SENATE
TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1967

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

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

O Thou God who art the hope of all the ends of the earth: Amidst the tragedy of a broken world, to-morrow facing the tasks of a new week, in deep humility of spirit we would ascend the altar stairs to an enduring peace, when hearts to the Nation's God, for in Thee we trust.

Grant unto us that greatness of vision which shall match the vast patterns of this creative age. Save us from setting narrow limits upon our responsibility to our fellow men. May no pettiness in our patriotism rob us of the ruling passion to sacrifice all for the common good. May we never hesitate when the choice is between brother and self-interest. Bring us, we pray Thee, to an enduring peace, when justice shall roll down like the waters and righteousness as a mighty stream.

We ask it in that name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL
On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 24, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 824. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; approved April 23, 1967, as amended.

H.R. 2824. An act to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia; approved May 23, 1938, as amended.

H.R. 837. An act to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who retired before such officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits; approved April 3, 1938, and April 11, 1938, as amended.

H.R. 2887. An act to prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3930. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 88-84 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McGOVERN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes, after the speeches by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph].

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield me 3 or 4 minutes, with the time not to come out of his time?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH—50TH HONORARY DEGREE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the weekend our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], one of the ranking Senators in this body, received her 50th honorary degree from Bates College, a State of Maine. I take this occasion to extend my congratulations and best wishes to Senator SMITH for a well-deserved honor and also to Bates College for having the talent and the wisdom to recognize the talents and contributions of the distinguished Senator from Maine.

In the House of Representatives, in which she preceded us, our offices used to be right next door to ours, I received much in the way of advice and counsel from Representative SMITH, and I have continued to be the recipient of her wisdom in my 15 years in the Senate.

After the completion of a quarter of a century of public service in the Congress of the United States, Senator SMITH has made a record of which she can be proud. She has maintained her integrity, her tolerance, and her understanding of problems and people. She is one not easily swayed after she has studied the facts and made up her mind. Her contributions to the Republic have been of lasting value to the United States as a living monument which she has built over the years and this monument stands straight and tall in the annals of this legislative body.

Again my best wishes and congratulations—and I know I speak for the Senate as a whole—to the senior Senator from Maine for a record of real accomplishments and a job well done.

Mr. Aiken. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 22, the Senate was signaled honored when the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] received her 50th honorary degree from Bates College in Maine. I was very happy to read the remarks of the president of Bates College, Thomas Hedley Reynolds, when he conferred that degree, because he left Vermont to become president of Bates College. His remarks were partially as follows:

MARGARET CHASE SMITH: What could be more appropriate for a recent immigrant from Vermont than to have the privilege of conferring upon you the degree of Doctor of Laws with all of the rights, privileges, and obligations which here and everywhere pertain to this degree.

I do not think that anything I could say would add much to what my fellow Vermonter, who is now president of Bates College, said in presenting the degree to MARGARET CHASE SMITH except to say that we are all extremely proud of this new honor which has come to her. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the citation which accompanied the honorary degree. Without objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, it is my honor to present Margaret Chase Smith, United States senator from the State of Maine, with the degree of Doctor of Laws, an honorary degree.
declared itself for the principle of equal educational rights for women, it is always gratifying to commend careers which justify this historic commitment, and especially so in the case of Mrs. Smith, who has brilliantly excelled in a field long held as a monopoly of men, and still so dominated.

Born in Skowhegan, Margaret Smith began a career as a newspaperwoman and business executive, before successfully running for her late husband's congressional seat in 1940. In 1948, she ran again and was elected to the Senate. Her seniority has given her many responsible committee assignments, and she speaks with an increasingly influential voice in public affairs. Her nomination for the presidency of the United States in the Republican convention of 1964, while unsuccessful, did serve both to demonstrate the stature she has within her party, and to serve notice that even the highest political office is considered attainable by a woman.

Mrs. Smith's long and unbroken voting record in the Congress has always been distinguished. Her consistent stand shows both a philosophic consistency and a sincerity that transcends party designation. This record of independent wisdom was established before 1945, as she first entered the Senate in 1935. In 1942, when in her first major address in the Senate, she bravely proclaimed her no-fault policy of neutrality against irresponsible members of her own party engaged in acts of slanderous defamation under the protection of Congressional immunity.

For a long and honorable career in the public life of this nation, and for the inspiring contributions she has been making throughout her tenure, I am proud to present Margaret Chase Smith, for the degree, Doctor of Laws.

THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the Second World War a great injustice was done a group of Americans who in dedication, devotion, and patriotism exceeded by none. I refer to the long and shameful record of discrimination against the Japanese, both foreign and native, which continued until recently. They were discriminated against in not being able to become naturalized citizens until 1932. They could not own land in California until a statute of that State was declared unconstitutional in 1952. After Pearl Harbor they were discriminated against still further even though the records show that there has never been a single case of sabotage or espionage on the part of Japanese Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the latest issue of Life magazine, entitled "Epilogue to a Sorry Drama," be inserted in the Record at this point.

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

**Epilogue to a Sorry Drama**

The last quiet act in a shameful drama—\( \text{the wholesale uprooting and detention of 112,985 people who were guilty of no crime—} \) was performed this month in Washington. By an act of Congress, the Court decided that the U.S. government owes $10 million to 4,100 Japanese-Americans whose savings were confiscated as "enemy property" 25 years ago. I applaud this decision, but it is only partial compensation for the shame which is this Nation's because of the wholesale uprooting and detention of well over 100,000 Japanese Americans who were treated with great disrespect and great shame. I know something about these detentions because several thousand Japanese Americans were sent to Manzanar. During my term of service I was a member of the faculty of the University of Montana and was one of those who sat as a judge to determine what should be done about these fellow citizens who were supposed to say that insofar as we were concerned in Montana, they were treated with dignity, respect, and consideration. Yet it is a sad memory.

It would be my hope that the Supreme Court would now make a judgment on whether the mass evacuation was legal and justified so that an incident of this kind would never again occur in the history of the Republic unless completely justified and on solid legal ground.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the latest issue of Life magazine, entitled "Epilogue to a Sorry Drama," be inserted in the Record at this point.

The decision recalled a passage from our past which may be unknown to many of the young Americans who today are concerned with civil rights. It's not something we talk about very much. But perhaps we should talk about it more, because it is too commonplace among rights we like to think are already well established.

By Dec. 7, 1941, America—and particularly the West Coast—was told of a Japanese-American leader for the dramatic statement he has made about the Japanese-American citizens, particularly with reference to Dan Inouye and the magnificent record of the 442d Regimental Combat Team. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the majority leader for the dramatic statement he has made about the Japanese-American citizens, particularly with reference to Dan Inouye and the magnificent record of the 442d Regimental Combat Team. I am familiar with that outfit, and the marvelous record made by those people has made me decide to change my vote to favor Hawaiian statehood, when I became aware of the fine contribution that men like Dan Inouye had made for their country.

Mr. President, I am familiar with that outfit, and the marvelous record made by those people has made me decide to change my vote to favor Hawaiian statehood, when I became aware of the fine contribution that men like Dan Inouye had made for their country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield to the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. CARNSTEDT), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), without their time being taken out of the time allocated to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. COONER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield to the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. CARNSTEDT), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), without their time being taken out of the time allocated to me.

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. WOOG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the majority leader for the dramatic statement he has made about the Japanese-American citizens, particularly with reference to Dan Inouye and the magnificent record of the 442d Regimental Combat Team. I am familiar with that outfit, and the marvelous record made by those people has made me decide to change my vote to favor Hawaiian statehood, when I became aware of the fine contribution that men like Dan Inouye had made for their country.
that one would use in gambling, where one would put everything he had on the line and throw the dice for everything he had left on earth, and he would "go for broke." He either goes broke or he wins.

That is the way those young men felt. They either won for their country or they died. That is what they had in mind. Qualitatively, they were, perhaps, Anderson's best fighting unit, with the possible exception of the "Green Berets" or the Army Special Forces, but I doubt whether the Special Forces had a record better than the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, in light of the courage it displayed.

Mr. President, I recall that not a single man surrendered and that only one man was captured by the enemy, and he had been so badly injured that he was unable to fight any longer.

The record of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team is among the finest records in combat anywhere.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER AND PRESENTATION OF HERBERT HOOVER AWARD TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to attend a testimonial dinner yesterday evening in honor of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], at which the distinguished President pro tem of the Senate was given the Herbert Hoover Award.

The dinner in honor of the distinguished Senator from Arizona was one of the most enjoyable evenings that I have had. I learned many things about the Senator from Arizona that I had never known before. I learned about Carl Hayden's record, starting with the days when he was the treasurer of his county, the sheriff of his county, and a football player for Stanford University. I learned many other things about him that I had not known before.

I am proud to have had the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement delivered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR CARL HAYDEN IN ACCEPTANCE OF THE HERBERT HOOVER MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE, APRIL 24, 1967

Mr. Golden, Secretary Gardner, Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamar, Fellow Senators, Members of Congress, Mr. Fulbright, President Sterling, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Press, and My Friends:

I am sixty-one years old when I graduated from the Arizona Territorial Normal School at Tempe, Arizona, in June, 1886. My father, who was an intelligent man, made up his mind that I should go to Stanford University. In September, when I presented my Normal School records to the Registrar, he informed me that I had only eight entrance credits and eleven were required for admission to the University. He then softened the blow by saying that I would have to stay the first semester as a student and that I could remain as long as I made a passing grade in all my classes, every hour of the day.

It is needless to say that I did not take Latin, Greek, or mathematics. I devoted my time to courses in economics, history and English. The only exception was a course in elementary geology under Doctor John C. Merriam. I took the course and failed, but the grade was returned to me. After some time, I wrote to my mother saying that if she wanted her boy to look like other boys she should send me some money. When we arrived in the city, we found that my mother had obtained skin-tight pants, high roll-down collars, and all the other things that a young man then wore. I did not wear them. Afterwards, I received invitations to visit fraternity houses, all of which were declined. I received invitations to be a member of the student body.

When I came to the University, I weighed about 180 pounds, so I went to the "gym" to get myself in shape. I learned how to box. When I played to the football third team, I ran back and forth and could not learn to pull up chest weights. I tried the track, but my legs were too short to be a sprinter or a hurdlcr. I later got on the football second team where I played center. In time, I weighed 180 pounds.

In my junior year, I played in a practice game against the Olympic Athletic Club in San Francisco. The opposing center was a big, bull-necked man. When I had my head on, George Carolus, I was afraid that he had placed his big hands on my head and twisted my neck. So, when his head was down, I knocked him out. I had knocked out two men at that time as I was a member of the student body.

After that, we got along very well and at the end of the game, when I went to the showers, I asked who was that fellow who played against me. To my surprise, he then learned that he was Jack Monroe, who had fought in Butte, Montana, with Jim Jeffries, who soon afterwards became the heavyweight champion of the world. I did not take part in another practice game in San Francisco, when the mistake was made of assigning me against the Stanford axc. When the game was over and we were leaving the grandstand, the axe was handed to me to take back to the campus. I only had a few companions with me and we had not walked very far when we were surprised and surrounded by a mob of students from Berkeley. They overpowered us and got away with the axe.

Based upon information that the axe could be found in a fraternity house, I went over to Berkeley one night with some others and eventually widened to the belief that it was not there. After a lapse of years, I was pleased to learn that, as a token of good will, the axe was returned to Stanford.

Antony Henry Suzzallo, who afterwards became President of the Washington State University, was for a time my roommate in Berkeley. He was a member of the campus Y.M.C.A. and was chosen to represent Stanford in both the Intercollegiate and Caront Debates. However, he had no doubt if I could have made either of them without his help.

In 1899, I came home for Christmas. My father became ill and passed away in February, 1900. I had to take charge of his flour mill, general merchandise store, and some of the other business ventures. I had to earn a living at Stanford. Later, I had an opportunity to turn over the mill at a good rental which enabled my mother to go to Palo Alto with my two sisters who became students at the University.

In 1904, I was selected at a Territorial Convention to represent the people of the Territory of Arizona in the Democratic National Convention held in St. Louis, Missouri, to nominate a candidate for President of the United States. I was a member of the delegation and performed my duty by standing on a chair and saying in a loud tone of voice, "Arizona casts four votes for William Randolph Hearst."

After I came home, I decided that I wanted to be the Speaker of the House, but, when I went to the County Convention in Phoenix, the old political heads said that if I tried to get a good Sheriff and was entitled to a second term, they offered me the nomination to be the County Treasurer and I accepted. During my two terms, I was re-elected without a contest.

I was elected to be the Sheriff in 1906, and again in 1908. It was a profitable office. I received a county commission for a mile whenever I or my deputies had to travel to the Territory of Arizona to serve a warrant or papers in a civil suit. The travelling that we did did not cost the County more than the county wages.

I could not persuade the Board of Supervisors to buy me an automobile for official use.

It was not until Arizona was admitted into the Union on February 12, 1912, that I turned over the Sheriff's office to my successor, Jef­ferson Davis Adams.

