$47,190	$69,452	$116,642
Unaccounted for [2]		1,581	1,581
Other	386,339	339,041	725,380
Total direct expenditures	1,014,753	1,272,016	2,286,769
Unaccounted for [2]		−1,500	−1,500
Total of all disbursements	1,132,663	1,385,492	2,518,155

[1] Senatorial committees included under "regular" in this table.

[2] Differences resulting from failure of some committees to report detailed expenditures in full and from errors in reports and computations.

EXHIBIT 3

GENERAL ELECTION, 1956, TOTAL RECEIPTS BY CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE WITH CLOSING BALANCE AND UNPAID BILLS, SEPTEMBER 1 TO NOVEMBER 30

The following tables show in detail the information summarized in exhibit 1–A about the total receipts of campaign committees during the period September 1 to November 30 (excepting "special cases," for which complete information is not available).

Shown in addition are the balance of funds on hand on November 30 (or on the date the committee closed) and the amount of bills unpaid on November 30. Information about unpaid bills was not available from some committees, including the Republican and Democratic congressional campaign committees. For this reason, and because of differences in the accounting procedures used by campaign committees, the volume of unpaid bills can be interpreted as only a very general indication of the extent of financial obligations existing at the end of the campaign.

A. ALL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

	Republican			Democratic		Labor	Miscellaneous	Total
	Regular	Finance	Volunteer	Regular	Volunteer			
Receipts—								
From contributions by individuals	$4,944,481	$7,762,689	$2,325,364	$5,140,277	$1,287,035	$833,647	$277,462	$22,570,955
From sale of tickets to dinners, luncheons, and similar fundraising events (net proceeds)	455,644	438,113	207,089	778,339	343,514	34,867		2,257,566
From other committees, associations, and organizations	5,816,644	1,361,081	1,016,863	2,994,460	471,522	648,658	9,385	12,318,613
From other sources	555,746	329,541	296,749	453,047	59,006	103,783	6,709	1,804,581
Unaccounted for	−30			4,034		1		4,005
Total receipts	11,772,485	9,891,424	3,846,065	9,370,157	2,161,077	1,620,956	293,556	38,955,720
Total by party and group		25,509,974		11,531,234		1,620,956	293,556	38,955,720
Balance on hand Nov. 30 (or close of committee)	1,482,313	1,222,895	315,157	884,818	167,695	478,160	67,410	4,618,448
Total balance, by party and group		3,020,365		1,052,513		478,160	67,410	4,618,448
Unpaid bills at end of period	484,969	105,256	65,273	1,090,893	34,982	28,498	14,453	1,824,324
Total unpaid bills, by party and group		655,498		1,125,875		28,498	14,453	1,824,324

B. NATIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

Receipts—								
From contributions by individuals	$1,390,173		$856,286	$1,545,712	$337,319	$673,605	$276,040	$5,079,135
From sale of tickets to dinners, luncheons, and similar fund-raising events (net proceeds)	2,597			35,900	120	619		39,236
From other committees, associations, and organizations	397,128		363,379	1,348,080	293,866	228,483	9,235	2,740,171
From other sources	3,695		8,295	1,092	2,090	53,057	6,512	74,741
Unaccounted for						1		1
Total receipts	1,793,593		1,327,960	2,930,784	633,395	955,765	291,787	7,933,284
Total by party and group		3,121,553		3,564,179		955,765	291,787	7,933,284
Balance on hand Nov. 30 (or close of committee)	565,523		181,380	59,458	76,895	314,000	66,468	1,263,724
Total balance, by party and group		746,903		136,353		314,000	66,468	1,263,724
Unpaid bills at end of period	88,327		40,256	691,737	5,081	400	14,019	839,820
Total unpaid bills, by party and group		128,583		696,818		400	14,019	839,820

C. STATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

Receipts—								
From contributions by individuals	$1,547,497	$5,733,880	$1,123,059	$1,476,740	$875,060	$109,818	$527	$10,866,581
From sale of tickets to dinners, luncheons, and similar fund-raising events (net proceeds)	203,106	247,502	197,327	370,428	331,600	6,525		1,356,488

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. These are the kind of items that each party would have to account for. Then, in his report, the Senator from Tennessee has the item "Other": $4.895 million for the Republicans, and $365,000 for the Democrats. So this item that is referred to as "Other", accounted for approximately one-half of all Republican expenditures.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is well to keep in mind that in his investigation, the Senator was only able to find perhaps one-half of the money that was raised and spent by the two sides. In fact, I have heard it estimated that the Republicans that year spent $40 million, and this is only $10 million out of the $40 million.

So the Ribicoff amendment proposes to take the kind of items which the Senator from Tennessee was able to uncover, and itemize and say that those particular items can be paid. Then he proceeds to say that there are certain other kinds of expenditures that cannot be paid, even though listed among the 25 percent items. In that respect, his amendment provides as follows:

No payment made under paragraph (1) into the treasury of a political party with respect to a presidential campaign may be used to defray any expenses incurred for services or products on the day of the presi-

dential election other than services or products falling within one of the categories described in the preceding sentence.

That means that a party cannot pay any of this money out for poll watchers; it cannot pay any of this money out for the transportation of voters to the polls; it cannot pay any of this money out for buying someone a Coca-Cola, a meal, a bottle of whisky, or anything else of that sort. These election day expenditures—which incidentally have been very high in many elections—are prohibited; they cannot be paid. It is intended that this would be a move toward prohibiting altogether such election day expenditures, which in many instances amount to a sometimes subtle and sometimes crude way of buying votes. If a man's car is hired for $50 to drive voters to the polls, it is presumed that he and his family would vote for the people who hired it.

So the Senator's amendment is a very good amendment—certainly one which deserves the best consideration of the Senate. As far as I am concerned, I would be pleased to see it become a part of the presidential campaign fund election law.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I find no reason to oppose the Ribicoff amendment. I find no substantial reason to support it. Indeed, I find the amendment makes no significant change in the law.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana has just pointed out, all of the categories of the expenditures which were reported after an investigation of campaign expenditures are incorporated in the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], for which 75 percent of the campaign subsidy authorized by the Campaign Fund Act can be expended.

I asked the able senior Senator from Connecticut to suggest some type of political expenditure that he could imagine other than those incorporated in his amendment. After some consideration for a period of time, the able Senator suggested that perhaps one of the Goldwater films would not be included in the categories listed in his amendment.

I am not sure whether that is the case. The able Senator from Louisiana has stated that no money could be spent for campaign workers on an election day. The amendment does not provide that at all.

Expenditures are allowed, for example, for: "Expenses for the preparation, printing, and distribution of campaign literature."

As I understand the function of a poll worker on election day, it is the distribution of literature, pamphlets, cards, fly sheets, or what-not.

The amendment also provides that expenditures shall be made for: "Reasonable salaries for campaign personnel."

If one can make expenditures for campaign personnel and if one can make expenditures for the preparation, printing, and distribution of campaign literature, that would surely include election-day workers. However, just in case some political activity has not been envisioned, in case there is some activity which nobody has been able to think about, the amendment provides that 25 percent or up to $7.5 million, could be expended for those unidentified purposes, and if such unspecified expenses are not enough to consume the amount, then the remainder of the $7.5 million could be expended for the purpose specified in the amendment.

So, I do not know just what is foreclosed by the amendment. I do not know what safeguards are provided. The money can still be expended for everything that everybody has been able to think about, and it can still be expended in one State or in a few States. It can be used so as to punish or reward candidates at the local level.

I do not know what material difference it makes whether the amendment is agreed to or rejected. However, out of love and affection and respect and honor and esteem for the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, I shall vote for the amendment. I cannot think of any other reason for supporting it, but that is sufficient.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator said that the amendment would permit the paying of expenses for the printing of literature and even for the distribution of literature.

Does not the Senator understand that the amendment would clearly prohibit payment for the distribution of literature on election day?

Mr. GORE. I do not so understand. The amendment does not so provide.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The bill disallows election day expenses falling in the 25-percent category. If somebody is paid to stand at the polls and hand out literature on election day, his pay would be an election day expense.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator to explain the meaning of the term "expense of printing and distribution of campaign literature."

The amendment does not say that it may be printed and may be distributed on every day except election day. The amendment provides for the expense of printing and distribution of campaign literature.

I do not think this a very important point.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator states categorically that all 1964 campaign expenditures reported by the Republican Party were described in the enumerated items covered in the 75-percent category of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut and suggested that it should go on up to 100 percent.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I did not suggest that. I just asked if there would be any objection, and I see no objection.

The Senator has just said something about election day.

If the Senator will look on page 3 of the amendment he will find that expenditures are specifically allowed on election day for all the purposes specified in the amendment, including salaries of campaign personnel and the printing and distribution of campaign literature.

I suggest to the able Senator that a little more study of the amendments hastily proposed here on the floor is indicated, just as more study of the bill passed last year should have received more study before it was enacted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to hear my statement just as I would like to hear his.

I read the entire list of Republican expenses into the RECORD on April 5, and had the Senate not adjourned on short notice, I would have challenged the statement of the Senator.

Today, I want to read from that list again and describe those items which are not encompassed by the 75-percent category. The following items are not encompassed by the 75-percent category:

National Committee Fellowships.
Contributions to committees.
Security.
Automobile maintenance.
Outdoor productions, such as political rallies.
Executive expenses.
Meetings and conferences.
Miscellaneous expenses.
Motion pictures.
Insurance and bonds.
Supplies.

With reference to the security item which I mentioned, if a man is elected President, we had better plan to keep him alive until after the election.

There are a lot of other expenses that a party might incur which would not be on this list and did not appear on the statement by the Republican Party. A candidate might go to Alaska, rent a dogsled, and take part in winter snow races. He might go to Hawaii and purchase leis with his campaign slogan on them to pass out at rallies.

He might buy straw hat skimmers and striped jackets for all his campaign workers to wear. Or it might be 10-gallon hats and cowboy boots. He might hire floats for a political parade, or even rent the local fire truck for that purpose.

He might bottle and pass out "Gold Water" to potential voters. He could hire a band, or a donkey, or an elephant. Sound trucks could be provided. He might pass out "I Like Ike" buttons or similar campaign souvenirs. He might produce a campaign song or record album which he could give to his faithful voluntary workers as mementoes of the hard work they did for him in the campaign. The record might be "Gallant Men" or perhaps "Keep the Faith, Baby" or even "Hello, Lyndon."

He might go to a war zone like Korea or Vietnam for the purpose of better informing himself of conditions there so that he might more effectively wage his campaign.

Voter registration expenses could be an important item in his party's campaign budget.

There are a whole host of other expenses that do not fit in the enumerated list of items for which 75 percent of the fund payments must be spent. I refer

to such things as legal and accounting fees connected with the campaign or with the contesting of an election, a tremendous amount of photography, the employment of advertising or public relations agencies when these agencies are contracted on a fixed fee basis, and interest paid on loans secured to meet obligations of a party prior to the receipt of campaign funds. None of these is provided for in the 75-percent list and all of them might be legitimate expenses of a presidential campaign. Therefore, they would have to be paid for from the remaining 25 percent of the fund payments.

But, even more important, it is necessary and wise to leave room in the law for expenses of a new character that may arise in future campaigns. The types of expenditures of which we have spoken are those that have been reported by national committees in previous elections. They do not cover expenditures by State and local committees. We are all aware that not all expenditures have been reported. Political campaign expenses are like an iceberg. What is reported is just a small part of the total activity. Expenses that have not been reported because there is no law requiring them to be reported may be legitimate expenditures that do not fall within any of the categories for which 75 percent of the payments are to be made. And so it is that flexibility must be permitted in the statute to allow payment of such previously unreported or unknown—but nevertheless perfectly legal and proper—expenses and of the new types of campaign techniques that may develop in the future.

As for permitting 25 percent of the payments to be used for purposes other than the specific items listed, the Senator from Tennessee should be reminded that in the report of his Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in 1956, campaign expenditures were listed for the Republican, Democratic, and other campaign committees; and in each of those listings, in addition to particular categories of expenditures, there is a line for "Other direct expenditures." I have with me a copy of that voluminous report of the Senator from Tennessee. The report is so thick that the numbering of the pages stops with 91, and there are hundreds and hundreds of pages thereafter delving into the subject of campaign contributions and expenditures.

On page 39 of that report, the total disbursements for campaign committees from September 1 to November 30 in the 1956 general election are listed. Senator GORE has broken down the direct expenditures into several categories, such as radio, television, newspaper, and periodical advertising; printing, purchase and distribution of literature—categories not unlike the ones listed in the Ribicoff amendment for which 75 percent of the fund money must be used. In addition, Senator GORE has a line item merely called "Other." This "Other" classification accounts for up to 50 percent of the direct expenditures by the national campaign committees. For example, of the Republican National Campaign Committee's total direct expenditures of $3,400,000, $1,600,000 was spent for "Other."

Of the $3,300,000 in direct expenditures by the Democratic National Campaign Committees, about $1 million was spent in the category simply labeled "other." The Senator from Tennessee has criticized the Ribicoff amendment for permitting too much of the fund payment to be used in what could be called the "other" category—that is, the 25 percent which need not be spent for the specific items for which the 75 percent must be spent. Yet, in his own report, he was not able to categorize expenditures by the national committees which amounted to not just 25 percent but 30 to 50 percent of the outlays of those committees. If he feels that all campaign expenditures can be listed in specific categories, can he tell me why such a large share of the spending by the national campaign committees in 1956 was listed in his report—not mine—under the unilluminating classification of "other," rather than having been spelled out in specific terms? The only real difference in the categorizing of campaign expenditures in Senator RIBICOFF's amendment and in Senator GORE's report in 1956 is that Senator RIBICOFF's amendment reduces the money that can be spent for miscellaneous or other types of expenditures. Whereas Senator GORE's report accounted for a little over 50 percent of the national campaign committee expenditures in specific categories, Senator RIBICOFF would require that at least 75 percent of fund payments be accounted for in specific categories.

While we are on the subject of the report of the 1956 Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, let me read one of the conclusions and observations of that report:

10. The need for remedial legislation in the field of Federal elections is imperative and immediate. It is the hope of the subcommittee that this study will serve to expedite the preparation of such legislation and to arouse an enlightened public opinion behind it. Few, if any, reforms are more direly needed in our democratic society.

I am not saying that. That was said by the Senator from Tennessee.

Although the Senator from Tennessee found an imperative and immediate need for legislation and hoped that the study he had conducted would expedite the preparation of such legislation, there was no legislation. There was no legislation for 10 years thereafter, not until the Senate Finance Committee amended the Foreign Investors Tax Act with the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act last year. If we were to repeal last year's act, I am sure there would be another study of a size comparable to that of the Gore subcommittee of 1956; and I am sure that the study would conclude with a suggestion for legislation, but I wonder whether such a suggestion would not meet with the same fate that the Gore subcommittee's suggestion met in 1956—absolute failure.

The basic difference between the sponsors of the amendment to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 and those of us who oppose such an amendment is over procedure. We both want to enact legislation governing political campaigning and Federal elections. I believe that we enacted a good law last year, and we should use it as a basis on which to build an even better law on Federal elections and campaign financing. The Senator from Tennessee and his supporters feel that we should repeal last year's law and begin again to find ways of revising our laws on the subject.

But if we proceed along the way that the Senator from Tennessee suggests, we will have eliminated the only step taken in the area in over 30 years. We will have retreated to where we have been for much too long. If we take such a backward step, the chances are great there will be no forward steps for many more years to come.