While I was the County Treasurer, I was elected to be the Captain of Company C, National Guard of Arizona, at Tempe. We elected the same day for the second record of the Territory of Arizona to serve a warrant or papers in a civil suit. The travelling that we did did not cost the County more than the county wages.

I was at Camp Perry, Ohio, consisted of members of my Company. With them, I became a fairly good rifleman—good enough to shoot a possible event at the Ohio State Fair.

I was at Camp Perry for the third time in the fall of 1911, when I read in a newspaper a statement by President Wilson that since Arizona adopted a Constitution it could become a State. I left for home, and with the support of only one weekly newspaper, I won the Democratic nomination for Congress over two very able opponents, and was elected in December, 1911.

Without any legislative experience, I became a Member of the House of Representatives on February 19, 1913. When Congress was about to adjourn, Dorsey W. Shackelford, a Member from Missouri, gave me some good advice by saying, "When you go home you will be a Congressman; but you have not yet learned how to be one. I would advise you to go along the streets, but if anyone stops to ask you about some piece of legislation, say that you must go on to keep an appointment. If you say any more, you and I will both find out that you do not know any more than he does."

In the 58th Congress during the Administrations of ten Presidents, the first of whom was William Howard Taft. He was a kindly man, and as a Member of Congress, I went to the White House to see him. I have often thought that if his son, Senator Robert Taft, had been fortunate enough to inherit his father's friendly manner, he might have become the Presidential candidate that he so much wanted to be.

I have been a supporter of Champ Clark, but he could not secure the required two-thirds majority to obtain the nomination for President at the 1912 Democratic National Convention in Baltimore, where Woodrow Wilson became the Party's choice. During his eight years the White House, Presi­dent Wilson, was able to secure passage of the Federal Reserve Act, the Clayton Antitrust Act, and tariff reform legislation—all of which benefitted all of the nation. He not only had to bear the burden imposed upon him by the first World War, but also to suffer the failure of the Senate to ratify the Peace Treaty.

Warren Gamaliel Harding became Presi­dent in 1921. I went to see him at the White House and in the course of conversation we urged that money be provided for construc­tion of a hospital in Phoenix to care
for the many veterans of the first World War, suffering from tuberculosis, who were seeking to benefit by the dry climate of Arizona. He gave me good advice, and I am told that his medical advisors were of the opinion that tuberculosis could be cured in one place just as well as another.

Upon the untimely death of President Harding in San Francisco, in August, 1923, Vice President Calvin Coolidge came to the White House, and during the next five years I had several occasions to talk with him there. President Coolidge was a typical Yankee whose modesty would not allow him to tell anything for himself. He would ask me to support legislation that he wanted to be passed into law. As the President's Secretary, I shall never forget the day when he became the Democratic Majority Leader in the Senate. Our long-time friendship has not abated since he entered the House of Representatives.

Herbert Clark Hoover became the next occupant of the White House, and I shall have more to say about him later.

When President Roosevelt became President on March 4, 1933, the Nation was at the bottom of what was called the "Great Depression." Business was in a shambles as thousands of men were out of work. President Roosevelt used the radio to bring hope and ways could be found for the future. When he came over to the White House, I took the opportunity to speak to him. He then asked how I had arrived at the figure and I said that I had telegraphed him a salary. I later learned that her name was Nan Downing and she and Lou Henry had graduated from the same Normal School, and that they were both Kappas. I afterwards learned that in 1939, Herbert Hoover had married his former secretary and must have the kind of relationship that figure and I said that I had telegraphed him a salary. I later learned that her name was Nan Downing and that she and Lou Henry had graduated in the same Normal School, and that they were both Kappas. I afterwards learned that in 1939, Herbert Hoover had married his former secretary and must have the kind of relationship that...

As the Sheriff of Maricopa County, I discovered that my convicts could be put in the Terminal Prison at Yuma, and then went over to Los Angeles to capture Nan Downing. She was with Lou Henry. Herbert Hoover was appointed by President Wilson to take charge of the Food Administration. As a mining engineer, his activities took him through parts of the world and he had made a million dollars before he was 30 years old. He later gained a world-wide reputation by administering the Food Relief in Belgium to the hungry in Europe who were suffering as a result of the first World War. He then became the Secretary of Commerce and sent Lou Henry and Nan that I first met him.

In 1920, Congressmen Phil Swing of Colorado and Leonard W. Jackson of California introduced a bill to create a Commission to apportion the water of the Colorado River among its seven basin States. For years, the issue was the subject of debate both in and out of Congress. In 1922, the Commission, which I appointed in 1920, was reorganized in 1924, by the recommendation of the new members, for the purpose of studying the efficiency of our Government.

I thank you.

CAREER SERVICE AWARDS PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Friday evening, the National Civil Service League held its 13th annual Career Service Awards program. The Career Service Awards program is a public service of the National Civil Service League designed to promote efficiency in government by-

Recognizing 10 career public employees for significant contributions; encouraging others in government service to pursue a career in public service; recognizing and promoting public appreciation of quality in government; stimulating able young people to choose careers in government.

The recipients of the National Civil Service League's Career Service Awards, inaugurated in 1955, represent the best in public service.

The success stories of the 10 career civil servants who won the Career Service Awards are familiar to the League and certainly give an idea of the jobs open to able young people in government today. But there's much more to the story. Their successes, adventures, rewards, satisfactions—though admittedly not typical—are shared by hundreds of thousands of other public employees. And more than 9 million people who staff N-tional, State, and local government share these rewards today in every kind of occupation. They range from managing and managing thousands of social services to the frontiers of space.

This year's awardees are:

Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary for the Federal Correctional and Federal Housing Commissioner and Urban Development.
Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
Donald C. MacDonald, Director, U.S. AID Mission to Vietnam, Agency for International Development.
William H. Smith, Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.
Dr. O. Glenn Stahl, Director, Bureau of Politics and Standards, Civil Service Commission.
David D. Thomas, Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency.
Dr. Floyd A. LaVerne Thompson, Director, Langley Research Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
Barbara McClure White, Associate Director, U.S. Information Agency.
Dr. Marjorie J. Williams, Director, Pathology and Allied Sciences Service, Veterans' Administration.

At the program honoring these awardees, the president of the National Civil Service League, Mortimer M. Caplin, said that the awards are presented by outstanding leaders in government, business, and career employees.
I ask unanimous consent to place the program in the Record at this point. There being no objection, the program was ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHING­TON, D. C., Friday, April 21, 1967.

PROGRAM

Invocation: The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, The U.S. Senate.

Presentation of Colors: Military Color Guard.

Dinner music: Ted Alexander.


Your Honor, Mr. President, Directors, Members of the Board, Happy 25th Birthday.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, an outstanding address was delivered by the Honorable John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which he stressed the opportunities for public service through the career system.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Gardner's speech be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE THROUGH CAREER SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, an outstanding address was delivered by the Honorable John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which he stressed the opportunities for public service through the career system.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Gardner's speech be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS* BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I have followed the work of the National Civil Service League for at least twenty years, and have enjoyed close friendship with many of its leaders.

Long ago I came to Washington Bum Glidieaux, John Macy and others approached me to speak at this annual ceremony, but it was not easy for me to get away from New York and give them a speech. After several tries, they decided they had better move me down here where I'd be more readily available.

Time is the essence of this century. I bow to the award winners. Each of them has in extravagant measure the requisites for effective performance—talent, motivation and character.

And they have so much more. Imagination, versatility. The breadth that enables them to look beyond the conventional definition of their jobs. The courage and stamina to buck the system—as it must be bucked by everyone who has been poisoned with the rot of waste, so as not to fail the people whose skills are outdated.

Career development still stands as a great frontier for all who are seriously interested in the conservation of human talent. We need more and better training programs, and a higher percentage of our people in those programs. We need far greater flexibility of assignment and reassignment. In a day when recruitment of trained and experienced technicians and subprofessionals is increasingly difficult, we need to learn to "grow our own" so to speak.

We're on our way to learning these things. As all of you know there has been a lot of movement among the great leaders of this country. John Macy. His new Executive Assignment holds great promise. And today the President announced another major step in career development.

But a tougher and more complex task awaits us. The personnel function must be made abreast of the great wave of change and must become a matter of direct concern to top managers. Many line managers are not now using to the maximum the opportunities and choices that almost everyone has in the Federal Service, so opportunities for training, reassignment, special salary provi­sions and so on.

The Nation's interest, of course, the least exciting games. Walter Cronkite said "Business is really more agreeable than falling is not unique to government. I know an industrial executive who shows the most unrealistic optimism. He says, "We have the iron ore going into his steel mill and no concern at all for the quality of the human material that runs through it.

Someday it will be recognized that skilled attention to the supply, quality and development of the men and women who make up an organization is as important as any other factor in the effectiveness of the organization.

Much of the most crucial work of developing personnel must be done by line supervisors. Personnel development properly con­ceived, properly executed, must be a part of the line's business to be a success.

We have so many other tasks. We must strive to make careers in large organizations individually satisfying. We must make government a hospitable environment for innovators, for those who question assumptions.

But we could talk all evening about the principles involved in creating healthy and vital organizations and still fall short of accounting for the emergence of such remarkable individuals as we are honoring tonight.

Much of their performance is traceable to personal attributes. Individual values, Intangibles, to be sure, but not wholly beyond description or cultivation.

I'm proud to be a part of this program. I'm happy to be a part of the National Civil Service League.

In a day when recruitment of trained and experienced technicians and subprofessionals is increasingly difficult, we need to learn to "grow our own" so to speak.
It interests the whole mind, the aggregate nature of man more continuously and more deeply. But it does not look as if it did."

He was right. There are activities even more exciting than business, because they engage even more fully the intellectual resources and moral attributes of man, e.g., science, teaching, governing. Surely, the activities engaged in by our award winners compare favorably with the most exciting activities in recreational games. These activities involve companionship, novelty, risk, change-taking, skill, teamwork, competition and all the other attributes of diversion. And they mean something.

What could be more satisfying than to be engaged in a business where only a talent one may have is needed, every lesson one may have learned is used, every value one cares about is furthered.

No wonder such men and women commonly overwork, pass up vacations and neglect the less exciting games such as golf.

It is one of the amusing errors of human judgment that the world habitually feels sorry for such overworked men and women—and doesn't feel a bit sorry for the men and women who escape from one pleasure resort to the next. As a result, the hard workers not only get all the fun but all the rewards. While the habits scratch the dry soil of calculated diversion and get roundly criticized for it. It isn't fair.

I have convinced you that these men and women whom we are honoring tonight are among the luckiest people we know and have little need of the rewards offered by our recognition.

But if they do not strictly need this ceremony, we do. The society needs them. Every society must for its own good celebrate the qualities it values most highly, and ceremonially recognize the men and women who embody those qualities.

That is our purpose tonight.

THE TAX BILL MESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the New York Times of April 24 contains an excellent editorial entitled "The Tax Bill Mess." The editorial strongly recommends that the Senate proceed immediately to restore the tax credit and repeal the election campaign credit. The outlook for the tax incentive bill remains uncertain in the Senate. If any more amendments are added, the measure seems destined to fail. Perhaps the best solution for Senator leaders is to kill the whole package and begin anew.

But before that measure vanishes from sight, the public should be made aware of a noteworthy amendment by Senator Williams of Delaware which was actually approved some days ago. It would go a long way toward cleaning up our stealthy ways of financing national elections.

The Williams proposal sought to amend the Corrupt Practices Act which are now in the Senate. This amendment is needed because the current law is so far removed from the principles which don't have to report their spending.

It is not the impact of the dissent on Hanot that worries the administration;

THE LESSONS OF VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, before delivering the prepared text of my remarks on Vietnam, which were completed several days ago, I wish to make a few comments that are prompted by recent developments. For several years, a number of Senator's of both parties, the majority leader [Mr. Massei], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Fulbright], the most senior Republican Senator from Vermont [Mr. Mansfield], and others, have been acting against our escalating troop commitment to Vietnam. These Senators, myself and others have predicted that each new escalation of forces on our part would lead to further escalations on the other side, which gives them an enormous advantage in a war of attrition.

The predictions and the warnings of our generals and the Senate critics have proved to be largely correct. The glittering military solutions of the hawks, one hand, have proved to be wrong.

Now in their frustration, the hawks are trying to blame the failure of their policy on their critics.

I do not blame General Westmoreland for his speech in New York, because obviously he is doing, whether in Vietnam or in New York, exactly what he is told to do by his Commander in Chief.

From General Westmoreland down, we have in Vietnam our finest soldiers and marines. They are brave men, and they have fought with valor and distinction, as American fighting men have always fought. This only adds to the horror of those of us who feel that whatever the fate of the dissent on April 24, 1967
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it is the fact that the disenters have exposed the contradictions, the falsehood, and the inconsistency which surrounds administration policy.

Hanoi knows very well that America is not going to surrender or withdraw from this war.

Hanoi knows very well that not a single U.S. Senator has advocated either U.S. surrender or U.S. withdrawal.

What we have advocated is that the administration quit widening the war; that it stop sending more and more American boys to do the job that ought to be done by Asian boys.