The Senator from Tennessee cannot deny that absolutely nothing was enacted into law as a result of his excellent investigation into campaign financing 11 years ago. There is strong reason to believe that exactly the same thing would happen if we were to repeal last year's law and start from scratch. There would be no urgent need to enact new legislation. On the other hand, if we keep last year's law on the books, just as it is evoking much concern and controversy in the Senate these days, it will stimulate us to enact further reforms in our election processes and in the manner in which we finance political campaigns. It has prompted the introduction of what I consider to be the good amendments of Senator WILLIAMS and Senator RIBICOFF, the interesting suggestions embodied in the bill of Senator METCALF, and my own bill, S. 1407, which even those critical of last year's law find an excellent measure, worthy of passage by Congress. To use the metaphor being employed in this debate, I feel that we have given the carrot to the political parties and they cannot prevent us from supplying the stick. But if we now withdraw that carrot, it will be an impossible task to go forward with a combination carrot and stick before the 1968 election is upon us.

Let me return to the report of the Gore subcommittee in 1956. Let me read another of its conclusions and observations:

7. For years thoughtful statesmen on the American scene have pleaded for greater participation on the part of the electorate in the making of campaign contributions so that the base may be broadened and opportunities of candidates and parties to present themselves to the electorate equalized. The findings of the subcommittee as set out in this report poignantly demonstrate the need for effective limitations upon the amount of individual contributions and the desirability of providing incentives for mass contributions, or perhaps governmental assumption of the cost and responsibility for the conduct of Federal election campaigns and the curtailment of private subsidization of election campaigns.

Yes, the Senator from Tennessee in 1956 suggested what in great part was done in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, that is, a governmental assumption of the cost and

responsibility for the conduct of presidential campaigns and his call in 1956 for the curtailment of private subsidization of election campaigns would be carried out if S. 1407, the bill I have had introduced this year, to amend last year's act were enacted because that bill calls for the prohibition of private contributions to the major political parties for presidential campaigns if those parties receive payment from the presidential election campaign fund.

I am happy that Senator GORE suggested these things back in 1956. I regret that he apparently has changed his mind now and does not approve of that part of his own suggestion which was enacted into law in 1966 nor does he seem to approve of that other part of his suggestion which I am advocating be put into the law this year.

Mr. President, the question of tax deductions and credits keeps coming up in this debate. I would like to lay that matter to rest by stating first that we tried to pass a tax deduction in 1964 and we fell flat on our face. The House refused to agree to it then, and they would refuse to agree to it now.

Secondly, it would not stimulate new contributions—it would only give a tax windfall to people who are giving today, and who will continue to give, whether they get a tax deduction or not.

Thirdly, a tax deduction or credit would bring the tax collector into the political arena with all the nasty implications of a political purge if he should zealously demand verification of the contribution from both the donor and the party. The party out of power would forever charge "foul" against the party in power, even where the tax collector is making only routine audits of their contributor's tax returns.

None of these issues is raised by the $1 formula in today's law. But they were all considerations which convinced the Committee on Finance that tax credits or deductions were not proper ways to finance political campaigns. If Senators want a "party of his choice" approach to campaign financing and feel that equal division of the money in the presidential election campaign fund is unfair to either party, we can change it in committee. Last year, when I offered my original bill, it was based on the "party of his choice" principle, but the committee wanted it changed to make a greater amount available to the minority party. I was perfectly agreeable. Now, Senators are holding that out as a defect in the law.

If they want to change it now, I am equally agreeable—the Democrats will gain at the expense of the Republicans—but, once again, we can do it in committee.

By rejecting the Gore repealer, we will have the chance.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 153) offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] to the amendment proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Washington, [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Aiken	Hart	Moss
Anderson	Hartke	Mundt
Bartlett	Hayden	Murphy
Bayh	Hill	Muskie
Bennett	Holland	Nelson
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Boggs	Inouye	Pell
Brewster	Jackson	Prouty
Burdick	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Scott
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Clark	Lausche	Spong
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Curtis	Long, La.	Symington
Dodd	McCarthy	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	McGee	Tower
Fannin	McGovern	Tydings
Fong	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Yarborough
Gore	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Montoya	
Harris	Morton	

NAYS—12

Allott	Cotton	Hatfield
Baker	Dirksen	Hickenlooper
Brooke	Dominick	Pearson
Carlson	Hansen	Smith

NOT VOTING—12

Byrd, Va.	Magnuson	Percy
Ervin	Mansfield	Russell
Hollings	Metcalf	Smathers
Kuchel	Morse	Williams, N.J.

So Mr. RIBICOFF's amendment (No. 153) was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request until after the amendment is read?

The legislative clerk read Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment to the Williams amendment, as follows:

On page 1, after line 4, insert the following:

"(c) Section 303(c)(2) of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"'(C) Each political party whose candidate for President in any presidential election receives more than 2,000,000 popular votes as the candidate of such political party shall be entitled to payments under paragraph (1) with respect to the presidential campaign conducted for such presidential election equal to $1 multiplied by the number of popular votes in excess of 2,000,000 received by such candidate as the candidate of such political party in such presidential election, except that such payments shall not exceed the amount determined under subparagraph (A) for a political party entitled to payments determined under such subparagraph. Any such political party whose candidate for President at the preceding presidential election received more than 2,000,000, but less than 15,000,000, popular votes as the candidates of such political party shall be entitled to payments determined under this subparagraph or subparagraph (B), whichever is the larger, but shall not be entitled to payments determined under both subparagraphs. Any political party entitled to payments determined under subparagraph (A) shall not be entitled to payments determined under this subparagraph'."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is a copy of this amendment on the desks of Senators?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; this is not a printed amendment. It was sent to the desk just a few moments ago. I will explain it. It is very simple.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It did not sound simple when it was being read.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will listen, I will explain it in a moment or two.

This amendment is designed to recognize more properly the emergence of a strong third party and to provide rules for reimbursing these minor parties on

the basis of their showing in the current election. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act limits its reimbursements to parties which received more than 5 million votes in the preceding presidential election. In 1964, there were only two parties which derived more than 5 million votes—the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. It has been argued that, because only these two parties will be eligible for reimbursement in 1968, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act discriminates against other parties and their candidates.

It has been a long time since a third party candidate received 5 million votes.

I might say that one of the reasons for my offering the amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is that the last third party candidate who received close to 5 million votes was Bob La Follette, who occupied the seat I now hold. I believe it will be a long time before another third party candidate will receive that many votes.

However, Senator WILLIAMS' amendment reduces this 5 million to 2 million for minor parties, and I have no objection to this. In addition, in order to soothe the objections and fears of those who still criticise the act, I am offering an amendment to provide reimbursement for minor parties on the basis of the current election results. Major parties—those whose candidates receives 15 million or more votes—would continue to be reimbursed only on the basis of the prior election results.

Under this amendment, these minor parties would be entitled to receive the greater of first, an amount computed on the basis of the preceding election; or, second, an amount computed under the same formula but based on the current election. Obviously, this will mean the minor party will get no advance payments but it will be entitled to a post-election payment provided the combination of private contributions plus the Federal payment does not exceed the expenses it incurred in presenting its candidate.

I said to the Senator from Iowa that it was a comparatively simple amendment, and I think it is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What the Senator is proposing is what I offered last year in the Finance Committee when we voted on the same matter. As I recall it, when we passed the presidential campaign fund proposal in the Senate, we provided for a distribution to a third party only if it received more than 1.5 million votes, but only in the prior election.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say that that is my understanding. That is what the Senator from Louisiana proposed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What the Senator is saying is that a third party should be permitted to receive help, not in the next election, but the current election in which it for the first time is runing a candidate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. The reason for it is that a third party would have to wait 4 years to receive a distribution, and it would be sorely put to finance the current campaign. On the other hand, it could finance its present campaign on the reasonable assumption that it would receive 2 million votes, if it would receive financial support from the Federal Government to help finance its campaign.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Suppose a candidate did the best he could, devoting to the campaign what he could afford, and he spent $5 million, and he was $3 million in debt. He had the same kind of expenses that the two major parties were reimbursed for. Do I understand that when the election is over and the votes are counted and somebody has spent $5 million, he will be reimbursed substantially in the same manner as the two major parties would be, and would get $1 per vote for the 3 million votes to reimburse him for what he had paid to wage his campaign?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. The formula subtracts 2 million from the number of votes received to arrive at the number of dollars the third party would receive as compensation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The idea of the 2 million figure, as I understand it, is that the Senator does not care to encourage anyone to make a mere nuisance campaign; a person would have to be a serious candidate to receive more than the 2 million votes. That is what the Williams amendment itself seeks to do, to make the figure more realistic by reducing it from 5 million to 2 million, so that if a man received 5 million votes, instead of having nothing available to help him in paying off his expenses, he could hope to receive $3 million to help repay his out-of-pocket expenses in running for office.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. I might add that there is no question that some third party candidates who go on the ballot for advertising, for publicity, for propaganda, or for various such purposes obtain relatively small support; and I think it would not be desirable to subsidize such parties. Obviously, however, when a candidate receives more than 2 million votes, it is a different kind of situation; he is obviously trying to as a candidate for office, if not in the immediate campaign, for another a few years hence. The amendment offers an opportunity to build a following on some kind of parity with the major parties.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose the Senator's amendment is agreed to, and the former Governor of Alabama, Mr. Wallace, should be a candidate for President and receive 15 million votes. Under the Senator's formula, how much would be paid to him out of the Public Treasury?

Mr. PROXMIRE. $13 million. The difference between 2 million and 15 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If he spent that much.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I add, for the Senator from Nebraska, just one further thing: If he spends that much, over the amount paid for by contributions.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. How does that compare with what the major parties reported spending in the last presidential campaign?

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator knows, estimates of the amount that the major parties spent in the last campaign have varied widely, but most people feel that they spent close to $30 million.

It is very hard to document that amount, as the Senator knows, because the reporting requirements vary so much State by State, and the national reporting requirements are not treated seriously by anybody. But the estimates, and I think they are pretty reliable, are that the spending was close to $25 million or $30 million.

Mr. CURTIS. For each party?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the estimates of expenditures by each of the two parties was in the area of $25 million or $30 million.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, the existing parties have a sizable expense in maintaining the bureaucracy of their organizations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the distinguished Senator from Nebraska knows, the Wallace party, if it is to be a serious effort, will also have to have its bureaucracy, as any party will if it is to receive anything like 15 million votes.

Governor Wallace ran in my State in 1964, and had a great deal of support. He had a respectable campaign, and a lot of money was spent in his behalf. He had many people working for him, comparable to other candidates running in past presidential primaries we have had in Wisconsin. I think he might very well mount the same kind of a national campaign this time. To get 13 or 15 million votes, he would have to.

Mr. CURTIS. When the Senator referred to the fact that Senator La Follette came near getting 5 million votes, what was the total vote at that time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The total vote then was a great deal less than it is now, of course. That was 1924. Women had just lately been permitted to vote. Participation by them was far less than it is now. It is my understanding that about 28 million would be close to the total vote at that time; so his proportion of the vote was most respectable, and would be equivalent today to three or four times that number.

Mr. CURTIS. While it is true that we go through the motions of a checkoff on the tax return, this money, of course, would be a direct payment out of the Treasury?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, it is my understanding that this would be a direct appropriation from the Treasury.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would not be a checkoff, alone.

Mr. CURTIS. Except that the individual taxpayers make the appropriation, rather than some committee of Congress?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, in this case Congress makes the appropriation. The law on the books now provides for appropriation by Congress in addition to the checkoff.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand it, the mechanics of it would be as follows: The existing law would still use the taxpayer checkoff. Taxpayers would check whether they want a dollar to go into the presidential campaign fund. If they want a dollar to go into the presidential campaign fund, then Congress would have to appropriate that much money to respect the wishes of the taxpayers who marked on their returns that they wanted this money to go into the presidential campaign funds. That being the case, the law then spells out how the presidential campaign funds can be spent. The Senator is seeking to amend that section that states how that money can be paid out, so that a third party, if its candidate receives more than 2 million votes, rather than having to wait 4 years, will be able to have some of the money from that presidential campaign fund to pay its current expenses. The big difference is that the minor party could not receive any help out of the fund until after the election, because it would not be known until that time whether its candidate would receive 2 million votes or not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is substantially the situation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So they would have to be reimbursed for expenses that they have incurred, while the candidates of the major parties have been paid as the campaign progressed for their expenses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. It is my understanding that the Senator from Louisiana has an amendment pending that would eliminate the checkoff feature and provide for direct appropriation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But it is immaterial whether they use the checkoff or not. One way or another, you get money into the presidential campaign funds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And the Senator is trying now to do justice to third parties by permitting third parties to get some of the money out of that presidential campaign fund for the next election, on the basis that it could perhaps borrow money or be extended credit for television time and that sort of thing, in anticipation that if it received 2 million votes, some money would be available for it to defray those obligations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. It would seem to me to be a serious inequity if such a party could not expect to share in the disbursement the first time it went over 2 million votes. If they are a serious third party, they could obtain their money promptly, pay their debts, and be in a position to conduct a respectable campaign for the next election.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. The third party would be at the disadvantage of having to campaign against the two major parties which were subsidized during the campaign, would it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, but it would receive a distribution immediately after the election.

Mr. TOWER. Having perhaps the hope of achieving 2 million votes, but no assurance that they would?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. But what this amendment would do would be to improve the bill over what it would otherwise be, because the third party would not have to wait for 4 years, or until it could become a major party. Therefore it would be better than what we have now. The Senator from Texas is correct in saying that it does not place third parties at perfect parity. I do not see any way that we could do so, without providing encouragement for people simply to run for propaganda or advertising, or something of that kind.

Mr. TOWER. I abhor third-party movements myself, but nevertheless, they have a right to exist and prosper, if they can secure the support.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They do indeed.

Mr. TOWER. And it seems to me that they would have to start out with that disadvantage.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the proposed amendment overcomes the disadvantage as much as we can.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment of the Senator, it would work in this fashion—the Williams amendment would provide that a third party could get some help in 1972 if it received more than 2 million votes in 1968.

Mr PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would provide that the third party could get some help in 1968 in the event it received more than 2 million votes in 1968.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. That is the difference. It is true, of course, that under my amendment they would not receive the help until after the election, but they would get the help in 1968 when it would be meaningful and when they could conduct a better campaign.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there are two major parties. A major party can be helped as the campaign goes along. Those parties presently are the Democratic and Republican Parties. They are the major parties because they received more than 15 million votes in the last presidential election, in 1964.

So, the major parties have available an amount of money that might be as much as $30 million with which to carry their campaign to the American people in 1968, assuming the taxpayers approve of this.

We then have the matter of the minor parties. At this moment we have no minor parties because none received more than 2 million votes for a minor party candidate. However, assume that at the next election, a party does receive more than 2 million votes.

That party would then be regarded as a minor party, and that minor party could be helped by the reimbursement of some expenses after the election as a result of the votes that the party's candidates received in 1968.

The minor party could be reimbursed in November of 1968 for expenses incurred in October 1968.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree. I think that clarifies it very well. However, they can even anticipate this. People would rely to some extent on the kind of widespread support a candidate might have.

Governor Wallace might be a good example. The polls might show that he would receive over 2 million votes. That would put him in a position to receive financing for his campaign.

A candidate from another section of the country might also develop support, as La Follette did in Wisconsin in 1924. He would also be in a position to anticipate receiving a vote actually completely far more than he could receive without the benefit of this amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is another type of party that we could talk about under this law. That is the type of party that we would refer to, for lack of a better word, as a nuisance party, a party that would make some noise and do some advertising and receive not more than one-tenth of 1 percent of the votes. It would receive less than 2 million votes.

Such a party would continue to be a threat, but it would not be eligible for any help. We must wait until after the election to find out whether the Wallace party turns out to be a nuisance party or a minor party. In the event that the Wallace Party turns out to be a minor party, it would then receive reimbursement after the election.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. Unless we wait until after the election, I do not see any way in which we could do it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I want to comment upon the statement made by the chairman of the Finance Committee earlier this afternoon when he implied the threat of a veto of this bill if the American businessmen did not support his position.

I have great respect for the Senator from Louisiana, but in my opinion his remarks were not in the best tradition of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. The implied threat that the administration may veto one of its own bills, the restoration of the 7-percent investment tax credit, if an amendment were agreed to that it did not like was in my opinion a reflection on the character of this administration. I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana did not intend that, but this is the impression he gave.

I do not think this administration is that low. I do not think this administration would stoop so low as to support a threat to the American businessman that if he does not put pressure on his

Senator to vote against the Gore-Williams proposal to repeal this campaign slush fund the bill itself may be vetoed. I do not say that was so intended, but the statement certainly could be so interpreted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator misquoted me.

Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. I am not misquoting anybody.

I will yield in a moment.

I tried to get the floor earlier, but the Senator had left.

I say again, as one who has great respect for the Senator from Louisiana, that I do not think his remarks were in the best tradition of the U.S. Senate.

As I interpret the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana they would be a reflection on the administration. I cannot conceive of the Senator from Louisiana intending it that way.

Another point was made that all the Senator from Louisiana wants is hearings on the bill. Who ever heard of having hearings on a bill after the bill has been enacted into law? We are supposed to hold hearings before a bill is enacted into law. Our suggestion here is to repeal a law that was passed last year.

The RECORD shows that while the Senate Finance Committee had a series of hearings on various proposals, the proposal for the $1 checkoff, on each tax return was not one of those proposals. That idea was developed in the Finance Committee by the Senator from Louisiana. He had a perfect right to develop it.

The proposal was approved by the majority of the Finance Committee. That committee had a perfect right to approve it, whether I objected to it or not. This was all done in the best traditions of the Senate, and then it was attached as a nongermane rider on the Foreign Investors Tax Act. It was no more germane at that time than it is to the proposal to repeal it now.

Let us face it. We are dealing with a similar situation here. In the first case we had a bastard child of the administration attached to the Foreign Investors Tax Act. We are now trying to make it legitimate by repealing it. There is no question about the procedure.

One more point and then I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

I am sure the Senator from Louisiana did not intend to convey the meaning that he was criticizing the Senator from Tennessee when he said:

> The Senator from Tennessee participated in two major conferences on financial matters between the Senate and the House of Representatives. One was a big social security bill, and the other the unemployment insurance bill. And in both cases the bills died in conference.

I am sure the Senator from Louisiana did not intend to convey that this was the fault of the Senator from Tennessee.

I happened to be one of the conferees and can state that the reason that the social security bill died in conference was because the conferees would not agree to accept the medicare proposal. The administration had sent word down that if they could not get their medicare proposal they wanted no bill.

Many of us on the minority side thought that was a callous position on the part of this administration, to deprive the elderly citizens of their promised increase in social security benefits, which had been agreed upon by both Houses of Congress, solely because the administration could not get its medicare bill.

That social security bill died, not because the Senator from Tennessee objected but because the administration objected to it.

The bill dealing with unemployment died in conference because the Senate, in acting on the bill, wrote in a measure dealing with Federal standards. The House rejected it because of the Federal standards.

The Senator from Tennessee was one who stood by the Senate position and tried to have the Senate version accepted.

I am sure the Senator from Louisiana did not intend to misrepresent the position of the Senator from Tennessee, or to leave that impression.

I think the Senator from Tennessee is entitled to have his position made clear.

Now, I get back again——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator let me defend myself for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

The Senator said that the administration made a threat. They did not say anything.

I said that if the amendment to the bill is agreed to, I will be against the bill. I am sincere in that. That is no threat. That is an old-fashioned political promise—"If you do that to me, I will do this to you."

I am not threatening anything. I simply leave the Senator under no misapprehension of where I stand.

I said that I will be against the bill, and that if it is passed, I will ask the President to veto it.

The only way I can fail to do that, after having made that statement, is if the President will not talk to me. I hope that I can communicate to him and say: "Mr. President, I hope you will veto the bill."

I said it, and I mean it.

The aspersions cast by the Senator from Delaware on my statement is unfounded.

If the Senator will permit me to respond further, he can then go ahead with his statement.

The Senator said that I had questioned the sincerity of the Senator from Tennessee. Not for a moment. I said the Senator from Tennessee is against this bill. Here are his minority views, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD. Here are the minority views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. He is against the bill. He believes it should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the minority views of the Senator from Tennessee will be printed in the RECORD.

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATOR ALBERT GORE

The "nervous Nellies" in the White House and the Treasury Department have evidently decided that a threatened slowdown in the economy requires a disorderly retreat from a previously adopted plan of fiscal policy action. It is disquieting to note that all too many currently in the tax policy kitchen cannot stand the slightest suggestion of heat from the business community, particularly big business.

Early in 1966, after it became clear to everyone that there would be an increase in capital outlays of some 17 percent over 1965, and with the knowledge that 1965 had shown an increase of some 16 percent over 1964, the administration stoutly and successfully resisted efforts by me and others to suspend the investment tax credit for a cooling-off period.

Later in the year, after most economic indicators were suggesting the beginning of an economic slowdown, or at least a leveling off, but during a money panic triggered in part by the administration's dumping of participation certificates on the market, it was insisted by the administration that national salvation lay in a suspension of the investment credit.

Now we are told that the investment credit should be restored because the latest surveys show that business plans only a modest 4-percent increase over 1966 for the current year. Clearly the 16- and 17-percent advances were unsustainable. Is a further increase of 4 percent on top of these too-rapid advances disastrous? It would seem that if a cooling-off period is desirable, such a modest advance, but still an advance from a very high level, would be a healthy factor and the cooling-off period might well be allowed to continue in effect for a few more months.

Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board put the dollar figures in good perspective in testifying before the Finance Committee. He stated that special surveys conducted by the Commerce Department, and by the Securities and Exchange Commission indicated that "businessmen reported that the tax law changes induced them to reduce their capital spending plans for 1967 by $2.3 billion below what otherwise would have been spent." He was referring to last fall's suspension of the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation for certain buildings. He went on to say that "the amounts of actual and planned spending reductions involved are small, relative to the $60 billion annual rate at which capital outlays are running."

One must conclude, then, that either the administration fears a recession, based on factors other than the slowdown in plant and equipment expenditures, and now seeks to pump money into the corporate sector, or that the administration has merely seized this moment of apparent economic slowdown as an excuse to fatten the coffers of the large corporations by an unconscionable tax cut.

I prefer to think that the administration fears a recession, and now seeks pellmell to pump funds into the corporate sector by way of this tax cut, primarily for the benefit of big business.

I do not subscribe to this recession theory, I am very much concerned about the burgeoning deficit. But if we can afford to forgo revenue, and if we do, in fact, need to pump up the economy, the consumer sector is more in need of stimulation.

It appears to me that we face three inescapable facts in considering this bill:

Fact No. 1: By enacting this bill we will be cutting taxes for corporations when there is no demonstrated need.

As pointed out above, there is no collapse

in plant and equipment expenditures. This year will see a still further advance, although not a large one, over the too-rapid advances we experienced in 1965 and 1966.

On the other hand, although a recession is not now predictable, there has been an increasing wariness on the part of consumers. Consumer expenditures have slowed and the saving rate has jumped up markedly. Although there is no shortage in productive capacity, there is a shortage of purchasing power and if any segment of the economy needs encouragement, it is consumers.

The slowdown in the automobile industry is characterized by an excess in inventory of unsold automobiles. Would this indicate a need for a tax incentive for more automobile productive capacity or for more consumer demand for the automobiles already manufactured and for the production of which idle capacity already exists?

Fact No. 2: Cutting taxes for corporations at this time is an indication of a decision to use fiscal policy to pump up the economy. But the administration, at the same time, is inconsistently pursuing restraint in expenditures where such expenditures might be more useful. Highway funds have been impounded, and although it was recently announced that they would be released, the final release will not take place until after July 1. But we are urged to give corporations a tax break now. The Bureau of the Budget is sitting on some $94 million badly needed for farm loans. We cannot afford to make these good loans, but we can afford to give away millions immediately to a relatively few large corporations. We must defer action to boost social security benefits for the elderly who are in dire straits. But we cannot afford to wait another month to cut corporate taxes.

One wonders whether administration spokesmen are being candid, consistent, or neither.

Fact No. 3: The enactment of this measure will kill any chance of adopting the President's proposed tax surcharge. As a result, the deficit may well approach $20 billion for fiscal year 1968. I, for one, cannot face such a prospect with equanimity, particularly since we have continued to run deficits through the past few years of unprecedented prosperity.

In view of these facts, it seems to me that we need to look beyond this particular bill. We need to reexamine, in the light of the practicalities of political life, some of the tenets of the "new" economics.

We are all Keynesians to some degree, and I am sure that every Member of the Senate believes in the active use of the powers of government to help regulate the economy under certain circumstances. But are we capable of intelligently juggling our tax patterns and tax rates? Are we not doing more harm than good with an on-again-off-again tax policy, the only constant being continuous and increasing deficits?

To begin with, forecasting is not sufficiently precise to allow policy to be pinpointed. And, second, timing will always be questionable when political activists must be counted on to arrive at decisions, and additional political forces must be called into play to transform decisions into action.

As a matter of fact, many of our current problems can be directly traced to the massive tax cut of 1964. I am a firm believer in the active use of the powers of government to promote socially and economically worthwhile goals. But I seriously question whether we are now on the right track. Given the present state of the science of economics and the art of forecasting economic trends, and the reluctance of political forces to take the hard decisions, I think we might be well advised to set up an equitable tax system which would bring in ample revenues during normal or average times. Fiscal policy could then be implemented largely through variations in the pattern of Government expenditures.

As for this bill, it should be defeated. It does not seem to me to be wise to cut any taxes at this time, particularly for corporations. But if the decision has been made that we can and should cut taxes, and the choice is between types of taxes, it is preferable that we start in the consumer sector.

The Congress has already acted to phase out the automobile excise tax, with the exception of 1 percent. It has also decided that the excise tax on telephone service should be removed. I would propose, then, that these taxes be taken off now, rather than restore the investment credit now. I shall offer an amendment to accomplish this when the bill is debated in the Senate. But I do want to make it clear that, in my best judgment, our fiscal plight will not permit a large loss of revenue now. Defeat of the bill altogether, therefore, would be preferable.

ALBERT GORE.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not disparage the sincerity of the Senator from Tennessee. I applaud the Senator's sincerity. He is sincere in being against the bill, as he was sincere in being against the initial bill and any act to improve on it. I said before that if the Senator from Tennessee prevails, I would deem it my duty to send his name to the desk to be a conferee on this bill. May I say, Mr. President, that I have done it before and I will do it again. I believe it to be my obligation, under the Senate rules, to respect the author of a major amendment. I will send his name to the desk, and the only way he could fail in that respect would be if the House would not sit with us or if he declined the appointment.

In two similar situations involving the Senator from Tennessee, he was equally as sincere as he is now. One situation was when the Senator added a medicare amendment on a social security bill. I went to conference with him and stood by his side until Congress adjourned. I stood in this chamber and demanded that we not adjourn, in the hope that I could get the House to agree to some part of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. Although I did not vote for it and I was the leader against it, I believed it my duty to uphold his position in conference. Nothing happened. The House proved that it could be just as sincere, and dedicated as the Senator from Tennessee, and so nothing happened. That was the end of medicare for that year.

In addition, that was the end of the across-the-board pay raise the elderly people were supposed to get.

It was my honor to name the Senator from Tennessee to the conference on the unemployment insurance bill. That bill died in the last Congress, in conference between the Senate and the House. I do not cast any aspersions on the Senator from Tennessee. I voted the same way he did in that conference, to make the House accept some part of the bill.

As a result of the amendments we placed in the bill—those were germane amendments, but this one is not—the bill did not become law, because it died in conference.

I applaud the Senator from Tennessee for his sincerity, his consistency, and his conscience in fighting for what he believes to be right.

I say to businessmen that if they want this bill to pass, they should give the committee a chance to study the matter and to report what the committee believes should be done; because if that is not done, the bill may die in conference. It might take until January to resolve this matter, and by that time the tax credit would automatically be in effect, under existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest to the American businessman that this bill will pass; and if the President saw fit to veto it upon the suggestions of the Senator from Louisiana I venture to say that he would be skunked when the bill came back and the Senate and the House overrode his veto.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We will see. I hope the Senator is not saying that I am not sincere in what I said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not questioning the sincerity of the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator misunderstood. I tried to defend the Senator from Louisiana. I said I did not believe he intended to cast reflection on the administration, and if he wishes to say that these are his own threats to the American businessmen, I will accept that. I did not believe it should be allowed to stand as a reflection on the administration.

I am trying to defend his administration, because as I have said before, I do not believe that President Johnson would stoop that low. I am trying to defend him. I ask the Senator not to get me in trouble because I defend his President. I do not believe that the President would be a part of this veto threat, and that is why I am trying to reassure the American businessmen.

The social security bill did die in conference, but that bill died in conference because the administration representatives who were in the conference told the conferees they would prefer no bill if they could not get medicare, and the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee supported the administration, as they had a right to do. This callous position of the administration should not be blamed on the Senator from Tennessee.

Similarly, the administration wanted the unemployment bill killed if it could not get the Federal standards which were in the Senate bill. The House conferees would not accept those standards. Therefore, the administration said, "All right. Let it die." So Congress adjourned without a bill.

I am trying to point out to the Senator from Louisiana that the administration asked for the defeat of both of those proposals.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before I participate in this family fight—and it looks as though it is going to be such, and I trust that no Senator will raise the question of the rule, since he can only yield to me for a question—I ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin why he puts all the emphasis on third parties and does not include fourth parties or fifth parties. Is there anything in the Senator's amendment to exclude them?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Absolutely not. The amendment applies to all political parties.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I need no explanation. That, of course, would make it possible for the Communist Party, if it could get over 2 million votes, to get a subsidy out of the Federal Treasury. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That may be correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all I want to know. Now, the Senator can see the mischief he will create with a multiplicity of parties, and these elections will all be decided over at the other end of the Capitol. That is where they will have to go. Confusion will be compounded, and it will be done by means of a subsidy out of the U.S. Treasury. That is what this amounts to.

If they get over 2 million votes, you have to pay them a dollar a vote for over 2 million votes. That is what the Proxmire amendment would do. And it would create no end of consternation before we get through.

I am not going to take a chance on having a Socialist Party of a Communist Party come up to the Federal trough and get money by my vote to subsidize their elections. That is what this is going to amount to.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the first place, the Communist Party has never come within a mile of 2 million votes, the limit set by Senator WILLIAMS.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What makes the Senator think that they might not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the second place, it has to be declared a constitutionally legal party.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Communist Party is not outlawed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We are not sure of its status.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator should ask the Department of Justice.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have enough faith in the American people to believe that they will not give 2 million votes to the Communist Party.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There sits the distinguished former Attorney General of the United States. I suggest that the Senator ask him whether the Communist Party is outlawed.

I am waiting for an answer, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the floor. The Senator from Delaware yielded to me.

I am waiting for an answer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin has not asked anybody a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said that the Communist Party has not been outlawed; and if that is not a statement of fact, let somebody stand and say that I am wrong.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am informed that the courts have not finally decided the issue as to whether or not the Communist Party would be declared a constitutionally legal party.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is begging the question. It has not been outlawed. Any lawyer can give the Senator that answer.