Although we have opposed sending American men to Vietnam, we have not urged withdrawal of those men until a satisfactory settlement has been negotiated.

Frustrated by the failure of the escalation policy to produce anything other than a bloodier war as we warned it would do, the administration is now trying to blame their failure on those who have warned them all along that they were playing with fire.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some of us think that there is no more to fear than a bloody war-

A Communist victory, a Communist takeover in southeast Asia; and we see the more greater disaster than a bloodier war in Vietnam.

While we deplore the cost to us of fighting this war, some of us feel that what a defeat in Vietnam would mean is a much greater price to pay for victory than our present sacrifice.

We have not lost the war: we plan to win it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I intend to develop the case against that line of reasoning later on. I will say quickly that it is my conviction that the war we are now following is one that is most likely to draw down the Chinese Communists into southeast Asia. This has been one of the fears I have shared with other Senators that I will miss an opportunity in southeast Asia to encourage the kind of fracturing of the Communist world that has taken place in Central and Eastern Europe, and might take place in southeast Asia if it were not for our policy which tends to unite the Communist countries.

If the Senator will be patient, I shall develop that point in more detail.

Mr. LONG. Of course. May I suggest that it is somewhat unfair to develop an argument to a point of ridiculousness? I am sure the Senator is not going to suggest the sooner we let the Communists take over the world, the sooner they will stop killing American troops.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am not suggesting that, I am suggesting that the policy we have followed in southeast Asia plays into the hands of the Chinese Communist, and no one is happier about our being bogged down in Vietnam than the leaders in Peking.

Knowing full well the political hazards involved in questioning the Administration's wartime policy, I can only warn again today that the new level of escalation marked by our bombing of the North Vietnamese airfields has brought us one step closer to a major war involving the legions of China and backed by the enormous firepower of Soviet Russia.

Thus, I do not intend to remain silent in the face of the absolutely mind-boggling madness which sooner or later will envelop American youth by the millions in a war without end.

Mr. President, our deepening involvement in Vietnam presents the most tragic diplomatic and moral failure in our national experience.

The mightiest nation in history—a nation with a glorious democratic tradition, the dignity and brotherhood of man—is, with allegedly good motives, devastating an impoverished little state and ravishing the people whose freedom we would protect. In the process we are sacrificing many of our bravest young men, wasting valuable resources, and threatening the peace of the world. We are being pulled step by step into a jungle quicksand that may claim its victims for America for years to come. This is the path of which the late Douglas MacArthur said:

Anyone who commits American forces to a land war in Asia ought to have his head examined.

If the war continues on its present course, our dreams of a Great Society and a peaceful world will turn to ashes. Vietnam is degenerating into a defeat for America whether we 'win' or 'lose' on the battlefield; indeed, the more we complete our military conquest, the more tragic our real loss may become.

What will we have really won if we succeed at long last in killing enough Vietnamese to bring us victory on the battlefield?

I have no doubt about the capacity of this greatest and most powerful of all countries eventually to score a military decision of sorts in Vietnam.

Shortly after the Communist victory in a U.S. Marine unit in Vietnam, the learned Bernard Fall, whose expertise on southeast Asia was, in my opinion, unequalled, had an interview in Saigon with a reporter named Clark. Mr. Clark should like to read one paragraph from that interview:

"The one overwhelming fact about this situation," Fall told me, "which makes all considerations of ideology or policy pale, is the enormous might of American firepower. Operation Cedar Falls in the Iron Triangle was, in my opinion, unequaled, but it is the biggest operation that you have ever read about. And I think it is the real story of this war. The Americans can destroy but they cannot pacify. They may 'win' the war but it will be the victory of the graveyards."

Our policy in Vietnam has been rationalized by a crude misreading of history and a distortion of our most treasured ideals. There was no American interest, no issue of political freedom, no moral impetus that the grimly bloody war in Vietnam for—be it achieved through an alliance with un­ popular forces abroad that deny free­ dom in Vietnam. Communism is a force hostile to American ideals, but we do not meet its challenge by forcing an American solution on a people still in search of their own national identity. Mao Tse-tung might claim the barrel of the gun, but that has not been the chief source of American power in the world, and it does not answer the basic yearnings of the people of Asia.

After all the dead are counted—American and Vietnamese—and the countryside is laid waste, what will we have accomplished? Could it be that having sown the wind, we shall reap the whirlwind.

We fight in Vietnam, not for any enduring objective; rather, we fight because of a highly questionable notion that this is the only honorable course. Implicit in our Vietnam involvement is an assumption that we may be ordained to settle the struggles and determine the ideology of the people of Asia.

We fight, also, perhaps, to save the American dream that our corporations may well, in the years of the present war, suffer in the face of what I regard as a policy of the从根本 aim of America power in opposition to basic forces, including the currents of revolutionary nationalism and social ferment consuming much of Asia. Our course has run afoul of the fundamental assumption of the people to escape outside interference, whether French, Japanese, Chinese, or American. We seem to be trying to demonstrate that American power can enable unpopular, incompetent regimes in Saigon to offset a widespread insurrection; that bombing bridges, roads, and oil depots, and now the airfields of North Vietnam—will somehow compensate for the weakness of government.

For years we have been told that some new show of American strength would bring the other side to the negotiating table. Instead, a Vietnamese civil conflict becomes an international conflict into a cruel international war. Our leaders talk about stopping aggression from the north, but this was a struggle among groups of Vietnamese until we intervened.

We seem bent upon saving the Vietnamese from Ho Chi Minh even if we have to kill them and demolish their country to do it. As the native people of southeast Asia have said, 'Our people, our children burned by napalm, rice crops destroyed, and cities overrun with our military personnel, they are doubly saying secretly of the Vietcong guerrillas and of the American forces, 'A plague on both your houses.'

The responsibility for our present predicament in southeast Asia cannot be placed on any one man or on any single department of government. Its roots go back more than 20 years to embrace four administrations as well as Congress and the American public.

Senators must bear a portion of the blame because they voted for the war in Vietnam—for we have been slow to speak clearly or even to ask hard questions.
about obvious contradictions, poor intelligence, and false prophecies involving the highest officials of our Government. Dissent in Congress and the Nation has been sharp and frequent in recent years, but it is not unprecedented.

Many of the Senate's most influential members, including the chairman of powerful committees, have believed for years that the United States made a serious mistake in intervening in Vietnam—first by trying to defeat the Vietnamese independence struggle led by Ho Chi Minh against imperial France, and second, by fostering a divided Vietnam leading to the recognition of the French. Yet, upon this privately admitted error a strange syllogism has been constructed:

First. The United States erred in entering and enlarging the Vietnamese struggle.

Second. We are, nevertheless, now deeply involved in that struggle.

Third. Therefore, we have no recourse except to see it through at any cost, or force the other side to negotiate on our terms.

It is a strange piece of logic, indeed, which holds that, once committed to error, we should compound the error by more of the same medicine, to salvage the original mistake. It would seem more reasonable, having accepted the premise of error in our involvement, to avoid further widening of the war while devoting our most imaginative efforts to finding a way to end the killing.

Before we take any further steps toward a larger war—and I notice in the hearings on the communist who is said to be asking for considerably more troops in Vietnam—or before we undertake any new ventures of this kind elsewhere in the world, I would hope that we will re-examine the assumptions which have involved us in what I believe to be a mistaken course.

Perhaps the only positive benefit that may come from an otherwise melancholy venture is for us to see the errors of this one clearly enough to avoid being drawn into another one.

To assist in stimulating such a re-examination, I make the following inferences:

First. Our Vietnam policymakers have distorted history to justify our intervention in a civil conflict supposedly to defend a free nation against external aggression from another nation; actually we are backing a dictatorial group in Saigon against a competing group backed by a dictatorial regime from the north.

Second. Our Vietnam policymakers are unwittingly advancing the cause of communism while seeking to contain it.

I do not see how anyone can controvert that statement in view of the developments of the last few weeks, which seem to indicate a cementing of the once splintered Communist bloc.

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

Mr. MCCOY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, is it not significant also that neither Russians nor the Chinese have to date committed a single soldier to combat; whereas our own men are bleeding there, we have lost some 10,000 fine young Americans killed in combat, 50,000 wounded, crippled, left armless or legless, the enemy—so-called—has not put a single soldier into the war? So I think the distinction that Senator Dulles is quite right when he says we are not weakening communism; we are aiding it. We are weakening ourselves; and for what purpose?

Mr. MCCOY. I think the Senator's point is well taken. Looking at it from the standpoint of naked power, doubtless the Communist leaders in Peiping must find some cause for joy in our being bogged down. But they can sit on the sidelines and see the enormous drain on American resources at very little cost to their position. I think that is why some of the most thoughtful generals in our country, including General Ridgway and General Gavin—

Mr. MCCOY. And General MacArthur.

Mr. MCCOY. And General MacArthur have warned against the very situation into which we are now being drawn, because this plays into the hands of the Communist world.

If the tide were reversed and massive forces from the Communist world were bogged down in some tiny quarter of the globe, I am sure many of our military strategists would view that situation with considerable pleasure knowing the other side was dissipating its resources without any substantial involvement on our part.

So I think the point can be established that the first step now following is the one most likely to reunite the Communist bloc and to cement what was once a fracturing of the Communist bloc.

I do not think it is too late to turn back. I do not paint a hopeless situation here. But I would hope we would not view the situation in Vietnam so narrowly that we lose sight of the world picture. The United States is a world power, holding the balance of the globe, and to sacrifice our overstrength for one tiny section of the world, where the situation is so complex and confusing, seems to me to be an act of folly.

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

Mr. MCCOY. Yes; I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. FULLERIGHT. The Senator has said he did not think it was too late. I wonder what justification he has for believing it is not too late when we consider the speech yesterday of General Westmoreland, who was brought back here to talk to the leading newspapermen of the United States; the talk of General Greene in Detroit; the fact that General Westmoreland is going to speak to a joint meeting of Congress. There is to be a special luncheon for him. I was invited to a briefing at the Pentagon this morning on the same subject.

Mr. MCCOY. I only do not think it is not too late and why does the Senator think there is the slightest possibility that our Government will not proceed to a total all-out victory in Vietnam?

Mr. MCCOY. I must say to the Senator that I am a little apprehensive about it. I like to think that the door to negotiations has not been slammed shut by the administration; but I think each act of escalation, including the recent commitment of 50,000 troops, makes it that much more difficult.

Mr. FULLERIGHT. The Senator said it was not too late, and I hoped the Senator would indicate any reason for the slight hope that there remains any inclination at all on the part of the President to negotiate at all short of surrender. Does he have any reason to believe that?

Mr. MCCOY. I certainly cannot develop a case that would convince the Senator as to the validity of my remarks this morning is to warn against the direction we are now taking, because it is the very direction that the Senator from Arkansas has been warning against for the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. FULLERIGHT. In connection with that last point, if we proceed with this course, do we leave any alternative to the powerful Communist countries but to draw together because such a course is a real challenge to both of them?

Mr. MCCOY. I am afraid that will be the result of the policy of escalation—that each new commitment on our part leads to a greater effort on the other side; and I frankly think how either the Russians or the Chinese can sit silently and watch one of their allies being destroyed. They remember the lessons of Munich, too. They have the problem of saving face, and they have obligations. It is very hard for me to understand the apparent ease with which we keep pushing up the level of our forces and bombers, knowing full well—and our policymakers must know—that it could lead to massive Chinese or Russian intervention, which would, in effect, be world war III.

Mr. FULLERIGHT. My administrative assistant told me a moment ago he believed in the report this morning alleging that a U.S. plane was shot down over China. Did the Senator hear that?

Mr. MCCOY. I have not heard of it.

Mr. FULLERIGHT. I am not sure whether the report says it was shot down or shot at, but it had to be in the Chinese airspace in either event. I am not sure they said it was shot down. It seems to me that one of the most ominous aspects of escalation is the almost inevitable joining together and drawing together of the Chinese and Russian and the other Communist countries to resist this all-out attack on them.

Mr. MCCOY. One of the things that disturbs me is that so many times the highest officials in our Government explain to us why we cannot follow a certain course lest it lead to the dangers that the Senator has referred to, and then, almost before those words have died away, they turn around and do the very things they warned us would be disastrous at all costs.

If the Senator will permit me, I would like to read a couple of paragraphs from this morning's Washington Post that underscore the point I am trying to make. I am reading from the first page of the Washington Post of this morning:

"The Secretary of Defense said yesterday that a large-scale offensive by the North Vietnamese might be expected at any time. He said he did not think it was too late. I wonder what justification he has for believing it is not too late when we consider the speech yesterday of General Westmoreland, who was brought back here to talk to the leading newspapermen of the United States; the talk of General Greene in Detroit; the fact that General Westmoreland is going to speak to a joint meeting of Congress. There is to be a special luncheon for him. I was invited to a briefing at the Pentagon this morning on the same subject."
In answer to a question, Westmoreland said he was “delighted” at the news of yesterday’s American raids on airfields in North Vietnam. Asked by Senator Charles Percy (R-Ill.) his “strong dissent” to the wisdom of these attacks.