But that is enough. I just wanted the Senate to know what the result would be. We would be subsidizing all the cats and dogs and we would confuse our election process before we got through.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It cannot be a cat or a dog. It has to get 2 million votes, the limit set by the Williams amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield to the Senator from Louisiana. No, I shall not yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The last time the Communist Party received any votes for the Presidency was in 1940, when they received 46,000 votes. That is a long way from 2 million votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How does the Senator know?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is ridiculous to say that a Communist candidate for President in this country would get 1 million votes, or 2 million votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was not thought that the La Follette-Wheeler ticket would get a hatful of votes either.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator would agree that Bob La Follette had an enormous following, and is certainly in a far different category.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was around at that time, and I know what was happening.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What has been going on this afternoon indicates once again how difficult it is and how ridiculous it is to try to write a bill on the floor of the Senate especially on a matter which is not germane to the main subject of the bill in this case having to do with the 7-percent investment tax credit.

I would hope that in some way, somehow, it would be possible to take this effort away from the floor, and restore it to the appropriate committee—the proper forum to write a bill. There action could be taken dealing with minor parties, dealing with a possible expansion of the present law to Congressmen and Senators, and dealing with the possible manipulation of funds which might be applied against a recalcitrant Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate; the longer we consider it here the more we will get into difficulty. The committee is the proper place to consider a proposal of this far-reaching nature—sometimes referred to as the $60 million Christmas tree bill; however I believe the present law will not produce $5 million in its first year of operation.

All of these matters should be sent back to committee and considered where there is time, where witnesses can be called, and away from the rush and the haste of the present atmosphere.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished majority leader makes an eminently sensible suggestion.

As a member of the Committee on Finance I am prepared now to take this bill back and consider it; the entire bill in connection with investment tax credit, the Gore amendment, and everything else, and perhaps we can work it out there.

I do not remember exactly what happened at the time, but I believe that our distinguished chairman was out of town when this matter came up. The Senator will have to refresh me on it, but I believe that we did not have an opportunity to consider the matter. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. In response to the question of the Senator, I proposed in committee an amendment to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. The distinguished chairman of the committee was absent that day, and out of respect for him, and out of consideration of the fact that he was the author of the law, I withheld the amendment.

The acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] said in the committee that he was confident that a majority of the committee would vote to adopt an amendment to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. He made that statement not only to the Committee on Finance in executive session but he made it also to a press conference following the committee meeting, and he had some generous remarks to make about my respect and regard for the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and my action in not pressing the amendment in his absence. Moreover, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I believe, made a similar statement on the floor of the Senate. I do not believe there was any question that the majority of the committee did favor an amendment to repeal this law which I regard as an unfortunate mistake.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall yield, but first I wish to make a comment.

My affection for my friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is as high as the highest star and as deep as Mohole, and one cannot get deeper than that.

However, if we can get the parliamentary situation cleared, he, as the very responsible and eminent chairman of the Committee on Finance, should move to send this bill back to his committee. If the Senator wants any instruction we can put an instruction on to have it brought back here in 5 days. But we could wrestle this proposal out, let the Senate go to other needed business, such as the Appalachia bill, the leasing bill, and other matters on the calendar.

Now, why not, out of the grace of your heart, and I know that there is much grace in your heart, do that this afternoon?

Let us get a consensus of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS],

and me. I am sure we can have a telephone cubicle meeting here somewhere. We can sit down and work this matter out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, first, with respect to the fact that this amendment would have been agreed to in the absence of the Senator from Louisiana, I wish to state that I was present at the meetings of the Committee on Finance as much as any member of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It might be embarrassing to some Senators, but it is not embarrassing to me because I have kept records which indicate how much time all members spent there. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I were at the top of the list. He may have attended another meeting and he may be ahead of me now, because on one occasion I was unable to be there.

I am told that had there been a vote in my absence I would have been defeated. It is easy to defeat the proposal of a Senator when he is not there to make his argument. It is much more difficult if the Senator is there to explain why he disagrees with what is being done. I feel that I cannot support this bill with the Gore amendment on it.

That leaves me two courses of action. First, if the Gore amendment is agreed to I must do what I stated. I would be glad to recommit the bill if it is agreed to. If the Gore amendment is not agreed to I will give assurance to the Senate that I will call the committee together, bring this matter up, as well as the ideas of everybody as to how the campaign election law could be improved—including the Gore amendment to repeal it. I am willing to consider all amendments. I am willing to bring to the floor of the Senate whatever the majority of the committee wishes to recommend after we have hearings and consideration of the suggestions of every Senator and the suggestions of the President. With respect to attacking the measure as a rider, everybody knows that we will have to extend the national debt limit bill in a few months. The President must sign that.

From the point of view of this Senator I am willing to cooperate on any reasonable basis provided that the Senate shows the same respect for my committee and me as the chairman that I have shown for every other committee and its chairman.

If that can be done, I am willing to agree to any honorable arrangement. This bill is needed and it should be passed. The bill was regarded as something of an emergency nature when it came down and it should be passed immediately. In the event this body does not vote to repeal the Long Act, I am willing to call a hearing, call witnesses whom Senators wish called and I urge each member of the committee to try to improve on my handiwork. It has already been improved on by other members of the committee who made fine suggestions. I was happy to work with them. I would be happy to follow that approach. Business could get this investment tax credit and anyone who wants to offer this as a rider on the next bill from the Committee on Finance could do so. In the meantime, we could recommend what we think could be done.

I was willing to amend the bill. I sent to the desk nine suggestions myself, some of which were merely clarifying amendments to meet the doubts that someone conjured up. However, three of them were major suggestions, some generated by the fine political scientist that the President appointed to study the matter and make suggestions. However, we are being asked to legislate without knowing what the President will be advised by the best political scientist in the United States after he reports on the act. Here is one man, Mr. Neustadt, employed by the Kennedy Institute of Public Affairs to study just how much better government can be achieved. He was also named by the President to study the matter and make recommendations to the President. I must say that when a political scientist has the complete confidence of a Kennedy and a Johnson, he must be pretty good. Yet, we are asked to vote without even knowing what this man would recommend, or how much of his recommendation the President would think wise.

All I am saying is that if the Senate will consider legislation in an orderly fashion, it can pass the investment tax credit bill and then do justice to the American people on this one.

The Senator has pointed out what he regards as a flaw in the pending amendment. That should be explored in the committee. That would be the best place to explore it. But if we are not permitted to do business that way, then we must legislate on the floor and let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me point out to my very distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana, where lies the weakness in his case.

If this job were to be done and done right, we would have to explore every method of campaigning. But when we get beyond taxes, then we are beyond the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. If I were going to do this job, I would ask for the designation of a very high-level select special committee to take a look at the Hatch Act, to take a look at the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, to take a look at corporate contributions, and to take a look at labor union contributions. I would go into the whole "ball of wax."

I want to say further, to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, as I recall, for a good many years. I know that he took a look at my campaign statement and fortified himself with many lawyers who took a good look also, because there was an item in there that had not been there before; namely, I transferred a great, big "gob" of money from the primary campaign to the election campaign because I did not spend it. I do not know where I got it, except that there were a variety of people all over who made contributions. As I recall, the amount was $98,000.

I have no secrets in this business. The Senator from Tennessee investigated me from hell to breakfast and when he got through, he came over to my office like a gentleman—like a member of the club—[laughter]—and he simply said, "Well, I have looked at you from all directions. I also got a whole lot of good legal talent to look at you, and we could not find that you had violated the law."

I said, "Certainly not."

I am a lawyer myself, but I do not always depend upon my own legal lore or lack of it. I go around and get a little help myself from those whom I know to be better lawyers than I.

Of course, I knew that I had not violated the law. I had nothing to cover up. There was nothing to indicate that I had done wrong to transfer this money.

Suppose I had kept it and spent it? Then I would have been in trouble, I am sure, with the Internal Revenue Service.

But it was a transfer of funds so that they might be continued to be used for purely campaigning political purposes.

Those are some of the facets of this problem which are not within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. Therefore, the Senator cannot very well assure anyone about hearings on all these points because he has not got the jurisdiction to do it. A point of order could be made on the ground that if the Senator did so and brought in a bill, it might be said that the Senator did not have jurisdiction and the point of order would be valid.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, let me say, with regard to what is at the desk now, that the amendments to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are not properly within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. With regard to everything else that we are voting on here, they are within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. The Senate can, if it wants to, give us jurisdiction in this whole field. But, let me say to the distinguished Senator, the Finance Committee, in recent years, has been a fertile committee and has brought forth legislation. It has not been a burial ground for problems. If someone says, "Here is a problem that the Finance Committee could handle because it is within its jurisdiction," we can help there. The Senator from Illinois remembers the problem connected with professional football. I recall an amendment of his——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To solve a problem which was plaguing professional football, and it was adopted by the Senate by a unanimous vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. The Senator and I should shake hands on that, because we saved many of these football clubs from going into bankruptcy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not a single member of the Senate Judiciary Committee objected on jurisdictional grounds to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois being added to a Finance Committee-reported revenue bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That shows my influence on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. While there was strong objection by the chairman of

the Judiciary Committee on the other side, the bill passed by a large vote. My understanding is that professional football clubs, and New Orleans in particular, are extremely grateful to the Senator from Illinois that he managed finally to obtain action on a proposal which had twice passed the Senate by a unanimous vote only to be buried on the other side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now New Orleans gets its team.

Mr. President, I wonder whether we could not come to the end of this furrow and let us have an agreement on a time limit, say, 20 minutes, 10 minutes to a side, and then vote on the Long amendment and on the Gore amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is ample, it seems to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not prepared to ask for it. If the Senator makes the suggestion, I shall object. However, do plan to do some voting tomorrow—perhaps today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will not ask, if it will embarrass my good friend from Louisiana. I would never do anything to embarrass him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have long admired the Senator from Illinois, for whom I have warm and everlasting affection. I am grateful for his cooperation and for his friendship. However, many times I have gone to the distinguished minority leader and asked him for a consent agreement to vote at a given time and he has told me that he would ask for a vote when he was ready to do so.

Therefore, I propose to operate in his tradition, to give consent to vote when I think I am ready to vote. I think I am ready with regard to amendments, and I am hopeful that we might vote on the pending amendment sometime this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is speaking now about the Proxmire amendment—the amendment to the Williams amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not inquire if there is reason, or lack of reason, for not voting on the Gore amendment; but, is there any likelihood that we will vote on it today, or is there any likelihood that we will vote tomorrow?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would say that it would be more likely that we would vote on the Gore amendment tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Tomorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. More likely.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, does the Senator think we can count on that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; you cannot count on that. [Laughter.]

But the answer to the question is that it is more likely we will vote on it tomorrow than today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that is like the expression, "Now you see it and now you don't."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the deputy leader and the chairman of the committee handling this bill, would find it possible to make some sort of unanimous-consent request today, it would be in the best interests of all Senators, so that we could notify absent Members to be here at a certain time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If we say, "yes," "no," "maybe," "but," or "perhaps," with respect to what will happen tomorrow, no one will know where we stand. I would recommend that, perhaps beginning tomorrow, we could commence operating under some consent agreement on this matter. I know that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has that in mind and will make himself a little more definite.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning after the morning hour tomorrow, debate on all amendments to the Williams amendment be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided by the sponsor of the amendment and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], if he does not agree with the amendment, or, if he agrees with the amendment, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]; that debate on the Gore amendment thereafter be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and that amendments must be germane in order to be considered at the desk.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if he intends to have a vote on the merits of the Gore amendment or on a motion to lay on the table?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Any Senator has a right to make motions. I do not foreclose myself from doing so. Any Senator has the right to offer an amendment. Neither do I foreclose any other Senator from making a motion to table, which of course is not debatable, or from making any other motions which are within his right as a Senator to make.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the matter were left thus open, of course there would not be any assurance of a vote at any particular time. In the effort to accomplish what I am sure every Senator hopes, that we can get rid of this matter at an early time, I would suggest a motion to lay on the table the Gore amendment at such time as the Senator from Louisiana cares to make it; and if he loses that amendment, then I suggest he has a really more serious problem on his hands, as to whether he wants to recommit the bill with all amendments attached, as suggested by the Senator from Illinois; but I think that method would bring about an early termination of the debate on the Senate floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will consider what the Senator has in mind, but I would prefer not to phrase the request that way at this time. I want Senators to know that they should be here and that we will be voting perhaps every hour.

Mr. HOLLAND. Still reserving the right to object, I think we have all enjoyed the political undertones and overtones that have been filling the air the last half hour.

I want to comment on one point with respect to the pending amendment which I understand was characterized by one of the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle as the Governor Wallace amendment, but which was not so intended by the Senator from Wisconsin.

There has been great argument among the learned columnists, who seem to know more about politics than anyone who has run for office and been elected to it, as to whether the running of the former Governor of Alabama for President would help the Democrats or the Republicans. I have been in doubt on this subject myself until today. The fervid argument advanced by the Senator from Illinois has given me an answer to that question. I do not now believe the Senator from Illinois or his fellow Republicans want Governor Wallace to run for President. So I am hoping we may have an expression on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which bears a name which does not reflect its paternity. I hope we will get to a vote on it this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think a comment is in order. I have not the slightest care what George Wallace runs for, and, in fact, I do not care what Lurleen runs for. They may even call me down there to campaign. Who knows? I am sure we would have a good time. Let them run for anything. This is, after all, a free country, and I would not interdict that for anything under the sun.

Referring now to the unanimous-consent request, when the Senator from Louisiana referred to the germaneness provision, that related only to amendments to the Williams amendment, and not to the other amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; what I had in mind was amendments relating to financing campaigns or to the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Insofar as the Williams amendment is concerned?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But there is a variety of other amendments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This request is directed only to the Williams amendments and the Gore substitute to the Williams amendment and amendments to the Williams amendment.

If we can dispose of them, my hope is that we may proceed expeditiously with the bill, and I would hope to request a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So it would be 2 hours on the Williams amendment and 2 hours on the Gore amendment, equally divided?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not want to mislead the Senator. I might very well offer an amendment to the Williams amendment. It would be subject to the limitation I am proposing of 1 hour to be equally divided, and the debate on the Gore amendment would be 2 hours, equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

Senator from Louisiana, in his original request, asked that the limitation start at the end of the morning hour. Did he really mean at the end of morning business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana, when he refers to the request that amendments must be germane that they must be amendments to either the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, the Corrupt Practices Act, or the Hatch Act—in other words, to laws pertaining to elections?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is intended that they relate to presidential campaign financing or the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the request does not apply to other than this amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is no limitation on the others. I said we might later ask for a limitation on other amendments.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the reason why my amendment is offered to a revenue measure. It is only as an amendment to a revenue measure that originated in the House of Representatives that the U.S. Senate can repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. This is true because that act makes changes in the revenue laws. The only way measures affecting revenue laws can be constitutionally initiated by the Senate is by amendment of a revenue measure originating in the House of Representatives.

So, lest someone think that the amendment which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I have advanced is offered in a cavalier way and should be subjected to cavalier treatment such as a tabling motion, let the Senate ponder how else it could work its will with respect to this act, which every Senator who has spoken, including its author, has now acknowledged to be defective in many respects.

I sought to offer my amendment in committee, and did, but, out of respect for the chairman, who was absent, and who was the author of the law, we decided that we would not act upon it in the committee.

Had the committee written it in the pending bill, it would not be subject to a motion to lay on the table.

I would not, however, deny any Senator the right to make such a motion.

A great many suggestions have been made here this afternoon about the desirability of committee consideration of a matter which affects the most vital function of our democratic process, the election of public officials. I agree the subject matter should have had adequate consideration before it was offered as a rider to a revenue measure in the Senate when the Act was enacted last year; but this mistake of the committee and of the Senate in the closing hours of a session became part of the "Christmas tree bill."