Percy told Associated Press panel the bombing operation “the policy both the State Department and the Defense Department had advocated as recently as last week.”

Percy said “the State Department told my office only last Friday” that attacking the Mig bases would “only force the North Vietnamese to establish new bases” and thus “bring us one step closer to Chinese involvement in the war.”

Percy’s Department told his aides there was no military necessity for attacking the bases, because the United States has lost only 11 planes to enemy aircraft since the start of the war.

But Westmoreland contended that the Mig attacks had been a hazard to American pilots and said there was a clear military advantage to forcing them to operate from Chinese bases where “their reaction time will be increased.”

Asked about the dangers of Chinese or Russian intervention, the General said, “From a military point of view, we should be prepared for any contingency.”

It seems to me that this is just one of a series of apparent contradictions and reversals in administration policy that, if not confusing to the enemy, is certainly confusing to the American people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it was right remarkable that Mr. Pacy had the courage to dissent, in view of the criticism General Westmoreland voiced about Senators yesterday. The general seemed to say that we were talking very undiplomatically when we take any different view from that of the administration, did he not?

Mr. MCGOVERN. That was the apparent implication of the general’s statement. I wish to add, if the Senator will permit me, that I do not think it is fair to blame General Westmoreland for what he does or what he says, either in New York or Vietnam, because, presumably, he is a soldier who is carrying out the orders of his Commander in Chief.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator completely. He is a good soldier. I have just been handed an Associated Press dispatch from Salong, which reads as follows:

Communist China said today its Air Force shot down two U.S. fighter planes in a dogfight just over the Chinese border from North Vietnam, but in Salong a U.S. spokesman denied the claim, broadcast by radio Peking.

The broadcast said the U.S. planes, identified as F-4s, “Invaded Chinese air space.”

“I have no indication that any aircraft ‘Invaded Chinese air space’ or that any aircraft were shot down,” said a U.S. spokesman.

He did not say they were not; he just says, “I have no indication they have been shot down.”

The dispatch continues:

“It can find absolutely nothing to substantiate this. I can find no report that would even remotely indicate this.”

A denial to a Communist broadcast by the U.S. command is rare. Normally, the command backs up reports, even on claims by Hanol or Peking or other Communist outlets.

Radio Peking said the dogfight took place yesterday.

That was the same day we attacked the airfields, was it not?

Mr. MCGOVERN. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It continues:

“The planes flew into China’s Kwangsi Province, a Chinese Air Force unit immediately engaged them and ‘destroyed both of them,” the dispatch said.

It proclaimed the battle an “important victory” for Communist Party Chairman Mao Tse-tung’s pro-leterian cultural revolution.

Of course, there have been reports similar to that before, which I believe would have been eventually admitted, were they not?

Mr. MCGOVERN. That is right. The Senator is correct.

Relative to the problem of trying to understand the limits of our policy are, I think the Senator will recall that last June, just before we hit Hanoi and Haiphong the first time, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, who is the Army Chief of Staff, delivered a speech in which he made this statement:

“It would be foolish to win the war and destroy North Vietnam’s economic and military capabilities, since this would only double the doubts and the limits of our policy, which the United States would have to ultimately rebuild what it had destroyed.

Of course, it was only 3 or 4 days later that we began doing exactly what General Johnson said it would be foolish to do.

It seems to me that this is just one of the best and most thoughtful speeches I have heard on this subject.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I also wish to join in congratulating the Senator from South Dakota on his excellent speech. I have a question concerning the remark he just made that General Westmoreland, being a soldier, was not free to say what he believed, or had to follow a certain line. While it is true that he has to follow certain lines, my expressions certainly must be my own.

I notice that in the address to the Associated Press in New York, he said:

“We have not yet observed the external aggression from North Vietnam.

There is a great deal of evidence, of course—convincing evidence—that what is not correct and that the United States has taken sides in a civil war. For example, we have, as rather striking evidence, the speech of the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young), who is now presiding over this body. In a speech to the Senate on February 6 of last year, after his return from southeast Asia, he made the following statement:

This is a civil war going on in Vietnam. Before I visited Southeast Asia, I had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were communists and infiltrators from the North. But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days—and during that period of time, I was in every area of the Mekong Delta south of Saigon and observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steering jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam.

Then he went on to say:

I learned from General Westmoreland that the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. I learned from General Stilwell that 70 per cent of the Vietcong fighting the Americans and the South Vietnamese in the Mekong Delta south and west of Saigon were born and reared in that Mekong Delta area. This is a civil war in which we are involved.

I think it is unfortunate that General Westmoreland, who has apparently been brought back here to pep up morale at home, and to counter the rising tide of opinion to the effect that we should fall into the oft asserted and now discredited fal-lacy that this is not a civil war, especially when the distinguished Senator from Ohio heard from General Westmoreland, clips, which was in southeast Asia a year ago, that it was a civil war. I think an explanation of these two conflicting statements from the same source is desirable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to say to the Senator, perhaps somewhat in defense of General Westmoreland, that at least he seems to understand that the war is not going to be won by the bombs dropped from the north. He was talking for more troops on the ground in the south, which would seem to imply a recognition on his part that he knows that it is in the rice paddies of the south where this war, if it is ever resolved, will be resolved.

The best established Vietcong stronghold in Vietnam, as the Senator knows, is a thousand miles away from the North Vietnamese border, in the Delta country of the south, where their greatest strength lies, and where it has been for many years. I think General Westmoreland recognizes that clearly, that someone who seems to think that just by obliterating everything north of the 17th parallel, we can eventually resolve this conflict.

Mr. GRUENING. Yet General Westmoreland is approving this bombing which took place of the Mig airports yesterday; so that would seem to be contrary to the view the Senator ascribes to him that this war will be won on the ground in the South.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I think that again comes back to the fact that the general is, after all, a soldier, who has a boss, the same as the rest of our soldiers. I have tried to make clear, in my remarks earlier, that I think this is the highest admiration for General Westmoreland and our other forces who are there, however much I might deplore the policy which did not carry the decisions which sent them into the Vietnam war.

Mr. President, I have given two of my indictments concerning our Vietnamese policy. I continue with the others, which are:

Third, while orally, calling for nego-
tations, we are practicing military escalation and diplomatic rigidity in such a fashion as to foreclose negotiations.

Fourth. Our policymakers have frequently misled the American public, the result being a serious loss of credibility for the U.S. Government.

Fifth. We are wasting human and material resources needed for the revitalization of the American economy.

Sixth. We are jeopardizing essential U.S. foreign policy interests, including a promising improvement in East-West relations.

Seventh. We bypassed the United Nations until the 11th hour and have disregarded the opinion and the sensibilities of the international community.

Eighth. We are weakening America's moral position and belaboring American idealism.

Ninth. We are creating at home a climate of intimidation designed to silence dissent and meaningful discussion of policy.

This is a grave indictment. I will summarize briefly the facts and arguments which substantiate these charges.

First. The rationalization of our Vietnam intervention is based on the Munich analogy or "the domino theory." At Munich in 1938 the Western allies failed to stand up to Hitler's demand for a plebiscite in Czechoslovakia. The result of this surrender was a series of aggressions leading to World War II. In Vietnam — so the theory goes — we are faced with another Hitler in the form of Ho Chi Minh or perhaps Moscow or Peking working through Ho Chi Minh. If only Ho or his backers can be stopped in Vietnam, we will have averted another Munich and saved mankind from world war III.

As one of our soldiers was reported to have said, according to a newspaper in my State:

We are fighting in Vietnam so we won't have to fight for its survival on the Main Street of Aberdeen, South Dakota.

It is said that if we do not crush Ho, his control of Vietnam will topple such other dominions as Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Burma, Indonesia, Pakistan, Australia, and Japan, and then on to Hawaii and San Francisco. We are left to wonder how a flootilla of Vietnamese or Chinese junks is going to get by the 7th Fleet en route to San Francisco.

This, I think, is a piece of historical nonsense. There is no analogy between Munich and Vietnam, and countries are not dominions.

Ho was a madman commanding the world's mightiest military machine — a machine with the mobility, the offensive power, and the assigned mission of leaping across national frontiers until the world was conquered. At Munich, he directed threatened Czechoslovakia, a highly developed democratic state that was capable of fighting for its survival with any indication of Western support.

Ho Chi Minh, doubtless guilty of many sins, has nevertheless devoted most of his public life to winning independence for his country. A confirmed Marxist, he is more significantly an ardent nationalistic leader, bound less by the claims of internationalism than by Vietnamese nationalism. He is far less interested in what Peking or Moscow want, than he is in what he wants for his own country.

During World War II he stood with the United States against the Japanese and assisted American flyers shot down over Japanese-held jungle areas. With the end of World War II, he used his prestige, with French efforts to regain colonial control of his people. After 8 years of fighting, he defeated the French and emerged a national hero. At the Geneva Conference of 1954 he agreed to end the fighting, withdraw his forces north of a temporary cease-fire line at the 17th parallel, and await an election 2 years hence that doubtless would have led to his election as leader of a united Vietnam. President Eisenhower has written that in 1954 after expelling the French, Ho had the support of at least 80 percent of the Vietnamese people, both north and south.

But the promised elections were blocked by Premier Ngo Dinh Diem whom we were instrumental in installing in South Vietnam. Of equal significance was the sight of Ho cutting off all trade and other relationships with North Vietnam and ruthlessly suppressing his internal opposition.

I remember that the late Bernard Fall, who understood Vietnam, said that the cutting off of trade between the north and south had as much to do in causing the conflict that eventually developed as anything else.

This was the background for the Vietnam revolt in the south, aided by Ho Chi Minh from the north. Although marked by bloodshed and violence, it is scarcely analogous to Hitler's attempted global conquest in moving against international frontiers with a mighty military machine.

The insurrection in Vietnam grew out of local conditions which pitted one group of Vietnamese against another. It was never clear whether such a country as China, or the Chinese more than any other outside power.

Actually, the most powerful force moving in Vietnam as elsewhere in Asia is nationalism against colonial communism. Ho Chi Minh left to his own devices might have united the Vietnamese as an effective buffer against Chinese penetration of southeast Asia. U.S. military victories from Okinawa to Peking, or Moscow, is most likely to draw outside Communist power and influence into southeast Asia. It may even reunite the feuding Communist world.

Since I wrote that statement, there has been all kinds of evidence compiled by our best observers, that that is exactly what is happening. The war is reuniting Peking and Moscow in a common policy and mobilizing the Chinese more than any other outside power.

The destruction of South Vietnamese villages by American bombers and the growing occupation of city and countryside by American forces raises the unspoken specter of a Western-style occupation again and plays into the hands of Communist propagandists all over Asia. In the north, American bombers are pounding away at the North Vietnamese economy and material strength. The resulting chaos or vacuum is hardly calculated to provide a formidable barrier to Chinese penetration.

Third. Our diplomacy before, during, and after the Geneva Conference of 1954 has been narrow and self-defeating. For years we made no effort to negotiate or even offer to negotiate an end to the violence. When Ho Chi Minh indicated in 1964 to the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, that he was ready to talk about a settlement, we rejected this opportunity as we rebuffed other peace feelers before and since. The Johnson administration has insisted it is prepared to embark on "unconditional discussions." Thus, on April 27, 1967, President Johnson said:

I will talk to any government, anywhere, any time without any conditions, and if they doubt our sincerity, let them test us.
When tested, however, as it has been on a number of occasions, the administration has insisted on conditions—and pretty harsh ones at that. Some of the conditions defied logic, in effect, rendered in the condition that the first casualty in wartime. Yet, it is in wartime when the claims of top level officials demand that we:

Fifth. There are other in calculable costs to America and to the world that stem from Vietnam. We are now pumping Federal funds into the war effort at a rate of over $2 billion monthly. This is a serious drain on our balance of payments, our dollar, and our fiscal health. It represents purely urgently needed to help the United States. It is also an intolerable burden to the rest of the world. It is a grievous blow to a democratic society.

Sixth. It may be that the greatest cost of our Vietnam involvement is its regrettable impact on other vital foreign policy interests of the United States. The improved relations with the Soviet Union and with China have been strained. The crisis of 1962 gave promise of a detente between the world's two great nuclear powers. Likewise, the fragmentation of the international Communist bloc opened new possibilities. But the reaction against heavy-handed Chinese interference in Africa, Indonesia, and elsewhere suggested further opportunities for a flexible, flexible strategy.

Seventh. The United States was founded by men who declared our national independence with a deeper concern, that we:

Seventh. The United States was founded by men who declared our national independence with a deeper concern, that we:

Eighth. America's greatest asset in the world has been our democratic tradition, our concept of human dignity, and a humane society devoted to peace. But Vietnam presents a different view of America. Here the world sees America intervening with massive military power—napalm, artillery, and bombing—on a scale heretofore used only against Nazi Germany and Tojo's Japan in the 1940's. American actions in Vietnam, however, are intended, do not square with the image of America that the world has traditionally admired.

In November of 1965, I visited a civilian casualty hospital in Danang near the site of one of our largest airbases in Vietnam. The poorly equipped wards were jammed with terribly burned, broken and torn men, women, and children. It was ghastly. It was said that these were our children, innocent victims of our bombs, napalm, and artillery. They lay silently—one person on each cot—their pained eyes following me as I walked from bed to bed. I wonder that day, when the claims of top level officials prove to be groundless or contradictory, the pressure is on to accept the next problem....
may, in fact, have prompted a much greater war effort by Hanoi. Secretary McNamara himself told a Senate committee: I don't believe that the bombing...has significant...defensive...holding...the actual flow of men and material to the South.

In the south, our bombs have killed or maimed countless innocents and alienated others whose support we need. We have also exhibited...in the south as advocated by Generals Gavin and Ridgway could be pursued...necessary...necessity of a cease-fire...a larger war is enticing and simple.

But before we make that choice, let us...a thousand miles from Saigon...two hundred miles from the gates stand open; but to reclimb the slope and escape to the outer air, this indeed...is a battle for power between Ho Chi Minh of the North and Marshal Ky of the South, but...at...supervise...if we did not need to...that Vietnam is that kind of testing ground of freedom and free world security. It is a confusing civil conflict...with no real certainty as to the issues...local governments...and...it never occurred to me...war would be restricted and a peace would...I wish to point out...Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A moment ago, the Senator from South Dakota made the point that Members of the Senate were slow to recognize what was going on in Vietnam—I know that I am one of those...of aggression from the north, it is essential...the complicity of much of the local peasantry...It never occurred to me, as chairman of the committee, back in 1963 or 1964, that our policy would ever become what it is today or that the war would be allowed to grow as it has.

As the Senator has pointed out, the whole purpose of the presidential campaign in 1964 was to make this point—that the Democratic Party and this administration were committed to no wider war. I campaigned on it, and I am sure the Senator did, on this basis.

It is quite natural, believing that, that we could not have been given warnings of what would result if the war was made wider, because if it would not be made wider, we believed the war would be restricted and a peace would...we hoped, be negotiated. We believed that if the war were restricted, about the only logical conclusion would have been a negotiated settlement. Am I correct?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator's point is well taken.

I involved the Senate in my statement about responsibility...in Vietnam in an attempt to be magnanimous about the matter. I believe that all of us have some responsibility for the course our country has been following.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have often said, both on and off the floor of the Senate, that the action taken on the Tonkin Gulf resolution, which was considered to be a commitment...I did not write it; it was written down-town—was taken under the false im-
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Preussen that there was no intention to do what has been done.

Mr. McGovern. I agree with the Senator and I am going to be very cautious ever again voting for such a resolution.

Mr. Fulbright. When we look back, it is easy to say that was a foolish thing to do, and I agree that it was foolish to have taken the resolution on faith. But I submit that it would have been extremely difficult, under the conditions existing at that time, to have raised the question that this resolution would make the question of election not in; because it would have been done directly against the assurances of the then President of the United States and the candidate for reelection, would it not?

Mr. McGovern. The Senator's point is well taken.

Mr. Fullbright. I believe this point should be kept in mind when we consider what the role of the Senate has been, and that it is up to the Senate is always secondary to any Chief Executive. But if the Senate is not given the facts on which to make judgments, it certainly is at a great handicap in making correct judgments.

Mr. McGovern. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. Kennedy of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGovern. I yield.

Mr. Kennedy of New York. I join some of my colleagues in condemning the Senator from South Dakota on the speech he has made today. I believe it is a very courageous speech. In my own analysis of the situation, and supported by the polls, the position the Senator from South Dakota is taking is not a popular position in the United States. The fact that he will run for political office in 1968, the fact that he makes this speech on the floor of the Senate and takes on these added political problems—these facts cause me to believe that this is one of the most courageous speeches delivered in the Senate since I became a Senator. There is no hedging. There is no effort to avoid the issues or to avoid the questions. He talks about the mistakes that have been made in the past and I believe quite rightly. He does not point to any one President or any one administration. As I said in my speech about a month ago, I speak in the responsibility of all of us, including myself. In any event, the Senator points out that makes recommendations as to what can be done in the future—which, in my judgment, takes much courage. I commend the Senator from South Dakota.

I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota as well as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. For- bess], regarding the state. In any event, the Senator points out that makes recommendations as to what can be done in the future—which, in my judgment, takes much courage. I commend the Senator from South Dakota.

He admitted quite frankly that those two efforts by the Soviet Union had driven the allies and NATO countries—France, Germany, the United States, and England and other countries—very closely together. He said that if they had not been in the past. He said that is what is happening in southeast Asia today. He said:

Through the efforts of the United States, you are accomplishing what we thought was impossible, because you are bringing Communist China and Russia back together again.

I was interested in the statement of the Senator from South Dakota about the destruction in South Vietnam and the casualties. There was a report in the newspapers last week by a representative of the United States that civilian casualties in South Vietnam are about 50,000 a year, and that is a low figure. That is a tremendous responsibility for all of us. These are not civilian casualties in a country that we are fighting against. Again, it is in a country we are allegedly fighting for. These casualties represent men, women, and children who are not involved in the armed services of their country, who are wounded and killed not only partly because of the actions of the United States. Again, this is a tremendous responsibility for our conscience, as public officials and as Americans. Whether we are doing all we should have been doing and can do in this connection, I believe, is a most serious matter.

Describing the Roman campaigns of many years ago, Tacitus, one of their generals, said, "We made a desert and we called it peace."

I believe that what the Senator from South Dakota has said here bears on this very question: if what we are trying to do in Vietnam is to bring about a peace through military action, which is really going to bring about destruction of Vietnam and the people.

I believe the situation of the beginning of the First World War which begins with the serving of an ultimatum by the Austro-Hungarian empire on a small Balkan state. But the reaction of the Russians at that time was that we cannot have the Balkans dominated by a central power. The Germans thought they could not allow the Russians to move into western Germany and mobilization; and then came the confrontation which brought about the deaths of millions of people, the downfall of empires, the rise of the Soviet State, in fact, the destruction of the world order of the early 20th century.

In the beginning of the war, there was a great celebration in Berlin, Paris, and to a lesser extent in Moscow and other capitals. It was said, "We are finally going to war; our manhood is going to be served, and we are going to teach our adversaries a lesson as to which side they are going to be on." But after 3 or 4 years of death and destruction, there was no celebration.

I know in war a country is under strain and stress, and that once our countrymen are being shot at, it is appealing to automatically support that effort and not criticize. I think the courage of the Senator from South Dakota is to be commended. Not that he has all of the answers, because nobody has all of the answers. But if the Senator from South Dakota and touched the conscience of this body and reminded the people of the United States that war is not always the answer, that killing people is not always the answer to our problems, that violence is not the answer; and that for rational men there might be some other solution.

Bolivar once said that we have wars because of the failure of human wisdom. I know that the Senator from South Dakota will try to bring a little wisdom into our deliberations.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Mr. McGovern is granted 10 additional minutes.

Mr. McGovern. I wish to thank the Senator from New York for his stirring words, which mean a great deal to me, and particularly what he had to say about courage involved in a time of war. I especially appreciate those words coming from the Senator from New York who has himself demonstrated great courage not only on this issue but on many other issues.

I am sure it is a hazardous course for anyone to question our policy at a time when we are committed to battle. More and more I suspect an effort will be made by those who are asking any questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, with letting down the troops.

It is my feeling that the most damaging way that we could let down the troops in Vietnam is to quit speaking about a course that we think is leading toward the destruction of tens of thousands of American boys on the Asian mainland. That, it seems to me, is the end result of pursuing the course the administration is now on.

Mr. Kennedy of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGovern. I yield.

Mr. Kennedy of New York. I do not want to take more of the Senator's time. However, is it not really inevitable that after the events of last week, our adversaries in that part of the world will have to take other steps themselves? As surely as we are standing here the Soviet Union, Communist China, and North Vietnam will have to react to what we have done by acting themselves.

Mr. McGovern. This was predicted, a few days ago, by our State Department and the Department of Defense.

Mr. Kennedy of New York. Is it not also inevitable, as surely as we are standing here that when they take that stand our leaders will then appeal to the American people and say, "We cannot accept that and we have to react," and thus appeal to patriotism and love of country. It seems to me that is what is happening here in the early moments that we are standing here today.

Mr. McGovern. I do not see any other possibility.

Mr. Kennedy of New York. We will
take that further step, and they, in turn, will have to take still more steps. If we trace the history of the world is it not a fact that that is how the destruction of mankind is ultimately arrived at? Mr. President, I say that at third world war in that part of the world is inevitable, is an overstatement. But the fact is that we are certainly moving toward a serious escalation and it is clear from the events of the past weeks that that is continuing to come from our side and our adversaries. (At this point, Mr. Scott assumed the chair.)

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is supported by history. In the early 1960's, when our troops crossed the 38th parallel in Korea, that brought a million Chinese soldiers into the war and thousands of Americans men were killed. It seems that we are repeating the same mistakes all over again in a more dangerous situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to emphasize that last point. If the war is widened to include the Chinese, then the question of compromise becomes quite a different one. It is almost as if, in that war, we are certainly moving toward a more dangerous situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is supported by history. In the early 1950's, when our troops crossed the 38th parallel in Korea, that brought a million Chinese soldiers into the war and thousands of Americans men were killed. It seems that we are repeating the same mistakes all over again in a more dangerous situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is supported by history. In the early 1950's, when our troops crossed the 38th parallel in Korea, that brought a million Chinese soldiers into the war and thousands of Americans men were killed. It seems that we are repeating the same mistakes all over again in a more dangerous situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is supported by history. In the early 1950's, when our troops crossed the 38th parallel in Korea, that brought a million Chinese soldiers into the war and thousands of Americans men were killed. It seems that we are repeating the same mistakes all over again in a more dangerous situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is supported by history. In the early 1950's, when our troops crossed the 38th parallel in Korea, that brought a million Chinese soldiers into the war and thousands of Americans men were killed. It seems that we are repeating the same mistakes all over again in a more dangerous situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is supported by history. In the early 1950's, when our troops crossed the 38th parallel in Korea, that brought a million Chinese soldiers into the war and thousands of Americans men were killed. It seems that we are repeating the same mistakes all over again in a more dangerous situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is supported by history. In the early 1950's, when our troops crossed the 38th parallel in Korea, that brought a million Chinese soldiers into the war and thousands of Americans men were killed. It seems that we are repeating the same mistakes all over again in a more dangerous situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is supported by history. In the early 1950's, when our troops crossed the 38th parallel in Korea, that brought a million Chinese soldiers into the war and thousands of Americans men were killed. It seems that we are repeating the same mistakes all over again in a more dangerous situation.
are poised for infiltration across the DMZ zone. That may be an exaggeration. I do not know. There is also talk of building a sort of Maginot Line or Chinese Wall across the southern part of the DMZ to prevent further infiltration. We would have to send additional Army units to reinforce our marines now fighting there. It would seem to me that General Westmoreland is really more urgently needed in the field. I say this at this time and in Washington lobbying for additional forces and urging an escalation of the war. Very likely he is in this country at this time largely for propaganda purposes.

If the President yields to his urgent requests and those of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for 100,000 or 50,000 additional fighting men, does that mean that additional draftees will be sent into battle in South Vietnam, following only 4 months of training, while four divisions of highly trained soldiers, most of them career men, are leading the “good life” in the U.S.? If General Westmoreland is really more urgently needed in the field, why haven’t we sent him there with his officers who never had it so good, living with their families and servants? There are presently more than 250,000 highly trained American fighting men stationed in Southeast Asia and perhaps more than 200,000 of the most part they are volunteers. They are well trained and ready for combat service.

We have, of course, the finest fighting men of our time, but it is not possible to call them present time, and their morale is of the highest. They are the cream of the crop. However, what justification is there for sending draftees to Vietnam while career soldiers are enjoying plushy European assignments? It seems that at the very least those soldiers who have reenlisted one or more times—who have chosen the Army, Navy, or Air Force as a career—should be called upon for combat duty in Southeast Asia before draftees are assigned to Vietnam, except in cases where the special skills of these career men are urgently needed elsewhere, if there are such cases.

It is a fearful thing to add another 100,000 fighting men to combat in the ugly civil war in Vietnam, which we have allowed to become an American war. It is a fearful thing also that Americans are allowed to become an American war.