Senator WILLIAMS and I propose that we erase that mistake. It is only by the correction of the mistake that the committees having adequate jurisdiction can seize themselves of the subject matter. The Committee on Rules and Administration cannot report a bill to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, because the Senate can initiate such action, I repeat, only in the form of an amendment to a revenue measure that has originated in the House of Representatives.

So I suggest, Mr. President, that this is the only manner in which the Senate can approach this matter, to work its will. We have followed the only course available to us, in conformity with the Senate's legislative jurisdiction, to initiate legislative action to repeal this unsound act.

And now what do we have before us? A pending amendment dealing with third, fourth, fifth parties. It is a subject with which we need to deal, but can we do so adequately, here on the floor, with only 30 minutes of debate for each side? This is a measure dealing with fundamental and basic principles under our Constitution—civil rights and equality of opportunity to seek public office. Can we act upon it wisely in so short a time? Can we do so with such inadequate consideration?

Mr. President, I am not prepared to vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, which I have had no opportunity to study. I for one do not wish, without full consideration, to act on a proposal which might possibly offer a reward to irresponsible political parties, whether they be based upon political ideology, racial bias, religious bigotry, or provincial narrowness.

That is not to say that the subject does not deserve and require careful consideration and action. It does. I am saying that I am unprepared to vote for the amendment after 30 minutes of debate on either side, without committee consideration. I do not rise for the purpose of objecting to the unanimous-consent request, but I remind the Senate that it places a severe limitation upon debate upon such fundamental questions and issues as are raised by the pending amendment and others we cannot foresee.

What, then, is the proper and advisable course of action? I see on the floor my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I appreciate his reference to the role that I played as chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. It was my duty to investigate what at first appeared to be a questionable transaction, what appeared to be a lack of identification of the source of a large sum of money.

When I discovered, after investigation, that no wrong had been committed, no law had been violated, I, as a member of the club, as a fellow Senator, went to him and so told him. But, Mr. President, had the facts revealed otherwise, I would likewise have gone to him and so told him. That happens to be the responsibility of a Senator to himself, to his fellow Senators, and to the country.

I call to the Senate's attention that this question of committee jurisdiction, the ability of committees to deal with this subject, is hampered by the existence of the law enacted last year. Repeal of this law will facilitate action by the committees with proper and adequate jurisdiction to take up the entire subject in a comprehensive way. That is an additional reason why it must be repealed. That is the first step for adequate consideration and responsible action, and I suggest that as we approach the vote, we examine ways in which to deal with this important subject in its many facets, which will involve overlapping jurisdictions of at least three committees. The only way we can properly handle the subject, in my opinion, from a jurisdictional standpoint, is to repeal the present law.

Moreover, for reasons I have stated heretofore, the first step necessary in order to deal with this subject without prejudice is repeal.

Let us erase the mistake we have made. I am glad to join in this unanimous-consent request, not that I believe it will provide adequate consideration—it cannot—but it will facilitate the reaching of a vote on an amendment to erase this mistake and pass the pending bill and send it to the House of Representatives.

A great deal has been said about what that body will do. I happen to know that a group of Members of the House of Representatives is awaiting arrival of this bill with my amendment, to move to instruct the conferees to accept the amendment for repeal. I believe we will achieve repeal, and the quicker the better.

Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have just now been conferring with the distinguished acting majority leader. If I remember the unanimous-consent request correctly, the time limit applies to the Gore amendment and to amendments to the Williams amendment, but does not apply to the Williams amendment as amended. I thought perhaps my friend from Louisiana should include that, to make it clear that that is included also under the time limitation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I intended to ask in my unanimous-consent request that that be the case. But after having heard the Senator from Tennessee make his speech, I am very much concerned about making any such request as that. The Senator has explained here that we might well adopt an amendment, after 1 hour's debate, that might bring an end to the Republic. If that be the case, I think we might do well to be a little bit more careful about these unanimous-consent requests.

So if the Proxmire amendment and some of the other amendments should have some harm in them that none of us could foresee, at such time as the Williams amendment comes down to final passage, some Senator might yet save the Republic by rising to his feet and saying, "Wait, fellows, it is not too late to save the country, even at this late date. With nothing but the Williams amendment before us, we can save the country yet."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think that the problem of the Senator from Louisiana might be solved, because if I understand the parliamentary situation correctly, after we have voted on the Proxmire amendment, assuming there are no other amendments offered, the next vote would be on the Gore-Williams substitute. If that carries it takes all with it, but if it does not carry we revert to the Williams amendment, which, as I understand, would be open to amendments under this unanimous-consent agreement with the 1-hour limitation. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the way the Chair understands the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They would have a chance to offer perfecting amendments afterward if they wanted to. After the vote on the Gore-Williams substitute, we would know whether we were going to amend the act in committee or on the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would think that by 6 o'clock tomorrow afternoon we would know where we stand one way or the other. However, it is now well understood that the Williams amendment is subject to amendment on the 1-hour limitation. The Gore amendment is subject to 2 hours' limitation.

That would not preclude Senators from making motions, some of which would be debatable and some of which would not be.

If the Gore amendment should fail to displace the Williams amendment, the Williams amendment would still be subject to discussion. I have asked for no time limitation on that, and I do not think that I should because it is not within my power, unless I get unanimous consent to keep the Senator from modifying his own amendment, which we cannot do as long as the Gore amendment is pending and his amendment is pending.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thought the Senator understood the parliamentary situation.

We can ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment as it may be modified, and that would stop all modifications. If that is what is disturbing the Senator I would ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment as it may be modified and solve that problem. Would that remove the objection so that we may get the consent of the Senator to move on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that at this particular moment it would take unanimous consent to make it in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the Williams amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think that we can take the word of the Senator from Delaware on what will be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I can assure the Senator that if he wants to agree to a limitation of debate we can get the yeas and nays at the appropriate time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we can have a gentleman's agreement that the Senator will not change his amendment by sending amendments to the desk, he would be in the same parliamentary situation as I would be if I wanted to amend the Williams amendment. I would have to send the amendments to the desk. If the Senator will reduce his power over his amendment to that of every other Senator, then I think we could have an agreement as to the time allowed for debate before we vote on the Williams amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware, having achieved his objective yesterday, would now be more than delighted to make that promise.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, would the Williams amendment remain subject to amendment at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will assure the Senator that I will first ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment if there is any request to modify the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it, we are now limiting debate on the Williams amendment, along with the other unanimous-consent agreement and with the gentlemen's understanding we just made that my amendment will not be further modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to make one request of the Senator from Louisiana. In which category of time does the Williams amendment fall—the 2-hour request or the 1-hour request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I will ask, assuming the Gore amendment does not displace the Williams amendment, that the Williams amendment be subject to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided, 1 hour under the control of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and 1 hour under the control of the Senator in charge of the bill.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, April 13, 1967, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] (No. 152) shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]: *Provided,* That in the event the Senator from Delaware is in favor of any such amendment or motion the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]; *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the amendment (No. 152) shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] (No. 136), shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. GORE and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]; debate on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware (No. 152, as modified and amended) shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, erroneous statements were made so profusely about this matter that I find it necessary to continue to correct them.

We have been led to believe that if the Gore amendment had been written into the pending bill as a committee amendment, it would not be subject to a motion to table.

Mr. President, that statement is in error. Any committee amendment is subject to a motion to table when the committee amendment comes before the Senate.

Further, the Senator is upset that the amendment was placed on the Christmas tree bill.

Mr. President, I have heard that Christmas tree thing over and over and over until it is well that the Senate understands how the so-called Christmas tree name came to be brought in here. If the Senator wants to explain it again, I will also explain it again.

I have been in the great State of Maine and I have seen the great Christmas trees in that State.

The Christmas tree bill came before us because of the parliamentary situation we had. During the year, as various bills reported by the Finance Committee were taken up on the Senate floor, a Senator would have an amendment which he would think was a very good amendment and which he would want to propose to the bill on the floor. The Senator in charge of the bill—me—would say: "Don't offer your amendment now. This bill must be signed by midnight tomorrow night. We will offer you an opportunity to present the amendment to some other bill, and we will assure you that you will get a fair break."

When time began to run out on us, we looked for a bill which would be an important bill and one which the President would like to sign and one where he would be willing to go an extra mile to go along with the amendment in the event the Senate and House concurred in it.

So, we said: "Let's put the amendments in this foreign investors tax bill and keep our faith with those Senators that we had previously told to delay the offering of amendments."

Likewise, we could perhaps come to the end of this session and ask the Senator from Tennessee, with reference to the Gore amendment: "Wait and let us look into the amendment and act on it at the end of the session on a revenue bill."

This type of amendment will have to go on a revenue bill, or otherwise the House will not consider the matter. The Senate would have no right to initiate such a revenue proposal as a Senate bill, under the Constitution.

We would say: "Here is a House-passed bill that you can offer your amendment to. We will make no procedural objection. Offer the amendment and we will vote on it. If the Senate agrees to the amendment, we will do the best we can to urge the House to agree and to urge the President to sign the bill."

The Gore amendment could well be the beginning of a new Christmas tree where one Senator has his own pet amendment and wants to have it agreed to and the manager of the bill says: "Please don't put the amendment in this bill."

Finally, the Senator in charge of the bill is accused of bringing a Christmas tree bill before the Senate simply because finally we have a bill in which we could conscientiously agree to accept the Gore amendment. When we do that, another Senator comes up with another amendment. He then says:

I want my amendment included in this bill.

We say:

We did it for the Senator from Tennessee. We cannot refuse to do it for another Senator.

Some other Senator comes up with an amendment and we accept his amendment. Perhaps the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] could come up—and the State of Maine has some real Christmas trees—and could say:

My Christmas tree industry is running into trouble. I want to offer an amendment to this bill.

So we could agree to a real Christmas tree amendment.

We then have a number of measures, none of which can originate here. They must originate in the House. However, one by one we agree to amendments of various Senators.

We are then accused of having a Christmas tree bill containing all sorts of proposals. We are trying to keep faith with the Senate and with the assurances we have made.

That is the reason that the bill was referred to in a somewhat uncomplimentary fashion as having been a Christmas tree bill that was brought before the Senate.

That is the only way that the Senate can get a revenue bill considered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the 4th of July comes along and we will then shoot them all down and it will not be a Christmas tree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It will be all right with me, either way.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana need not be concerned about this measure being characterized as a Christmas tree bill because of the Gore-Williams amendment being agreed to. The situation would be different. This time the presents will be given to the American people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I say to the Senator that he of course can contend that, but it is my judgment that what he saves by letting a handful of millionaires and billionaires and corporations and lobbyists finance the campaign rather than letting the people finance it with $1 campaign contributions would cost the public 1,000 times more than would this proposal.

When we get down to it, the money that the Senator would save by repealing the one-man, one-vote, one-dollar proposal would make the American people pay back 1,000 fold for monopoly rights and matters of that sort.

Mr. President, I have expressed myself on this matter, and if no one else cares to discuss the Proxmire amendment, I would suggest that we vote on it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to question the advisability of voting upon an amendment of such far-reaching nature after such limited debate and limited consideration. I must confess that I am not prepared to discuss the amendment in an intelligent manner, because I have not had an opportunity to study it. Indeed, what Senator has a copy on his desk? The only copy I have been able to find is the one that was sent to the desk. I tried to read it in company with other people who were also trying to read it.

The amendment has not been printed; yet it deals with a fundamental constitutional question. It deals with the disposition of public moneys, in vast sums, affecting our whole elective process.

Under these circumstances, I am not prepared to condemn the amendment. I do not. It merits consideration. It deals with a subject matter with which the existing law deals in a discriminatory way. But I surely am not prepared to vote on an amendment of such great import, which I have not yet had an adequate opportunity to read.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I have no choice but to vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 59, as follows:

[No. 71 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Bartlett	Hill	Proxmire
Brewster	Holland	Randolph
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Clark	Long, La.	Symington
Dodd	McGovern	Talmadge
Ellender	Mondale	Thurmond
Gruening	Muskie	Tydings
Hart	Nelson	Yarborough
Hartke	Pell	

NAYS—59

Aiken	Fong	Miller
Allott	Fulbright	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Montoya
Baker	Griffin	Morse
Bayh	Hansen	Moss
Bennett	Hatfield	Mundt
Bible	Hayden	Murphy
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Brooke	Hruska	Pearson
Cannon	Inouye	Prouty
Carlson	Jackson	Ribicoff
Case	Javits	Scott
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Tower
Curtis	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Dominick	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	McGee	Young, Ohio
Fannin	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—12

Byrd, Va.	Kuchel	Morton
Ervin	Lausche	Percy
Harris	Magnuson	Russell
Hollings	Metcalf	Smathers

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment to the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, when it finishes its business today, stand in adjournment until 11:30 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL 10 A.M. ON FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock Friday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ELLENDER ON FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, at the conclusion of the reading of the Journal, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be recognized for not to exceed 2 hours.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Friday next, beginning at 10 o'clock a.m., I shall present to the Senate my report on our Government's operations in South and Central America, including Mexico, Panama, and the islands of the Caribbean.

Senators will be furnished with a copy of that report, entitled "Review of U.S. Government Operations in Latin America," so that they can look into it and ask such questions as they may wish.

I believe this document will contribute to helping the administration and the Congress to devise programs and policies to bring the United States and our neighbors to the south closer together, for the benefit of all the people of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I urge the Senate, or as many Members as possible, to be in the Chamber at that time because, based on previous experience, we know that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] goes into great detail, that when he goes to these countries he really works diligently and digs out vital information and always has worthwhile recommendations to make. I hope, therefore, that as large an attendance as possible will be in the Chamber on Friday to listen to the Senator from Louisiana.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR DOMINICK TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, immediately after the conclusion of the prayer tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] may be recognized not to exceed one-half hour.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McCLELLAN TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the unfinished business being laid down tomorrow, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

TV COMMENTS OF JOSEPH McCAFFERY, OF WMAL–TV, RESPECTING PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING ACT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, yesterday evening during his commentary on the news, Joseph McCaffery of WMAL–TV, channel 7, discussed the current attempts to repeal the Presidential Campaign Financing Act.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The Senate is now involved, and deeply involved, in Senator Russell Long's tax check-off plan, which allows a taxpayer to check-off on his Federal income tax return a dollar for the Presidential campaign of the two major parties.

Senator Long attached this plan to last year's tax bill and since then it has been under fire. Now with the reinstatement of the Investment Tax Credit on the floor, Senator Albert Gore is trying to tie a rider to it which would kill off the campaign plan, and he has, strangely enough, drawn some strong editorial support from around the country.

The words, *"strangely enough,"* are used because these are the same pious editorial writers who decry the Dodd case and the Baker case and who talk about the dangers of conflict of interest in the solicitation of campaign funds.

Now here is the first big step ever taken to solve the problem of raising funds for political candidates, and it is being flayed and pilloried from coast to coast.

If this plan is scuttled this year, then the initial step toward the reform of campaign fund raising will have been killed for the life time of every member of the Senate.

Certainly, the plan as it is now drawn has many flaws, most of them major.

But the remedy is not to throw the entire plan out.

Rather it is to correct the flaws, perfecting the plan.

We should extend its coverage to help pay for Senate and House campaigns, allow other than the two major parties to participate under some clearly defined limitations.

The very same critics who deplore the Long Plan, are those who also say, from their velvet padded cells, that every voter should be encouraged to contribute to political campaigns, and that a small contribution is as essential to making democracy work as the act of voting.

Now the frame work for the individual contributor, the frame work for developing some intelligent system for financing our elections is on the block in the Senate.