Mr. GRUENING. Why would you like to ask him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very comprehensive article by the well-known journalist, Theodore Draper, which appears in the current issue of the New York Review of Books entitled “Vietnam: How Not To Negotiate,” which tells an other side of the story, and one which should be told, be included at the conclusion of the Senator’s remarks. It is desirable that this important article be published in the newspapers, and amplified the point he has made as to why there have been no negotiations. It is not true that the other side has adamantly refused to come to the negotiating table. They have given signals, some of which we have ignored, and at other times when those signals have been heeded we have been unable to get both sides to agree about those negotiations to come about by actions which are described in Mr. Draper’s article. This is an important part of the picture. These obstacles to negotiation, coupled with our continuing escalation, may well result in bringing China, or Russia, or both, into the war. I fear our policy may make that impossible. I hope not. But the fact is that it may well result in the other side to come to the negotiating table when those signals had made been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. I appreciate the Senator from South Dakota being granted an additional 10 minutes. I have some questions that I would like to ask him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without commenting on the Senator’s speech in any detail at all, I am going to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not true that it is helpful rather than hurtful to have General Westmoreland here in our Nation, as the commander of our troops in South Vietnam for nearly 3 years, to make his appearance before the news chiefs of the Nation at New York, to come down here and make an appearance before a joint session of the Congress?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Is it not true that it is helpful rather than hurtful to have the Commander in Chief, the President, here in our Nation, as the commander of our troops in South Vietnam for nearly 3 years, to make his appearance before the news chiefs of the Nation at New York, to come down here and make an appearance before a joint session of the Congress?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very comprehensive article by the well-known journalist, Theodore Draper, which appears in the current issue of the New York Review of Books entitled “Vietnam: How Not To Negotiate,” which tells an other side of the story, and one which should be told, be included at the conclusion of the Senator’s remarks. It is desirable that this important article be published in the newspapers, and amplified the point he has made as to why there have been no negotiations. It is not true that the other side has adamantly refused to come to the negotiating table. They have given signals, some of which we have ignored, and at other times when those signals have been heeded we have been unable to get both sides to agree about those negotiations to come about by actions which are described in Mr. Draper’s article. This is an important part of the picture. These obstacles to negotiation, coupled with our continuing escalation, may well result in bringing China, or Russia, or both, into the war. I fear our policy may make that impossible. I hope not. But the fact is that it may well result in the other side to come to the negotiating table when those signals had made been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without commenting on the Senator’s speech in any detail at all, I am going to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not true that it is helpful rather than hurtful to have General Westmoreland here in our Nation, as the commander of our troops in South Vietnam for nearly 3 years, to make his appearance before the news chiefs of the Nation at New York, to come down here and make an appearance before a joint session of the Congress?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Is it not true that it is helpful rather than hurtful to have the Commander in Chief, the President, here in our Nation, as the commander of our troops in South Vietnam for nearly 3 years, to make his appearance before the news chiefs of the Nation at New York, to come down here and make an appearance before a joint session of the Congress?

Mr. HOLLAND. Without commenting on the Senator’s speech in any detail at all, I am going to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not true that it is helpful rather than hurtful to have General Westmoreland here in our Nation, as the commander of our troops in South Vietnam for nearly 3 years, to make his appearance before the news chiefs of the Nation at New York, to come down here and make an appearance before a joint session of the Congress?
stand he is here carrying out his orders, the orders of his Commander in Chief. He is a good soldier, I am sure, who obeys his superiors, following the policies that are laid down by his superiors. I have no criticism of the general in any fashion. I think he is doing the job that he was ordered to do.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the reason Hanoi is staying in the war is because of dissent in the United States. I think that is completely mistaken and misleading. It would be just as easy to say—and I believe this with all my heart—that Hanoi knows very well that the United States is not going to surrender or withdraw from this war. We have a half million men over there, and we are building up our forces all the time, and stepping up the war on a day-by-day basis.

But they have been fighting for 25 years. They are a very determined people; and the experts who have studied people who believe in their cause, as the President knows from previous wars that the other side. A good many of us predicted that generals can have opinions of their own and yield at that point. If he did not believe it, than he could tell the President from South Dakota and my other fellow Senators will all adopt that point of view. If we cannot get a truthful report from our own field, who has been there at the risk of his life every minute for about 3 years, and who is permitted to come over here so that he can communicate with his fellow citizens in the United States, believe in him, and take some comfort from what he tells us, and in some degree formulate our opinions upon what he tells us, as the best possible observer, I think we shall have passed up a tremendously good opportunity to get a much clearer view of what is happening over there than we have had heretofore. I personally welcome his coming. I think it is an advantage for him to come, and so far as I am concerned, I think the President was completely right in approving his coming. I do not think that the President could any more tell him what to say or tell him what to do. I think he has demonstrated what he is all wrong and that they are right; that the President is all wrong and that they are right; that General Westmoreland is all wrong and that they are right; that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are all wrong and that they are right; that Henry Cabot Lodge and other statesmen whom we have all known a long time, and in whom we have great confidence, are all wrong, but they are right.

I think he is very much like the other generals the President, perhaps, is following the Johnson policy and a Johnson policy, we are in even worse shape than I thought. The Senator will remember that the last time we had a prominent general coming back from Vietnam with a Johnson policy and a Johnson policy somewhat different from that of the White House, he got fired. I am thinking about General MacArthur in the Korean war.

I think the presumption is that while General Westmoreland may believe in what he is doing, it is also quite clear that he is carrying out administration policy.

I will say to the Senator that I was somewhat startled when I was in Vietnam in late 1965, at a time when top administration officials were saying that our policy was one aimed at negotiation, and so we were going to negotiate negotiations as soon as possible, to hear every single general officer that I talked with in Vietnam saying they were opposed to negotiations, that negotiations would be a disaster, that it would be a victory for the Vietcong in control of the country. That disturbed me at the time. I have never said anything about it, because I was frankly a little embarrassed to see that kind of inconsistency between what our generals were saying to Senators who were visiting in Vietnam and what the President was telling us, both publicly and privately, here at home.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senate will yield, I think he has demonstrated in what he has just said the fact that generals can be independent. Generals can have opinions of their own and state them frankly.

Mr. McGOVERN. Does the Senator?

Mr. HOLLAND. And that generals will state what they believe. I think that is what General Westmoreland will state. I think he will tell the Senate, if he has the main, with the position of the President, does not mean any more that he is taking directions from the President than that the President, perhaps, is following the advice he gets from him and others. I think he is a good one to give advice. The point I am making is that while I did not hear, and I am sorry—I am sure I did hear some of the parts of what he said, and I gathered the impression that they were very much out of humor with General Westmoreland's coming, that they thought he was somewhat of a Charlie McCarthy, and was saying what someone else told him to say. I think he is very much like the other generals who had been to South Dakota talked to in Vietnam. I think he is too used to serving his country to come here and say what somebody else tells him to say, if he does not believe it. As far as I am concerned, I think this is a wonderful opportunity for our country to get a
Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I see the Senator from Arkansas is on his feet. I hope he will not stand too long. Either way, General Westmoreland will appear before the distinguished committee which he heads, and I hope that the Senator from Ohio, who, while not the chairman of his committee, is a very valuable member of the Committee on Armed Services, will use his utmost persuasive influence to achieve that same result, and have General Westmoreland appear before that committee.

If we think the more rapport we can get, the more advice we can get from a man like General Westmoreland, who is reported to me by the men whom I know best in the service—including one I have known ever since kindergarten days—as being one of our best soldiers and most conscientious Americans at the present time, I want to hear what he says.

I believe he is a good American. I believe too, that he will tell us what he believes from the bottom of his heart and that his information is based upon a much clearer chance to observe than the Senator from Florida has had, or than any other Senator, or any committee of the Senate have had, to observe the actual facts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And he is not running for re-election anywhere.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Anyone who runs for re-election for or against the war in Vietnam is doomed to be disappointed. This is not an issue to be exploited for political purposes.

No Senator who has spoken here today has directed his remarks at re-election. Speaking out on the issues involved in Vietnam, pro and con, is very hazardous, and the Senator knows that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not a fact that the President of the United States is in a most dangerous position because he is carrying out his honest judgment—the following out of his honest judgment on Vietnam has made him politically weak?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I say that the Senator from Ohio think the rest of us are doing but carrying out our honest judgment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is one thing for the President to say that we cannot pull out of Vietnam; it is another thing for others to say that we should pull out. The President is being plagued and hit from every side.

Mr. MCGOVERN. No Senator is suggesting that we pull out of Vietnam. Not a single Senator has suggested that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator says that we should not pull out. What does he propose?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I recommend, and have recommended for 3 years, that we stop widening the war and the sending of more American men in an effort to end a problem that has to be settled by the Vietnamese people.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it not be better to pull out than to let our men sit there and be mowed down by the fire and the bullets of the North Vietnamese? I reaffirm that rather than have our men sit there it would be better that we pull out.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The course I have recommended is the course that is best calculated to save the lives of American men in Vietnam.

The course the Senator from Ohio has recommended is the course designed to lead to a larger war and to the loss of more American lives.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not recommended any course. However, the Senator recommends that we stay there. I insist that if our men are to be required to stay there, we must stop the movement of troops and equipment from the north. I would not stand by for one moment and watch equipment and troops coming in from the north mowing down our men and then tell them, "You stay there. We will not protect you."

That, in my judgment, is not the course to follow.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida first; I shall then yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator for yielding. The Senator from Florida did not rise to create any inflammatory conditions on the floor of the Senate. He rose to make it perfectly clear that he feels that the coming of General Westmoreland to speak to his own people—his fellow countrymen whom he has served all his life since he graduated from West Point—is a wholesome and healthy thing. It is naturally designed to give us the clearest view and the best and most dependable information which we could possibly have.

The Senator from Florida gained the impression from the colloquy to which he listened after he came to the Chamber that there was another position, to the effect that General Westmoreland ought to be back in Vietnam.

I think it is important now for our people to understand better this situation. General Westmoreland comes and tells us that the things that are happening here are making it more dangerous for the half million men we have there, I think he is entitled to be heard.

I am going to listen with great confidence to what he says. He has a much better vantage point than we have had. His life has been long in danger, every minute. I think he has a closer chance to know what the facts are.

I hope that we will utilize his presence by having him appear before our committees and give us the benefit of all the information he has.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. I am not mad at anybody. I think that having General Westmoreland here will be a grand opportunity for us to gain more information on the subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the lead editorial in the Evening Star today, entitled "Westmoreland's Appeal," be printed at this point in the Record.

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

WESTMORELAND'S APPEAL

In his address to the Associated Press managing editors, General Westmoreland was calling for two things—understanding of the Vietnam position and support on the home front. It was an admirable performance, one which should inspire confidence in the man who is responsible for the direction in combat of some 450,000 men.

This general is not a wishful thinker. "The end," he said, "is not in sight. I foresee, in 25 years, the same Vietnam that has inspired some of the bitterest fighting of the war."

But General Westmoreland also spoke with confidence in our military capability. The problem as he sees it is no longer involved with danger of a military defeat. A military victory is beyond the reach of the Communists. This is evidenced, however, with the attitude of some Americans.

"The magnificent men and women I command in Vietnam," he said, "have earned the unified support of the American people."

But a noisy minority denies them this unified support. And our troops are dismayed, as I just indicated, by the clamor on the streets.

What can be done, however, and what General Westmoreland evidently hoped to do, is to isolate this type of demonstration and raise the patriotism and the good sense of the American people.

This is not an issue to be exploited for political purposes. Speaking out on the issues involved in Vietnam, pro and con, is very hazardous, and the Senator knows that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object—

The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore. Will the Senator from Arkansas make his request?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wanted to have an additional 10 minutes. I understood that the Senator from West Virginia had gone to lunch and was in no hurry. I was told that by one of his staff.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, nobody has been authorized to say that I have been waiting here.

The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I would like it clearly understood that the Senator from West Virginia had just arrived and had no way to accommodate. However, I have been waiting for an hour and 15 minutes, and I had an order, just as the distinguished Senator from South Dakota had an order. We have been waiting for two hours, and I have to adjust to. We have a vote scheduled for 2:30 this afternoon.

Some seven other Senators are joining with me in the subject that we shall discuss.
Mr. President, I shall not object.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I will make my remarks as brief as I can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to make one point to correct the impression of the Senator from Florida that there was any criticism of General Westmoreland. There was none whatever, from any point of view. As a matter of fact, I think he inadvertently has rendered a great service.

It is quite clear to me, although no one has said so in such words, that the very fact that General Westmoreland is here and made the kind of speech he did, plus the kind of speech that General Green made, that there is not the slightest significance of the voice of -

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with that statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know how the Senator from Florida can think that General Westmoreland knows what goes on in his jurisdiction. But merely because the general is a great general, I do not accept him as an authority on all subjects which, of course, I am quite ready to admit that only generals know anything about human relations or diplomacy or other nonmilitary activities.

I do not accept him as an authority in every respect.

There is a legitimate difference of opinion as in our best course of action as a nation. It is quite clear, however, that there is a growing implication that dissent will lead to charges of disloyalty and muddleheadedness and then finally to implications of treason. This, I fear, is one of the last times that anybody will have the courage to say anything else about the war.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it would be incomprehensible to me that anybody should accuse any of my distinguished friends of disloyalty or treason because they have a different opinion than others.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are already doing it.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator will agree that they are coming pretty close to that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have assured my good friend on the floor, privately and publicly, that I have respect for people who have convictions and speak them. However, I call attention to the fact that General Westmoreland has access to all of the information that has been adduced from interviewing prisoners of war and defectors from the Vietcong and from North Vietnam, and there are thousands of these. Which of us has access to any of those sources, which are multifarious?