If there is ever to be a sensible system of campaign funding, during the next decade, the Long Plan provides the vehicle for it—scrapping the Long Plan kills the first and most important step toward bringing order out of chaos in campaign funding.

VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators BREWSTER, BYRD of West Virginia, CLARK, COOPER, FULBRIGHT, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, HATFIELD, HICKENLOOPER, INOUYE, MONDALE, MOSS, PERCY, RANDOLPH, YARBOROUGH, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public and private agencies for comprehensive family planning programs. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make Federal grants to State, local, and private nonprofit organizations to enable them to provide family planning information and related medical assistance to individuals who desire these services but cannot afford to obtain them. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the need for the services provided by this bill cannot be overstated. The health hazards of unwanted children, the deleterious social and economic consequences of unwanted children, the unhappiness of the family and the unwanted children themselves, demonstrate beyond doubt the need for this bill. A host of expert studies support this conclusion. To cite two recent reports, an August 1966 study conducted by the Chief of the Bureau of Health Services of the U.S. Public Health Services, regarding means to combat the serious domestic problem of rising infant mortality rates, concluded that the most cost-effective means to meet this problem would be an extensive program of family planning services. In its report, in February 1967, the President's National Crime Commission concluded that insuring the availability of family planning assistance was one vital means of combating crime, by insuring against economic and emotional deprivation which are both the legacy of unwanted children and a root cause of crime.

No one, of course, should be coerced in any way to plan family size. This bill provides ample safeguards against coercion or interference with personal moral convictions. But no one in this country should be deprived of free choice to plan family size. Yet according to estimates endorsed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—HEW—approximately 5 million women presently desire family planning assistance but are denied access to it because of inadequate incomes. This need has been eloquently documented by the pioneering work of Senators ERNEST GRUENING and JOSEPH CLARK, both of whom, I am proud to say, are among the cosponsors of this bill, and encouraged me to introduce this legislation.

There is no longer any question that family planning assistance is a pressing governmental responsibility. President Johnson stated, in his 1966 health message to the Congress:

We have a growing concern to foster the integrity of the family, and the opportunity for each child. It is essential that all families have access to information and services that will allow freedom to choose the number and spacing of their children within the dictates of individual conscience.

Secretary General U Thant stated, in December 1966:

We must accord parents' right to determine the numbers of their children a place of importance at this moment in man's history.

Pope Paul, in an encyclical published last month, stated:

It is certain that public authorities can intervene, within the limits of their competence, by favoring the availability of appropriate information and by adopting suitable measures, provided that these be in conformity with the moral law and that they respect the rightful freedom of married couples.

Both the need for family planning assistance and the overwhelming consensus that government should act to provide such assistance are clear. The 89th Congress recognized this by taking historic steps mandating action by the Federal Government, both in this country and abroad, to sponsor family planning programs. Committee reports accompanying the Comprehensive Health Services Act, and legislation creating neighborhood health centers under the Economic Opportunity Act made clear that family planning services should be provided. The Economic Opportunity Act was also amended to provide that local community action programs could make family planning services available to unmarried women.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 incorporated an amendment, which I offered, to authorize the use of counterpart funds for voluntary family planning services by foreign countries. The food-for-peace bill also permitted the use of currencies received for U.S. agricultural commodities to be used for voluntary family planning programs abroad. In my view, however, we can never hope to offer meaningful assistance to meet the worldwide problems of burgeoning populations unless we develop and demonstrate in our own country effective means to provide family planning assistance to those who now cannot obtain it.

But the action taken to date by the executive branch, in implementing its promises and the mandate of the Congress, has been hesitant and manifestly inadequate. In the domestic field, neither present nor planned family planning program assistance comes close to being adequate. A research effort regarding population planning has been launched by the executive branch. But, although research should continue, we need not await its results to initiate immediate, far-reaching programs to make family planning available to those who now cannot afford to obtain it. As a report recently published by the Ford Foundation concluded:

> The women presently denied access to [family planning] service can be identified. In general, it is known how to design services in respect to optimum location, auspices, budget, and staffing. Innovations in extending the service into the community are proving successful. Continuing program evaluation can be expected to reveal additional operational guidelines. Costs are modest compared to other social and medical programs. Adequate technology exists and improvements are forthcoming. Short-run results are likely to be significant, and long-run consequences may be even more so if the revelant professions, public agencies, and hospitals accept the challenge to implement and broaden existing policies. (Perkins & Radel, *Current Status of Family Planning Programs in the United States,* Ford Foundation, August 1966.)

There is thus no need to wait before implementing extensive family planning programs. The time for action is now. It is generally accepted that the annual cost of providing family planning assistance in this country to any particular woman is approximately $20. To reach the 5 million women who want and need such assistance would cost approximately $100 million. The bill I propose today would provide $20 million in its first year and would rise in stages to $75 million in 5 years. The rest of the necessary funds would come from State or local matching sources.

The present family planning efforts of the Federal Government fall far short of these necessary expenditures. In 1966 funds made available under maternal and child health programs amounted to approximately $3 million, and an additional $2.4 million for family planning was spent by community action agencies under the antipoverty program. During the 89th Congress, administration spokesmen clearly acknowledged the inadequacy of the present level of expenditures. Mr. Wilbur Cohen, Under Secretary of HEW stated, in a letter to me dated October 20, 1966, that plans under the administration's comprehensive health services bill called for family planning program expenditures of $20 million in fiscal year 1968, $25 million in fiscal year 1969, and $30 million in fiscal year 1970.

A copy of that letter is exhibit 1 to these remarks, which I ask unanimous consent be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TYDINGS. At the time that letter was written, the administration's health bill had been reported out by the House Committee with funds authorized at a level close to the final authorization approved by the Congress. Thus, Under Secretary Cohen's statement appeared to be based on a realistic appraisal of the funds which would be available.

I had introduced legislation, in the 89th Congress, essentially identical to the bill I introduce today, to provide specifically earmarked funds for a significant expansion of Federal family planning assistance. But in view of the Under Secretary's commitment of significantly increased funds for family planning assistance, I concluded that passage of my legislation was not necessary. Indeed, at the request of the administration, I did not press it.

It is now evident, however, that specific earmarking of funds for family planning programs was and is now vitally necessary. Notwithstanding the President's recognition of the importance of family planning programs, notwithstanding the clear mandate of the 89th Congress that both domestic and foreign family programs should be assisted by Federal expenditures, notwithstanding Under Secretary Cohen's letter, the promise of significantly increased funds for domestic family planning programs has proven illusory.

The detailed budget justification recently submitted by HEW to the Congress for fiscal year 1968 reveals that the few family planning programs already funded will, at most, be expanded only marginally. State and local officers attending recent HEW regional conferences on family planning programs have indicated that HEW departmental spokesmen advised that no new Federal funds would be available. In January 1967, Dr. Milo Leavitt, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Science and Population, was quoted in the press as stating:

> I am genuinely concerned that the Public Health Service has not developed plans to provide family planning services which we are telling the states are available.

A March 1967 newspaper article quotes Dr. Eugene Guthrie, associate surgeon general, as stating "We just couldn't get the money" for family planning programs. In fact, even the limited family planning services offered in antipoverty programs are struggling to remain at present funding levels. The prospects that the Office of Economic Opportunity would expand these services and institute new services—which appeared likely a year ago—have now virtually vanished.

The present situation regarding Federal funding of family planning programs is hard for me to believe. The bold rhetoric of the executive branch during the last 2 years has evaporated into silence and inaction. Why has this happened? Why has the proven need for expanded family planning programs, and the clear congressional mandate to provide those programs, been ignored. The basic fault, in my judgment, was the absence of specifically earmarked funds for family planning programs. In the competition for funds appropriated generally for health programs, family planning programs are at a considerable disadvantage. They are relatively new and involve only a few staff people.

By contrast, the older, firmly established health programs have batteries of bureaucrats who are committed advocates. Family planning programs are thus ignored because they lack advocates within the bureaucracy of the Federal Government. The congressional mandate for family planning programs will be carried out only if the Congress appropriates funds which can be used solely for such programs. We tried the other way in the 89th Congress, and we have found that the executive branch has completely let us down.

Last year, testifying before a Senate subcommittee in opposition to earmarked funds for family planning programs, Dr. Philip Lee, Assistant Secretary of HEW for Health and Scientific Affairs, stated:

> If in a year or two, we found through existing authorities adequate numbers of programs and services did not develop, then we would certainly not be opposed to a categorical program in family planning.

It is now clear that "adequate numbers of programs and services" are not developing. The time has come to earmark funds for family planning programs to mandate the executive branch to develop such programs.

The time has come for action. That is the purpose of the bill I introduce today.

EXHIBIT 1

OCTOBER 20, 1966.

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Thank you for your letter of October 10 and for your interest in S. 3008 which would enable the Department to develop programs in family planning.

We have indicated in testimony in both the Senate and the House of Representatives that family planning programs can be developed as an integral part of comprehensive health services within the States. S. 3008 assures that comprehensive public health services, in which family planning would be included, can be developed through a flexible State grant program administered by the Public Health Service. This would be accomplished in two ways: first, by providing non-categorical formula grant support to localities and States for utilizing Federal assistance to meet their most important health problems; and secondly, by means of project grants for health services, development which would enable the Public Health Service to award "grants to any public or nonprofit agency, institution, or organization to cover part of the cost of (1) providing services to meet health needs of limited geographic scope or of specialized regional or national significance, (2) stimulating and supporting for an initial period new programs of health service, or (3) undertaking studies, demonstrations, or training designed to develop new methods or improve existing methods of providing health services." Project grant awards may be made to public agencies such as State, county or metropolitan health departments, universities, hospitals, and to non-profit private voluntary organizations such as universities, hospitals, and voluntary agencies.

In his recent testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Surgeon General, Dr. William H. Stewart, in response to specific questions by Representative Samuel N. Friedel, indicated that both the formula grant to States for comprehensive public health services and the project grant for health services development can be used to support family planning activities. For the purposes of supporting programs under S. 3008 in the field of family planning, our present plans contemplate $20 million in fiscal year 1968, $25 million in fiscal year 1969, and $30 million in fiscal year 1970. We will review these figures in connection with our next year's program. In addition, funds are also being made available for family planning through Title XIX of the Social Security Act, Medical Assistance Program; Maternity and Infant Care project grants; and formula grants to the States for Maternal and Child Health Services.

In view of your deep and continuing interest in family planning, I am enclosing a copy of the Departmental Report which summarizes the current activities of our operating agencies in this important field.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Under Secretary.

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

The bill (S. 1503) to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1503

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants to State, local, or other public agencies and institutions, and to hospitals and other private, nonprofit organizations for the purpose of assisting them in carrying on necessary programs in the field of voluntary family planning. Such programs may include the dissemination of family planning information, medical supervision and supplies to individuals who desire such information, assistance, or supplies.

SEC. 2. (a) Grants under this Act shall be made only under regulations promulgated by the Secretary. No grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

(1) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

(2) no individual will be provided any medical supervision or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

(b) The use of family planning services provided by the applicant under such grant shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs of financial or medical assistance.

(c) The Secretary shall make grants to carry out programs for the dissemination of family planning information, medical supervision, and supplies only to applicants who—

(1) serve areas where there are substantial concentrations of low-income families; or

(2) will otherwise utilize such grants primarily to serve low-income families.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall not deny a grant under this Act to any applicant which is otherwise eligible therefor on the grounds that—

(a) such applicant will provide family planning assistance which is limited in scope to one or more methods or aspects of family planning;

(b) the area to be served by the programs to be carried on by such applicant is already served by other family planning programs; or

(c) the applicant, under standards it prescribes, provides assistance to unmarried individuals.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act the term "nonprofit," when applied to any agency or organization, means a private agency or organization no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private owner or shareholder thereof, or any other private person.

SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the Secretary and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to coordinate, and insure full exchange of information upon, all family planning programs within their respective jurisdictions in order to provide maximum availability of services and in order best to meet the varying needs of different communities.

SEC. 6. (a) Grants under this Act shall provide such part of the total of the expenses required to carry on the program with respect to which the grant is made, as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe.

(b) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $20,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $30,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; $45,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $60,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and $75,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to join in enthusiastically supporting the legislation which the distinguished Senator from Maryland has introduced. He is attacking one of the most vital and pressing issues of our time, a subject which lamentably, despite the President's repeated utterances, has not been followed by the naturally expected cooperation of the administration's own agencies.

On another occasion today, I had the opportunity to discuss the desirability of making family planning information available to persons who wish to have it. To do this, it is necessary for people to know that it is available, and it is essential that the birth control method they may select, in addition to being the method of their free and uncoerced choice, be not priced beyond their means. So I am happy and proud to join again as a cosponsor of the bill proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], which would provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies as well as private nonprofit organizations, to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs in the United States.

Senator TYDINGS has been a leader in Congress in this vital field. This is important and proper legislation, because the population explosion exists in our own country as well as others. The right of parents to plan their families as they wish must be respected. My good friend, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, is concerned about the quality of man's life on earth. He seeks means to correct some of the ills which plague so many—poverty, delinquency, and the terrible thought that no one seems to care.

I hope that the 90th Congress will enact this excellent proposed legislation promptly, and thereby let the President know that it supports his 31 public mandates to find new ways to solve the multiplying problems of multiplying populations. It is no less important that Congress act as Senator TYDINGS' bill provides, in order that the regrettable inaction of the Federal agencies which Senator TYDINGS has so clearly pointed out cease and that we may move forward in accordance with the repeated utterances of President Johnson. It is a mystery why when the President has spoken so emphatically and so repeatedly, that his agencies have not gotten the message. So this is one of the things it is now necessary for Congress to try to correct. Senator TYDINGS' bill is a very constructive move in that direction.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, last fall a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations held hearings on the problems of the city for some 3 or 4 months before national television cameras and the national press. I submit that nothing will really be accomplished toward rebuilding our great cities in this country until we provide the poor in the cities with the same opportunity to plan their families that the affluent and the rich have.

There is not a city in this country that does not have a major crime program, where a substantial portion of the juvenile delinquencies cannot be traced to unwanted children, who came into this world, for at least one of the reasons, because their mothers never had the opportunity to plan their families.

I further submit, Mr. President, that $1 spent in the cities of this country to give the poor the same right to responsibly plan the size of their families will be equivalent to $20 spent on almost any other type of program, whether it is urban renewal, expressways, colleges, housing, or whatever it may be.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. It is an interesting coincidence that the Senator uses the formula of 1 to 20, because it echoes and coincides with the statement made by the President at the United Nations conference last July, when he said that $5 spent in population control was worth more than $100 in economic aid.

I would have assumed that that statement was the equivalent of a mandate to his foreign aid administrators and other agencies. But as the Senator from Maryland has so well pointed out, there has been no action. It is really time we moved on this burning problem. It is not only late, it may be too late. The question is, how can we possibly meet this tremendous, burgeoning growth of population, which is impairing our resources in this country and is eroding our foreign aid program? We have overwhelming evidence that as we pour billions of dollars into aid for foreign countries, their population explosion is nullifying our aid as well as their own efforts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senate about the program that Baltimore adopted approximately 2 or 3 years ago. The Baltimore Department of Public Health provided a program in the city hospitals whereby they provided family planning assistance and devices for those mothers, particularly in the ghetto neighborhoods, the poorer sections of the Baltimore City, whereby the mothers could have the same benefits, the same advantages of family planning devices and techniques that the richer inhabitants of Baltimore City enjoyed.

After the first full year that the program was in operation, the number of new babies born in Baltimore City decreased by approximately 7,000. These were primarily children who would have been born in the ghetto sections, many of them illegitimate children, without parents who wanted them or could take care of them.