In my opinion, the Commander in Chief, who has been the responsible party for evaluating everything in the field, not only is entitled to have an opinion as to what is most responsible for the adamant attitude of North Vietnam, but also, he probably has the best possible opportunity to have the correct view. At any rate, I believe it is a great service to our people to have an opportunity to hear General Westmoreland, and it will help to clear up these difficulties.

I again say that I hope that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas, who always keeps an open mind, will invite General Westmoreland before his committee. I hope the Committee on Armed Services will do the same. I hope we will all feel free to have conferences with General Westmoreland, because I think he is saying as much as any great general, and he is certainly a patriotic American.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no question about that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that his point of view will be the most valuable contribution to the thinking of our people on the home front that we have had in a long time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Again, I rose in the beginning to make that point, and not to question anybody's attitude.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will now report.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—H.R. 6950—to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

THE LESSONS OF VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. I wish to make two brief observations on the remarks of the Senator from Florida. First, we have the time-honored tradition of the civilian supremacy over the military, which I, for one, hope we never surrender; and, second, let us not forget that even a great general can be wrong.

General MacArthur, in my judgment, was every bit as great a general as is General Westmoreland. Both are great generals. But General MacArthur had access to the same general information that the Senator from Florida says is available to General Westmoreland. General MacArthur was on the home ground, he was involved on the scene, and he assured our President that if he had the authority to take American forces into the Yalu River area, the Chinese would not intervene.

Nevertheless, the Chinese came in, a million strong, and we paid an enormous price. The Senate may review that misjudgment and that miscalculation on the part of a very fine general.

I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I do not commend the Senate for the courage and the candor of the statement he has made today.

I was dismayed to hear the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] intimate that the Senate position may be somehow related to the fact that he is up for reelection. If there is one thing that should be clear—and all of us know it in our hearts—it is that it takes a great deal of political courage to express a dissent over national policy once the country has become involved in war.

There is safety and even favor to be gained in marching in step. But there is obvious political danger involved in expressing dissent. And to try to turn that situation around is little less than appalling to me. So I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his courageous speech.

I should like to ask the Senator two or three questions concerning the bombing, the scope of which has been enlarged by the Senate. The bomber has been in North Vietnam about 2 years. How long has the bombing been going on? Approximately 2 years? Is that not correct?

Mr. McGOVERN. The bombing began in the South, I believe, on February 9, 1965, and began in the North about a week later. As I recall, it was February 16 or 17 of 1965. So has been in progress, in both the south and the north, for a little over 2 years.

Mr. CHURCH. As I recall, the stated objectives of the bombing, announced at the time, were two: first, to interdict the supply lines from the north, and thus to cut off the supply of men and material being infiltrated into South Vietnam; second, to bring pressure to bear upon Hanoi, to persuade Ho Chi Minh to come to the conference table, and thus to terminate the war. Is that not correct?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct. Those were the stated reasons at the time.

Mr. CHURCH. Now, the bombing has gone on for 2 years. What have been the results as acknowledged by spokesmen for the administration itself? First, has the supply of men and material from the north been substantially reduced? Is it not true that actually the supply of men and material has increased during the period of the bombing, rather than having been reduced?

Mr. McGOVERN. My understanding is that the bombing has gone on for 2 years. It has been reported by American forces in North Vietnam, 400 North Vietnam- ees regulars were reported to be south of the 17th parallel. I believe it was said that the neutralization zone was in the 32nd Degree of the Division of the north. There was one conflict even about that. I remember reading reports that we were not sure it was an organized North Vietnamese unit, but they later settled on the figure of 400 men.
Today it is my understanding that a good many thousands of North Vietnamese regulars are fighting in the south. I am not sure what the figure is, but I understand it is many thousands. At any rate, the number who were there when we started the bombing 2 years ago to shut off the infiltration.

Mr. CHURCH. So, on the record, the bombing has failed to accomplish its first objective. Is that not so?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. CHURCH. As to the second objective, there has been any indication whatever, since the bombing commenced, that it is breaking the will of the Hanoi government to persist in the prosecution of the war?

Mr. McGOVERN. Quite the contrary, I believe there has been a hardening of the attitudes of Hanoi toward negotiation.

Harrison Salisbury, who was in North Vietnam—which is not true of General Westmoreland or of any of our field commanders—and other on-the-spot observers have reported that the bombing is doing what bombing usually does: it is hardening the will of those under attack.

Mr. CHURCH. Can the Senator recall any war in which the will of a country has been broken by an aerial assault alone, where bombing in fact has produced the result that we are apparently seeking for it in North Vietnam?

Mr. McGOVERN. The only example might be the atomic bombing of Japan, where the shock was so enormous that it literally paralyzed the Japanese. But no one is suggesting that we use that same approach against the guerrilla fighters in Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. Wherever conventional bombing has been used in the past, as in Korea, as in Germany in the Second World War, the bombing alone has never resulted in either breaking the morale of the bombed people, or destroying the resolve of the bombed government, to persist in its prosecution of the war that it was not true?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct. Certainly, that was true with the bombing of Britain, and with the bombing of Nazi Germany and other countries in World War II.

Mr. CHURCH. In fact, is it not true that it was possible for Hitler to retain control of Germany in a most astonishing fashion until there was nothing left of Germany but the black, smoking, twisted ruins of Berlin, that he remained in charge until he put a pistol to his own head, underground in his bunker in Berlin? And, it was at that moment, the moment he took his own life, that he stopped being dictator of Germany.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. And is it not true that one of the reasons for this remarkable feat ascertained afterwards, was the unifying effect that the bombing had in holding the German people together under Hitler until the Allied armies actually reached Berlin?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Well, that is the record of the past, and I believe it testifies to the fallacy of the contention that the Senator from South Dakota has made on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Idaho. If, few days ago, the delivery of the talk by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], I appreciate his courtesy in yielding the additional time.

Mr. CHURCH. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record several articles and editorials supporting my speech.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials asked to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**FLAT-OUT WAR WINS IN WEST VIETNAM**

*By Arthur Hoppe*

It was in the 38th year of our lightning campaign to wipe the dastard Viet-Ni-C Kampuchean guerrillas out of the country, that the President and his protegearose on how best to save that beleaguered nation for democracy.

Some strategists favored bulldozing a 200-yard-wide "Death Strip" between West Vietnann and East Vietnann. And some strategists favored declaring the entire border between Whar Dat and a "Free Kill Area" in which anything that moved would be blasted.

It was the U.S. military commander, Gen. Zipp K. Zapp, whose clear thinking resolved the issue. "Both plans have merit in our unending struggle to save our beloved allies," he said thoughtfully.

"Let's stop talking and start doing." "Do what, sir?" said an aide.

"Do both, dammit," said Gen. Zapp.

And so it was that the entire province of Whar Dat was bulldozed flat and declared "Free Kill Area." Hands Up Don't Move Democracy-Loving Area.

Naturally, such an ambitious undertaking was not accomplished without some carbine-throwing among the Wreeders. Whar Dat, Gen. Ngo Mahn Ngo, dictated an eloquent letter of protest to his Premier, Gen. Cao Chong. The letter was never transcribed as Gov. Ngo succumbed to an uncontrollable urge to scratch his left ear while seeking a phrase. This drew an immediate response from 43 Strategic Air Command bombers. And Ngo Mahn Ngo was gone.

This ended the protest movement in Whar Dat. In fact, it ended all movement.

"I am proud to report that the province of Whar Dat, for the first time in 38 years, is free from any foreign interference and thus secure for democracy," Gen. Zapp reported proudly to the President. "President," Gen. Zapp added, "I think you've found a way out of this scrape we're in," said the President jubilantly. "Keep scribbling." Thus it was that the bulldozers ground forward to the next province, Opp Krik, and scraped that clean, too. Victoriously moving on, they had flattened half of West Vietnann by the nightfall, leaving the Government zone delighted with the new strategy.

"This is getting to be the cleanest war we ever fought," said the President.

"Our pilots have not mistakenly bombed a friendly village in months," the Air Force said happily.

The only person who wasn't absolutely de-lighted was Premier Hoo Dat Don Dar. "I'm not complaining, mind you," he said, "but the Colonel Palace Boys are getting all up with my poor relations from what they used to be the sticks."

He said that just before the bulldozers marched through the Hanoi Palace.

And so it was that peace and total victory came at last to West Vietnann. Our President's friends were lauded as having说服ed the Vietnannian people summed it all up.

"We have honored our commitment to the tide of communism in Asia," he stated, "and made your beloved Vietnann safe for democracy."

There was no question that the President's statements were welcomed by the people. But, none of the seven wanted to make the first move.

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

**COME HOME WITH THAT COONSKIN**

The essence of democracy is that the citizens of a nation shall have the right to vote on the major issues confronting them. The essence of our tragedy in Vietnam is that no such right has ever been exercised, either in Vietnam or in the United States. Vietnam, where the last elected leader was murdered three years ago, our 36-year-old president, Marshal Ky, recently held an "election" that provided only for "respectable" candidates to join in writing a still unwritten constitution. In our own country, the Congress repeatedly voted about its constitutional duty to vote on a declaration of war, the inability of the people to express their free choice has been even more astonishing.

Two years ago, when there were only 23,000 American "advisers" serving with the Vietnannians, and which, to John F. Kennedy's statement that "in the final analysis it's their war," Barry Goldwater, expressed a great many people by advocating such drastic measures as bombing Communist bases in North Vietnam.

The Democrats promptly produced television commercials strongly implying that a vote for Goldwater was a vote for World War III. "We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home," said President Lyndon Johnson, "to do what Aslan boys ought to be doing to protect themselves."

"Never had so many Americans cast their votes for war," the President said, "yet, before us, peace, than President Johnson adopted the Goldwater policy as his own. Now that he was more than half through, he suddenly "do what Aslan boys ought to be doing," now that 5,630 of them have been killed, now that 10,000 have been dropped, now that the Vietnamese, and when we still adhered to the issue.

"Both sides are fighting for democracy," said Gen. Zapp.

"And so it was that the entire province of Whar Dat was bulldozed flat and declared "Free Kill Area." Hands Up Don't Move Democracy-Loving Area.

Naturally, such an ambitious undertaking was not accomplished without some carbine-throwing among the Wreeders. Whar Dat, Gen. Ngo Mahn Ngo, dictated an eloquent letter of protest to his Premier, Gen. Cao Chong. The letter was never transcribed as Gov. Ngo succumbed to an uncontrollable urge to scratch his left ear while seeking a phrase. This drew an immediate response from 43 Strategic Air Command bombers. And Ngo Mahn Ngo was gone.

This ended the protest movement in Whar Dat. In fact, it ended all movement.

"I am proud to report that the province of Whar Dat, for the first time in 38 years, is free from any foreign interference and thus secure for democracy," Gen. Zapp reported proudly to the President. "President," Gen. Zapp added, "I think you've found a way out of this scrape we're in," said the President jubilantly. "Keep scribbling." Thus it was that the bulldozers ground forward to the next province, Opp Krik, and scraped that clean, too. Victoriously moving on, they had flattened half of West Vietnann by the nightfall, leaving the Government zone delighted with the new strategy.

"This is getting to be the cleanest war we ever fought," said the President.

"Our pilots have not mistakenly bombed a friendly village in months," the Air Force said happily.

The only person who wasn't absolutely de-lighted was Premier Hoo Dat Don Dar. "I'm not complaining, mind you," he said, "but the Colonel Palace Boys are getting all up with my poor relations from what they used to be the sticks."

He said that just before the bulldozers marched through the Hanoi Palace.

And so it was that peace and total victory came at last to West Vietnann. Our President's friends were lauded as having说服ed the Vietnannian people summed it all up.

"We have honored our commitment to the tide of communism in Asia," he stated, "and made your beloved Vietnann safe for democracy."

There was no question that the President's statements were welcomed by the people. But, none of the seven wanted to make the first move.

[From the Saturday Evening Post]
President Johnson, now that he has approved attacks on the Hoa Lac and Kep airfields, could order bombing of the other MiG fields. This would be a further indication of U.S. determination.

North Vietnam's leaders must make the decision whether to risk further attacks or whether to negotiate. They also would limit the time the short-ranged Vietnamese jets could spend in the air over their own country. North Vietnam planes cannot fly as far as halfway from China, 225 miles northwest of Hanoi.

The United States, aid with North Vietnam's bases are near Hanoi—Haolac 19 miles west of the city and Thanhhoa 25 miles northwest of Hanoi. The North Vietnamese MiG bases at Phuuyen and Gia Lam near Hanoi, Cathi at Halphong, and Quang at Tho Quang in northern Vietnam, near Thanhhoa was bombed while it was under construction.

Military leaders would have preferred bombing all the operational MiG fields at once rather than let the North Vietnamese concentrate their anti-aircraft defenses at the time.

But President Johnson, evidently preferred to escalate the war more gradually. If he had attacked all the other MiG bases in the coming weeks, Hanoi would have little choice but to move its MiGs into China.

In fact, the defensive character of the MiGs long had been an argument for not bombing their bases. They were not related to the war, but were for national defense, according to this argument.