Do you know what that means in dollars and cents, 7,000 children? It means, in the cost of classroom construction for new classrooms alone, which would otherwise have had to have been built for those children, approximately $10 million less that the taxpayers have to carry in Baltimore City, not to mention the great cost of supporting the unwanted child who develops into a delinquent, or never has an opportunity to make a contribution in life. I only hope that Congress realizes that the executive branch will not move to meet this challenge. They have gone back on their promises, and the only way we will get any action is for Congress to mandate the action, and say, "Here are the dollars, and they must be spent." We can no longer rely on the promises and assurances of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEATH OF WILLIAM B. WHITLEY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I learned of the sudden death of William B. Whitley, who served so ably as assistant to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

I knew Bill Whitley personally. As a member of the Joint Inaugural Committee, I had occasion to work very closely with Bill who served as staff director for the committee. He was an able, competent, and loyal Senate employee, and his services will be sorely missed.

I know that I speak for each Member of this body in expressing sincere sympathy to his widow and children.

FLOOD PROTECTION FOR TUG VALLEY, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for years I have been working to secure sorely needed flood protection measures in imperiled areas of West Virginia.

One of these areas, the Tug River Basin, has suffered repeated flood damage. I recall all too vividly the appearance of the area following the heavy flood of 1963, when in March of that year I flew to the State with officials concerned with aiding flood areas.

We traveled over points such as the Tug River Basin in a helicopter, so that we might gain firsthand knowledge of the flooding. Subsequently, I returned to Washington to renew efforts to secure U.S. Army Corps of Engineers construction, but these resulted unsuccessfully due to failure of the Tug Valley area to meet existing eligibility requirements.

Earlier this year, Tug Valley suffered another flood, endangering life and property, and again the citizens of the area and their representatives in the Congress are attempting to secure appropriate construction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. My distinguished colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, and I heard the pleas and urgings of a large group of citizens from Tug Valley just last week when a delegation came to Washington to testify at a congressional hearing, over which Representative JAMES KEE, of West Virginia, presided, as to the dangers and hazards of repeated flooding of their homes, businesses, and property.

Among the most eloquent of these statements was that presented by Mr. William F. Tolbert, editor, the Williamson Daily News.

This veteran newspaperman's assessment of the need for flood control measures is a cogent argument for effective action by the Army Engineers. It is my hope that some formula can be devised to permit approval of a project to provide flood control measures at an early date.

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

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

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. TOLBERT, AT A HEARING BEFORE THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONCERNING FLOOD CONTROL FOR TUG RIVER, APRIL 6, 1967

My name is William F. Tolbert. For forty years I have been associated in various capacities with the Editorial staff of the Williamson Daily News and since 1953 I have been serving as its Editor and Managing Editor.

In my professional role, I have been privileged to be in close contact with the many factors—economic and otherwise—which control the well-being of our Tug Valley and the lives of our men, women and children.

Over a long period of years, flooding was no major concern to our area. Our Valley was a booming coal mining area with production centered largely on underground mining. Whatever concern we had with the Tug River was centered largely with the possibility of canalization, which at one time was accorded a favorable ratio of feasibility in a report by the U.S. Engineers but which was fought with intensity and bitterness by the Norfolk & Western Railroad.

During the mid-forties a boom developed in strip-mining and auger mining of coal which devastated many of the mountain tops and peeled trees from large areas, causing top-soil, clay, rocks, mining debris to cascade into our river and its tributaries. This only compounded the accumulations in our river's bed. Man-made implementation of the flood plains to personal economic advantage only added to our plight.

As I have said, prior to this time Spring rises of the Tug River were to be expected and they were considered more or less of nuisances but did in fact inflict considerable losses and inconvenience to the low-lying areas. In the city of Williamson, most of the inconvenience came from back-water flooding and the area concerned was comparatively limited.

It was to curb and contain this back-water flooding that engineers proposed a flap-gate installation for the business district of Williamson. Before this proposal could be put into effect, what was regarded as the granddaddy of all floods descended upon Tug Valley in 1957. It brought a record all-time high flood crest at Williamson of 43.7 feet and for the first time, Tug River actually came out of its banks and ran down the business streets of the city. A new survey aimed at flood protection for Tug Valley was initiated. Results of that survey finally resulted in provision for a floodwall for the main business district of Williamson, leaving all other areas to the mercy of the elements and those elements were not long in striking with vengeance.

In 1963, after the engineers had assured us that floods such as the 1957 inundation were occurrences which could be expected once in 100 years, the flood waters cascaded over our Valley to a stage of 44.4 feet at Williamson and which actually lapped over the floodwall which required sandbagging in many sectors to prevent total annihilation of the city itself.

Four major floodings have occurred in our Valley in ten years and it is little wonder that none can sleep in Williamson at nights when it is raining for fear that this flood wall protection will prove inadequate to the occasion.

In my research and in discussions with experts, I have been told that flood protection has given way to flood control. Catching the raindrops where they fall and storing them for future use by man offer the greatest economic justification as our nation faces a growing peril in the rapidly declining water levels.

Apparently these new principles are applicable to every section but the Tug River

Valley. We have long since been relegated to the role of a state-fed pauperism and of continued economic blight without hope for any recovery.

To be sure, our area is not totally neglected. We have the food stamp program, the ADCU, Head-Start and the OEO, projects sponsored by the Appalachian Recovery and the War on Poverty. Even in times of distress caused by the rampaging Tug River, the OEP is quick with funds for repair to public facilities and the SBA moves in with low-interest loans to private business concerns while the Red Cross assists individuals with disaster relief and the Salvation Army and other such organizations assist in alleviating misery and hastening recovery.

This is all good, but mind you, how many times can small businesses make loans to continue with flood disasters recurring more frequently than loans can be repaid. There was an independent merchant at Matewan who was washed out in 1957. He secured a SBA loan. Before he could repay this loan, another devastation struck and he secured his second loan. This worry and anxiety induced a fatal heart attack. His widow gamely took up the struggle and now, for the third time in 10 years, their business has been destroyed by the wrath of the elements. How do you measure this in reckoning the so-called criteria of feasibility? There are countless other examples.

Business establishments can measure their losses in dollars and cents, but how do you compute the losses of husband and wife, father and mother who have toiled a life time in purchasing a home and then in the matter of a few hours, through no fault of their own, see their efforts floating down the river with the debris of their neighbor's belongings? Our citizens have a rich heritage of intestinal fortitude, but believe you me, it takes plenty of "guts" to suffer the personal havoc, the anxiety and the economic disaster wreaked by an uncontrolled Tug River which could be corrected with a mere fraction of the money which is being shipped to strange foreign lands to nurture even our mortal enemies? In our zeal to be the benefactor of the world, why is it necesasry to close our eyes to the plight of our own loyal patriots who stand ready to defend this nation with their lives if necessary?

Recently, a subcommittee from the House of Representatives and other high officials toured our area and viewed the damages wrought by the March flooding. One Congressman, the Hon. Robert Denney, was quoted by the Omaha World-Herald in his home state of Nebraska as saying:

"Any money spent in Appalachia should be in permanent not temporary improvements. Reservoirs and other structures to control and store water would be better investment than various anti-poverty programs in the area.

"There is not much sense in urban renewal for towns which are flooded out by a two or three-inch rain."

Congressman Denney's remarks are most appropriate and summarizes our situation. We are most gratified with the sympathetic understanding which is accorded us with every flood crisis. But these promises float down Tug River as the flood waters recede and once again we are left with the confusions of feasibility and criteria as we prayerfully watch for the next flood which is bound to come with the first unusual precipitation over our Valley.

Gentlemen, I thank you for your kind indulgence. I can assure you that others will present documented facts and figures which we fervently pray will convince you and other officials of this great government that our cause is meritorious and that new hope will come to the people of our Valley through flood control brought about by the construction of the Lower Knox Creek dam and reservoir.

TEXTBOOKS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning carried an article entitled "Neglect of District of Columbia Schools Assailed by McNamara." The Post article reported that Defense Secretary McNamara, in effect, told Representative H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, on April 11, that he, Representative GROSS, would do better to worry about textbooks for schoolchildren in Washington than about furnishing a plane for Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker to visit his bride. I quote from the Post article as follows:

"I think the real disgrace," MacNamara retorted, "is for you to sit here in the Nation's Capitol not two miles away from school children who lack textbooks because Congress won't appropriate the funds for them."

Mr. President, I have always admired Secretary McNamara's grasp of the facts with regard to Defense Department appropriations. However, apparently the Secretary's same unerring grasp of the facts does not extend to all other areas of the Government. Perhaps he was misquoted, or perhaps he has been misinformed.

I wish to set the record straight with regard to the District of Columbia's provision of textbooks for schoolchildren. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, I sent a telegram to Dr. Carl F. Hansen this morning, in which I said, and asked, the following:

Washington Post this date quotes Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, responding to statements by Representative H. R. Gross (Iowa), as follows:

"I think the real disgrace is for you to sit here in the Nation's Capitol not two miles away from school children who lack textbooks because Congress won't appropriate the funds for them."

Please provide information as follows:

1. Do District of Columbia school children lack textbooks?

2. If answer is affirmative, does the lack result from failure of Congress to appropriate funds for textbooks?

3. Summary of budgetary requests of Congress for textbooks and facts regarding appropriations in response to these requests over the past five years.

In response to that telegram, Dr. Hansen replied in a letter dated April 12, excerpts from which I read as follows:

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In response to your request for information concerning the current textbook situation in the D.C. Public Schools, I am submitting answers to specific questions as follows:

1. Do D.C. school children currently lack textbooks?

The answer then to the question, "Do we lack textbooks?" is this: "In summary, we know of no instances of shortages. If any do exist, this may be mismanagement on the part of local school officers or the result of an unexpected increase in school enrollment or a shift in emphasis in curriculum.

"Under current funding conditions the emergency needs for textbooks can be met immediately upon request of the school principal. Textbook obsolescence does not exist in the school system, except for those occasions resulting from oversight or bad management. If such cases do exist, Congress is not at fault."

To the second question, "If the answer is affirmative, does the lack result from failure of Congress to appropriate funds for textbooks?" Dr. Hansen answered:

From Fiscal Year 1961 to Fiscal Year 1967, inclusive, Congress has appropriated $868,681 for textbooks, an amount 17.1% greater than requested by the Board of Education and 32.5% greater than approved by the Commissioners.

In addition, the schools have applied $787,933 from other Federal funds, including impact aid, to the meeting of textbook needs.

In answer to the third item, "Prepare a summary of budgetary requests of Congress for textbooks and facts regarding appropriations and response to those requests over the past 5 years," Dr. Hansen presented a table which showed that the total funds requested for textbooks by the board of education during the past 8 fiscal years, including fiscal year 1968 for which we have not yet acted on appropriation requests, amounted to $742,419; that the President's budget requests, in totality, during those 8 fiscal years came to $656,255; and that the amounts approved by Congress over the same period—and we have not yet acted on appropriations for fiscal year 1968—was $869,686.

(At this point Mr. TYDINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So, to repeat the figures, for textbooks, the Board during the 8 fiscal years requested $742,419. The President's budget requests for the same period totaled $656,255, and the amounts approved by Congress totaled $869,686. Additionally, $787,933 came from Federal funds which were used for the purpose of textbooks.

Dr. Hansen closed his letter by saying:

I am greatly pleased with the advances made in the textbook funding through the efforts of Congress, either through direct appropriations or through special Federal programs.

I am pleased to submit this information to you as an indication of the considerable improvement in the textbook situation over the years.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL F. HANSEN,
Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I share with the Senator from West Virginia a great respect for the Secretary of Defense. I also serve on the District of Columbia Committee, and I have visited some of the schools in the District of Columbia. My own experience and my own observation is that there is a good deal of obsolescence in the textbooks of some of our students in the District of Columbia. There is a shortage of school books.

I do not report to the Senator from West Virginia merely on the basis of my own inspection and investigation, but also on the basis of what others have told me.

I am interested in what Mr. Hansen says. I do not know whether he has visited some of the schools that I have visited or heard some of the complaints that I have heard. But I would like to

follow the matter up with Mr. Hansen and possibly over the next few days we might place some other facts in the RECORD.

My experience has been—and the information I have bears out the findings of the Secretary of Defense—that there is a shortage of schoolbooks in the District of Columbia, and there are books that are being used by a number of students in the District of Columbia that are obsolescent books.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I would be glad for the Senator to do that. Let me say that in the 7 years in which I have acted as chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations, I have sought to respond as well as I possibly could to the needs of the schools in the District of Columbia as those needs were presented by the District of Columbia Commissioners, the Superintendent of Schools, and his associates.

I feel that the Superintendent of Schools is correct in what he has said in his letter, and certainly his figures which I have quoted today would indicate that Congress has not been remiss. It has not been niggardly in responding to the appropriation requests submitted to it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Perhaps, if the Senator from West Virginia is free on Monday morning, the two of us, and perhaps other Senators, might go around to the schools of the District of Columbia and look at the books so that we could have firsthand information.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me say to the Senator from New York that I have visited the schools.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I know that the Senator has visited the schools. I know that the Senator from West Virginia takes a great deal of interest in the District of Columbia and has visited the schools. However, since the question is raised by the Secretary of Defense, and Mr. Hansen has responded in the way in which he has, perhaps if the Senator has a few free hours on Monday morning, or at any other time, the two of us could go to some of the schools and see for ourselves.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me again say to the Senator from New York that I have visited the schools of the District of Columbia. I intend to do so again.

My subcommittee is presently conducting hearings on appropriation requests, and it will certainly give every proper consideration to any requests presented by school officials for textbooks, whether I visit the schools on Monday or whether I do not.

I intend to visit the schools at a time that is convenient to me, as I have done before, and I shall continue to give, as I say, the most careful consideration to requests that are submitted by the appropriate officials.

I do not gainsay the fact that one might be able to go through the schools and find an obsolescent book here or a book that is perhaps overly used there. But Secretary McNamara is reported to have stated that there is a "lack" of textbooks and that such a lack exists because of the failure of Congress to appropriate the necessary moneys.

I am simply trying to point out to the Senate, on the basis of the information supplied to me by Dr Hansen, that Secretary McNamara's statement—if indeed he was quoted properly—to the effect that: "School children lack textbooks because Congress won't appropriate the funds for them" is just simply not a fact. That just simply is not the case, and such a statement should not go unchallenged.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does the Senator from West Virginia contest the statement that a number of school children of the District of Columbia, for whatever reason—I do not mean a handful, but a number of them—are using poor or obsolescent textbooks?

Is the only question raised by the Senator whether Congress or somebody else is responsible for it?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The question to which I am attempting to address myself is that which appears in the paper, that schoolchildren "not 2 miles away"—and I assume that that has reference to the District of Columbia—"lack textbooks because Congress won't appropriate the funds for them."

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Specifically on the question, does the Senator raise any question about the fact that the children of the District of Columbia do lack adequate schoolbooks?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am not saying that there may not be one here or one there.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am not talking about a handful. I am talking about a sizable number in some of the schools.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am saying that the children of the District of Columbia do not "lack" textbooks as a result of the failure of Congress to appropriate funds. This was the charge reportedly made by Secretary McNamara. I say the Secretary, if he was correctly quoted, misstated the facts.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. But they might be lacking textbooks for another reason.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am addressing myself——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I ask the Senator, based on his own experience, whether it is his finding or his judgment that the children in the District of Columbia, whatever the reason, lack adequate textbooks—not just one or two, but a number of the children.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If they do, it certainly would conflict with the testimony that has been provided to the subcommittee of which I am chairman, and it would certainly conflict with the statement that I have just read, which was provided to me today by Dr. Carl Hansen.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe that I could produce evidence and information quite rapidly that the schoolchildren in the District of Columbia lack adequate textbooks, or a considerable number of the schoolchildren in the District of Columbia lack adequate textbooks.

I did not know about Dr. Hansen's letter, but I could refer Dr. Hansen to some of the schools and some of the schoolchildren where they lack adequate textbooks. I have not read his letter, but if his letter says that the schoolchildren in the District of Columbia all have adequate textbooks, I would be very surprised about such a statement coming from him.

As I have said to the Senator from West Virginia, I believe that the schoolchildren in the District of Columbia do lack adequate textbooks. Without trying to lay the blame on anybody's shoulders, the fact is that the schoolchildren in the District of Columbia lack adequate textbooks; and all of us in public life, whether in Congress, in the executive branch of Government, or in some public position in the District of Columbia, have some responsibility for that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am attempting to conscientiously assume my responsibility, and I base my actions and judgments on the testimony of those who are responsible for administering the public school system in the District of Columbia and on my own observations, limited though they may have been.

Certainly, I have had some opportunity to become familiar with this matter in the 6 years I have held hearings on this budget, and insofar as I have been able to conduct hearings in the present fiscal year, I have had some further opportunity to explore the situation; and I have certainly attempted to do everything I could to meet the request as submitted to me and as justified by the people in the District of Columbia whose responsibility it is to administer the school program.

When the Vice President was a Senator, he led the fight to provide adequate textbooks and to replace those books that were obsolescent and becoming obsolete. I, as chairman of the subcommittee at that time, joined with him and provided moneys over and above the budget requests, over and above the resquest of the Board of Education, in order that we might replace textbooks that were obsolete and obsolescent.

So, if indeed textbooks in some exceptional cases ought to be replaced, I do not believe that this is the fault of Congress, as Mr. McNamara charged, because we have certainly responded in a way which I believe is commendable.

To repeat, I do not gainsay that possibly the Senator from New York or I or any other Senator might find here and there a book which in our judgment, as laymen, would be ready for replacement. I do not believe we can ever reach the point where we will not find some book somewhere in the District of Columbia school system which, perhaps because of inadequate care on the part of the student using that book, should not be replaced. However, we must address ourselves, in my judgment, to the over-all situation and attempt to do what we can

to provide, in a general way, textbooks that are current and usable by the students in the school system.

Since the Senator from New York has raised the question, let me read additional portions of the letter from the Superintendent of Schools which I intend to place in the RECORD later.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY of New York assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Superintendent of Schools wrote as follows:

On November 9, 1964, the Superintendent issued a circular to all school principals advising them to submit requisitions to provide adequate up-to-date textbooks for each child enrolled in the schools. Upon the response of principals, $605,591 of Impact Aid money was spent on textbooks, maps and globes.

On September 13, 1966, the Superintendent sent the following memorandum to the Assistant Superintendents in charge of Elementary and Model School Division Schools and Secondary and Vocational High Schools. The memorandum is as follows:

"I have received several complaints in recent weeks regarding the issuance of obsolete and out-worn textbooks to students. It may be justifiable in some instances to use textbooks with old copyrights if the material is of pertinence today. On the other hand, there may be some merit to the charges that textbooks of questionable educational value are being distributed to pupils by principals.

"Please look into this situation immediately and furnish me with a report."

Reports received in response to the memorandum indicated that in the case of the Junior-Senior High Schools that when all textbooks ordered have been received, except for Backus and Hart Junior High Schools, there should be no problem of obsolete and wornout textbooks.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], who is presently presiding over the Senate, to the exceptional instances referred to in the superintendent's letter in which perhaps there may have been some problem of obsolete and worn out textbooks but which problem has since been corrected, apparently.

I quote from the Superintendent's letter as follows:

A check with the Junior-Senior High School office on April 5, 1967 brought this response from the Assistant Superintendent in charge: "To the best of my knowledge no students are using obsolete textbooks at the present time." The report was to the effect that deficiencies had been corrected.

That was as late as April 5, 1967, which was a week ago today.

In the case of the Vocational High Schools, the Assistant Superintendent in charge responded to the October, 1966, memorandum to the effect that except for M. M. Washington Vocational High School, where thirty old textbooks in business were being used, the vocational high school principals reported that they have no obsolete and worn-out textbooks.

Here is another exception where a few old textbooks were being used. I quote again:

. . . except for the M. M. Washington Vocational High School, where thirty old textbooks in business were being used, the vocational high school principals reported that they have no obsolete and worn out textbooks.

I quote further:

In response to the April, 1967, inquiry, the Assistant Superintendent stated that no textbook shortage existed, indicating that any earlier shortages had been eliminated.

In the case of the Elementary Schools, the Assistant Superintendent in charge stated in October, 1966, that the elementary school principals reported a few obsolete textbooks; that the general problem is replacement of worn-out books. For the most part the books used in the elementary schools have a copyright date 1960–1965.

The elementary school Assistant Superintendent stated on April 5, 1967 that "To the best of my knowledge there are no books which are being used by elementary children which are more than eight years old. Readers in daily use with children are 1 to 4 years of age." In effect, earlier deficiencies had been corrected.

In the case of the Model School Division, the Assistant Superintendent reported in October, 1966, that two schools, Cardozo and Banneker, were using certain books with 1955–56 and later copyright dates running through to 1960.

On April 5, 1967, the Assistant Superintendent in charge of the Model School Division reported the correction of these deficiencies. His statement was: "To the best of my knowledge the secondary level has few books being used over eight years old. In most instances where such books are being used, they are being used as classical literature, which does not change substantially." Thus earlier deficiencies had been corrected.

The answer then to the question, "Do we lack textbooks?" is this: "In summary, we know of no instances of shortages. If any do exist, this may be mismanagement on the part of local school officers or the result of an unexpected increase in school enrollment or a shift in emphasis in curriculum.

Under current funding conditions the emergency needs for textbooks can be met immediately upon request of the school principal. Textbook obsolescence does not exist in the school system, except for those cases resulting from oversight and bad management. If such cases do exist, Congress is not at fault.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the telegram which I sent to Dr. Hansen this morning, and his letter in response thereto.

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

(See exhibits 2 and 3.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that no one can say that there may not be a book here or there or a few books here or there that should not be replaced, because of overwear or otherwise. Indeed, Dr. Hansen, in his letter, has indicated that there have been some instances of shortages and he states explicitly, categorically, and unequivocally, that if textbook obsolescence exists now it results from oversight and bad management. But, even so, he says Congress is not at fault.

I wish to say to the distinguished and able Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] that, if, indeed, books can be found in District of Columbia schools which should be replaced, the same can probably be said with regard to the schools of New York, the schools of West Virginia, or any other State and as much so, perhaps, as in the case of the District of Columbia.

The thing I want to be sure of is that the Congress, in the case of the District of Columbia, is not at fault for any lack of textbooks which may be presently suffered by children in the Nation's Capital. In this regard, I believe Congress has met its responsibility. I believe children generally do not lack textbooks and, certainly, if they do, in an exceptional instance, it is not, as Secretary McNamara was quoted as saying—rightly or wrongly—because Congress "won't appropriate the funds for them."

I wish to emphasize that the facts are that the Congress for several fiscal years, 1961–67, has appropriated an amount substantially greater than requested by the District of Columbia Board of Education, and greater than that approved by the District of Columbia Commissioners, for textbooks. In addition, the schools have been enabled from other Federal funds, including impact aid, to make additional progress in meeting textbook needs.

The facts are that constant and continuing efforts have been made to avoid shortages and to meet emergency needs for textbooks.

I again call attention to efforts on the part of Vice President HUMPHREY at the time he was acting as a Senator in this body. He joined with other responsible Members of Congress in attacking the problem of obsolescence and wornout textbooks.

The facts are that under current funding conditions, in which responsible Members of Congress have interested themselves, the emergency needs for textbooks can be met on discovery of needs. The facts are that Congress listens with a sympathetic ear to requests for funds for adequate provision of up-to-date textbooks for each child enrolled in the District of Columbia schools, and that the Congress has voted progressively to increase textbook funding on its own initiative, beyond that requested by authorities on at least two occasions.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1967]

SHARP EXCHANGE WITH REPRESENTATIVE GROSS—NEGLECT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS ASSAILED BY MCNAMARA

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara told Rep. H. R. Gross (R-Iowa) yesterday that he would do better to worry about ill-equipped school children in Washington than about furnishing a plane for Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker to visit his bride.

A sharp exchange between McNamara and the irascible Gross took place during House Foreign Affairs Committee hearings on foreign aid.

In his farewell to Bunker, new ambassador to Vietnam, President Johnson Monday promised him that a jet plane would be made available to him "from time to time" so he could visit his bride of three months, U.S. Ambassador to Nepal Carol Laise.

In yesterday's committee hearing, Gross deplored the "gigantic" national debt and asked McNamara how he could justify furnishing a plane to "this 72-year-old bridegroom to further his romance."

"I think the real disgrace," McNamara retorted, "is for you to sit here in the Nation's Capitol not two miles away from school children who lack textbooks because Congress won't appropriate the funds for them."

As for Bunker, he said, "We are not short of pilots and planes, and we can surely allow the use of a plane to transfer Ambassador Bunker once in a while out of the combat environment in which he will be working 20 hours a day, seven days a week, to visit his family."

"We do it for others," he added, "and we should certainly do it for him."

Reminded of the national debt, which now exceeds $330 billion, McNamara said: "I don't plan to retire the national debt."

"You certainly don't," Gross retorted.

McNamara said the U.S. economy is strong and healthy, and "we are the most affluent country in the history of the world."

"But our math students know less than the math students of other countries," he added. "I think it's disgraceful."

EXHIBIT 2

APRIL 12, 1967.

Dr. CARL F. HANSEN,
Superintendent of Schools, District of Columbia, Franklin Administration Building, 13th and K Streets NW., Washington, D.C.:

Washington Post this date quotes Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, responding to statements by Representative H. R. Gross (Iowa), as follows:

"I think the real disgrace is for you to sit here in the Nation's Capitol not two miles away from school children who lack textbooks because Congress won't appropriate the funds for them."

Please provide information as follows:

1. Do District of Columbia school children lack textbooks?

2. If answer is affirmative, does the lack result from failure of Congress to appropriate funds for textbooks?

3. Summary of budgetary requests of Congress for textbooks and facts regarding appropriations in response to these requests over the past five years.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 3

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In response to your request for information concerning the current textbook situation in the D.C. Public Schools, I am submitting answers to specific questions as follows:

1. Do D.C. school children currently lack textbooks?

On November 9, 1964, the Superintendent issued a circular to all school principals advising them to submit requisitions to provide adequate up-to-date textbooks for each child enrolled in the schools. Upon the response of principals, $605,591 of Impact Aid money was spent on textbooks, maps and globes.

On September 13, 1966, the Superintendent sent the following memorandum to the Assistant Superintendents in charge of Elementary and Model School Division Schools and Secondary and Vocational High Schools. The memorandum is as follows:

"I have received several complaints in recent weeks regarding the issuance of obsolete and out-worn textbooks to students. It may be justifiable in some instances to use textbooks with old copyrights if the material is of pertinence today. On the other hand, there may be some merit to the charges that textbooks of questionable educational value are being distributed to pupils by principals.

"Please look into this situation immediately and furnish me with a report."

Reports received in response to the memorandum indicated that in the case of the Junior-Senior High Schools that when all textbooks ordered have been received, except for Backus and Hart Junior High Schools, there should be no problem of obsolete and worn-out textbooks.

A check with the Junior-Senior High School office on April 5, 1967 brought this response from the Assistant Superintendent in charge: "To the best of my knowledge no students are using obsolete textbooks at the present time." The report was to the effect that deficiencies had been corrected.

In the case of the Vocational High Schools, the Assistant Superintendent in charge responded to the October, 1966, memorandum to the effect that except for M. M. Washington Vocational High School, where thirty old textbooks in business were being used, the vocational high school principals reported that they have no obsolete and worn-out textbooks.

In response to the April, 1967, inquiry, the Assistant Superintendent stated no textbook shortage existed, indicating that any earlier shortages had been eliminated.

In the case of the Elementary Schools, the Assistant Superintendent in charge stated in October, 1966, that the elementary school principals reported a few obsolete textbooks; that the general problem is replacement of worn-out books. For the most part the books used in the elementary schools have a copyright date 1960–1965.

The elementary school Assistant Superintendent stated on April 5, 1967 that "To the best of my knowledge there are no books which are being used by elementary children which are more than eight years old. Readers in daily use with children are 1 to 4 years of age." In effect, earlier deficiencies had been corrected.

In the case of the Model School Division, the Assistant Superintendent reported in October, 1966, that two schools, Cardozo and Banneker, were using certain books with 1955–56 and later copyright dates running through to 1960.

On April 5, 1967, the Assistant Superintendent in charge of the Model School Division reported the correction of these deficiencies. His statement was: "To the best of my knowledge the secondary level has few books being used over eight years old. In most instances where such books are being used, they are being used as classical literature, which does not change substantially." Thus earlier deficiencies had been corrected.

The answer then to the question, "Do we lack textbooks?" is this: "In summary, we know of no instances of shortages. If any do exist, this may be mismanagement on the part of local school officers or the result of an unexpected increase in school enrollment or a shift in emphasis in curriculum.

"Under current funding conditions the emergency needs for textbooks can be met immediately upon request of the school principal. Textbook obsolescence does not exist in the school system, except for those cases resulting from oversight and bad management. If such cases do exist, Congress is not at fault."

2. If the answer is affirmative does the lack result from failure of Congress to appropriate funds for textbooks?

From Fiscal Year 1961 to Fiscal Year 1967, inclusive, Congress has appropriated $869,681 for textbooks, an amount 17.1% greater than requested by the Board of Education and 32.5% greater than approved by the Commissioners.

In addition, the schools have applied $787,933 from other Federal funds, including impact aid, to the meeting of textbook needs.

3. Prepare a summary of budgetary requests of Congress for textbooks and facts regarding appropriations and response to those requests over the last five years.

Our budget information from Fiscal Year 1962 to the Fiscal Year 1967 shows (1) The Congress significantly increased textbook funding over the request of the Board of Education on two occasions. (2) Supplemental support was achieved from Impact Aid and other Federal funds. The result is that the Public School textbook condition is currently more satisfactory than at any known time in the history of the school system.

The summary report attached herewith shows from Fiscal Year 1961 to Fiscal Year 1967, inclusive, Board of Education requests for textbook funds amounting to $742,419, District Board of Commissioners' approval of $656,755, and actual Congressional appropriations of $896,686.

Public schools of the District of Columbia—Funds requested and received for textbooks in elementary schools and junior, senior, and vocational high schools

Fiscal year	Board request	President's budget	Amount approved by Congress	Federal funds used for textbooks
1961	$61,741	$61,741	$21,249	----------
1962	41,655	32,273	[1] 172,354	----------
1963	27,050	27,050	[2] 176,109	----------
1964	229,016	[3] 176,594	154,794	----------
1965	86,871	86,871	81,588	$605,591
1966	110,008	85,648	77,514	182,342
1967	186,078	186,078	186,078	----------
1968	56,785	56,785	----------	----------
Total	742,419	656,255	869,686	787,933

[1] Includes $128,400 received in appropriation for extension of "Amidon" program.
[2] Includes $135,400 received in appropriation for obsolescence.
[3] New formula introduced which accounts for larger increase this year.

I am greatly pleased with the advances made in the textbook funding through the efforts of Congress, either through direct appropriations or through special Federal programs.

I am pleased to submit this information to you as an indication of the considerable improvement in the textbook situation over the years.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL F. HANSEN,
Superintendent of Schools.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 13, 1967, at 11:30 o'clock a.m.