Another worry is that against bombing the MiG fields was that the fighters were not enough of a nuisance to justify the intercept enemy bombers. As such it has a longer range than the MiGs, but was for national defense, accord- ing to this argument.

Another worry is that against bombing the MiG fields was that the fighters were not enough of a nuisance to justify the intercept enemy bombers. As such it has a longer range than the MiGs, but was for national defense, accord- ing to this argument.

In fact, the defensive character of the MiGs long had been an argument against not bombing their bases. They were not related to the war, but were for national defense, accord- ing to this argument.

The Pentagon said yesterday that Air Force F-4 fighter-bombers destroyed "up to nine MiGs" on the ground at Hoa Lac while parrying short range. Moving its bases to 20 MiGs at Kep. This, according to the latest Pentagon estimate, leaves North Vietnam with between 40 and 50 MiGs of various types, including some modern Mig 21s.

Both the bombed air fields are near Hanoi—Haolac 19 miles west of the city and Thanhhoa 25 miles northwest of Hanoi. The North Vietnamese MiG bases at Phuuyen and Gia Lam near Hanoi, Cathi at Halphong, and Quang at Tho Quang in northern Vietnam, near Thanhhoa was bombed while it was under construction.

Military leaders would have preferred bombing all the operational MiG fields at once rather than let the North Vietnamese concentrate their anti-aircraft defenses at the time.

But President Johnson, evidently preferred to escalate the war more gradually. If he had attacked all the other MiG bases in the coming weeks, Hanoi would have little choice but to move its MiGs into China.

In fact, the defensive character of the MiGs long had been an argument against not bombing their bases. They were not related to the war, but were for national defense, accord- ing to this argument.
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Going back over the course of events from 1945—the struggle against the French, the victory at Dienbienphu, the Geneva settlement, and so on—the idea that the movement toward a political struggle to warfare—it seemed to me—that Hanoi’s ambition had undergone great changes, at least, as late as 1958 or 1959, I thought that the North Vietnamese and other Asian Communist leaders, like Ho Chi Minh, who had been thinking in grandiose terms. They had dreamed of the creation of a great Asian Communist movement which would have the material means, and possibly even the kind of victory at Dienbienphu, the Geneva settlement, which would have helped General Giap to succeed at Dienbienphu. The fuller of the movement would be Vietnam. There was every reason for Hanoi to have thought in Vietnam favored the North and that the Communist regime would spread from Vietnam and possibly from there to Laos and Cambodia.

This was a long dream and possibly more a dream than a war in those years. But with the steady rise of conflict within the Communist world and the country was to spread and become more real 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 the United States seemed to make it more likely that the whole world Communist movement radically, and no Communist regime was more in the mind of the Communists in the Communist world.

During this period, however, it was still possible for Hanoi to dream of what political domination of Vietnam was capable of doing. A closer partnership with the United States, and Communist China was also possible. Indeed, the Chinese were prepared to support Hanoi, and China had already worked out the tactics on their present hysteria almost any act of Peking’s could be interpreted in Peking as a threat to China’s security. Peking might lead the world to its present hysteria almost any act of Peking’s could be interpreted in Peking as a threat to China’s security. Peking might lead the world to nuclear catastrophe.

And the 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 prided itself on its theories about the inevitability of American nuclear assault, the wiping out of American cities, and the destruction of all of China’s large cities. Peking thought this would merely create a trap (killing, in this case, if you can call it killing) and Peking might lead the world to nuclear catastrophe.

The European Communists were familiar with this Chinese thinking. They were phobic of American cities, and Peking had prepared a strategy for dealing with the nuclear devastation of China. Peking prided itself on its theories about the inevitability of American nuclear assault, the wiping out of American cities, and the destruction of all of China’s large cities. Peking thought this would merely create a trap (killing, in this case, if you can call it killing) and Peking might lead the world to nuclear catastrophe.

The European Communists were familiar with this Chinese thinking. They were phobic of American cities, and Peking had prepared a strategy for dealing with the nuclear devastation of China. Peking prided itself on its theories about the inevitability of American nuclear assault, the wiping out of American cities, and the destruction of all of China’s large cities. Peking thought this would merely create a trap (killing, in this case, if you can call it killing) and Peking might lead the world to nuclear catastrophe.
so even there was a grave impediment. It could not occur to me, directly lest this provoke the very intervention and reprisals by the Chinese of which it was most fearful. At this stage of the war, the United States was faced with the worry that Peking was apt to intervene forcibly—by closing the frontier and cutting off supplies, by bringing political pressure to bear within the Vietcong, that the Government was sending in the "volunteers" to shift the balance toward war. It was important for me going to Hanoi that the only effective method of exploring the possibilities of negotiation was by private, complete secret talks, far from the spotlight. I would seek to see the futility of publicized techniques. Some efforts occurred while I was in Hanoi. The British Foreign Secretary, Anthony 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 bastion of imperialism and that they were bombing North Vietnam. It was incredible bumbling. Or possibly it was not intended, but 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. They were all well-intentioned, but I was sure that Hanoi would refuse them. There was no doubt in my mind that de Gaulle was well regarded in Hanoi. But the attitude of the United States toward this possibility they much preferred such a delicate business to be carried on without the intervention of third parties. They had had considerable experience with such talks. And 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 would have 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 genuine willingness by the other side to see what each side was doing. They would not have talked. And this was the real turning point. I returned to the United States, it was possible for me to talk to Washington with the same frankness, the same candor, that had marked my conversations in Hanoi. It seemed obvious both in Hanoi and in Washington that each side was aware of the critical situation, compelled to renew the war inevitably follow. If the talks stalled and agreement was not reached, the political and military situation would become untenable.

I returned from Hanoi convinced that the moment was appropriate to restore the Front at the negotiating table. The existing coalition government of Marshal Ky was our alternative, and while we had not coalesced our various objectives, our inclinations naturally went toward the Saigon Government, with all its faults rather than toward Hanoi, 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 the public record or even to agree to it in the first flush of private discussion. But both sides seemed to feel that the period for reinforcement and regrouping, which would then halt the period of rapid advance in standards of living and the rate of infiltration in the North might enter into talks simply to utilize the time to hasten the rapid advance. This would bring an inevitable turn toward radical expediency. On the American side, the military factor could be followed through the question of the escalation to higher and higher force levels. What specifically would we do? I was in no position to guess. But the speculation in Washington now showed that our intentions were primarily to resist the intensification of bombing, sustained air attacks on Hanoi, blockade or bombing of Chinese ports. The 1965 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 the time limit of what the French call "l'intervention passee." It is a moment of time that had a turning point at a turning point was an understatement.

I returned from Hanoi convinced that a settlement had to be found by negotiation, that the talks laudatory statements held to cut its military links to Peking and to ease the pressures on Hanoi enormously. The divisions within the Vietminh Front had spelled this out to include the Vietminh Front at the negotiating table. The existing coalition government might be constructed? Would a coalition government possess durability? Would it be a coalition government? It was a difficult and complex task. But that the in­ credible fighting morale there 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 on many occasions, only a few months earlier, in the late spring and early summer in 1966, in a trip which led me all the way from Saigon to Moscow. I had seen the impression then that the establishment of a secure and comparatively stable Southeast Asia might be impossible on terms whichmade Washington's political and economic aid possible. As I understood our objectives in Southeast Asia, they comprised the following:

We had no territorial aspirations in Viet­ nam and none in Southeast Asia. We had no desire to remain in South Vietnam or any part of Vietnam. We desired to withdraw from the Communist regime of North Vietnam. We acce­ pted the continuance of Ho and his success­ ors in the South. 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 dominated by Communist. The regime would be non-Communist-threatened, but we did not mean that this regime necessarily not by Communist. It would have to be based on a multiparty democ­ ratic system, which might be led by the Communists. It would have to be elected in free and fair elections. It would have to be a regime which would respect human rights for all parties, neutral foreign policy, and the rule of law.

We desired to reduce the Communist threat to all Southeast Asia and to increase the probabilities of the success of the Geneva agreements. We did not want to see the collapse of Laos. We did not want to see the war in 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 established, to redeploy our forces and to offer economic and technical assistance on a massive scale, which would probably include economic and technical assistance on a massive scale, which would probably include military as well as economic support.

I 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 appeared to me that on the basis of my conversations with representatives of the Saigon Government and of the National Liberation Front of Vietnam's constituent governments, we could coordinate reasonably well in fulfilling them.

If a public record went forth, the chief difficulty concerned the future status and regime of South Vietnam. The problem centered on Hanoi's support of the Front as a substitute for Vietnamese non-Communist. We did not recognize the Front, although we had said cryptically that there would be no alignment with or support for the Front at the negotiating table. The existing Saigon Government of Marshal Ky was our ally, record, and while we had not coalesced our various objectives, our inclinations naturally went toward the Saigon Government, with all its faults rather than toward Hanoi, with which we had done mortal combat.
The situation had developed in an inappropriate manner for the achievement of aims which had been far beyond the horizons of possible diplomacy a year earlier. It was an aim of the United States, and of the South Vietnamese States, one which might not recur and which might slip away in certain eventualities, such as a victory in 1966. It seemed to me that Laos represented an equally dangerous problem. Laos had been strengthened by the recognition of its independence and by the hands of an uncertain number of guerrillas, operations, some sponsored by the United States, some by the Communists, and some by purely Laotian groups. Unless Laos could be quieted and sanitized, the whole theater of struggle might simply shatter. It was a matter which, I thought, would undermine the area dangerously, Cambodia had mingled more than it was prepared for it, but it needed economic and probably political support as well as some economic and probably political support as well. I thought that it was a matter which might not recur and which might slip away in certain eventualities, such as a victory in 1966.

For those who believed along these lines, I had no doubt that many thoughtful men—men who had considered these ideas—there was nothing more strongly to be resisted than talk of peace or of ending the war. The time had come, it seemed to me, to tell the President to turn the job over to the diplomats. So they called for more of what, and how much of that? I was not certain that Washington could be ready to the application of military power to Laos. It seemed preposterous to suppose that such a nation as the United States, with its huge resources, could not handle Laos. I thought that it was a matter which might not recur and which might slip away in certain eventualities, such as a victory in 1966.
would manage to reign supreme? What of neighboring Laos and Cambodia? Would not total defeat in Vietnam, and then in Laos and Cambodia, create a situation in which for a hundred years we would be committed to maintain costly and perilous relations with the memories 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 mind, the arguments ran strongly toward an effort at negotiation. The task of negotiating a durable Southeast Asian settlement was difficult. But it was clear that on any of the diplomatic engagements on any single point, the kind which would be a monument to the statesmanship of the man who accomplished it, something far beyond the transient triviality of some many postwar diplomatic settlements. This could be the forecast of the human era. 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 real defeat in Vietnam, even if it were to be followed by weeks of fancy diplomatic posturing, by months of fancy diplomatic posturing, by years we would be committed to it or the consequences that flowed from it. It may even have passed the point of whatever passing crises might come to it.

There was a hope that the immediate crisis could be ended by negotiating a durable settlement. The first, second, and fourth points of the Geneva conference of 1954 could be re-convened. In the surface, none of these four points appeared to be an insuperable obstacle to some form of peaceful negotiations. In his original letter to the Senate Relations Committee on February 18, 1966, Secretary of State Rusk said that the United States could accept three of the four points, that the only exception he took was to the third, which he called the "core of the Communist position," and his arguments were so cogent that Secretary Rusk had to engage in one of his most tortuous intellectual exercises.

Instead of being content, for diplomatic purposes, with the four points of the Geneva conference of 1954, as meaning no more and no less than what it said, he chose to reinterpret it according to the program of December 1965 issued in the heyday of Ngo Dinh Diem's regime. By this means Secretary Rusk sought to convince the committees that Pham Van Dong's third point implied prior recognition of the National Liberation Front as "the sole spokesman for the people of South Vietnam." This would have been acceptable, however, Secretary Rusk had to engage in one of his most tortuous intellectual exercises.

The December 20, 1960, "action program" of the NLF called for a "broad coalition government and with universal suffrage elect a new National Assembly. Freedom of expression, press, assembly, association, travel, religion, and other democratic liberties will be promulgated. Religious, political, and patriotic organizations will be permitted freedom of activity regardless of beliefs and tendencies," etc. The entire document may be found in Douglas Pike, The Viet Cong pp. 344–47, which devote an entire chapter to tracing the various changes in the NLF's programmatic efforts (pp. 344–71). There is a somewhat different but similar publication in Benjamin Pike, The Vietnam News, pp. 449–55. It may be argued that the NLF program was democratic window-dressing to lure the greatest number of anti-Diem followers to the fold. It certainly was not an outright bid for sole Communist control. Secretary Rusk refers to the NLF program as "innocuous. A lengthy, diffuse, and essentially moderate political mosaic, carefully contrived to appeal to the greatest number and variety of anti-Diem elements, that it could have been used as a basis of negotiations without committing anyone to anything very much in advance." Unfortunately, no one on the Senate side was sufficiently familiar with the document to take it seriously enough to challenge the Secretary's fanciful exegesis.

In the United States, the NLF had styled itself "the only genuine representative of the fourteen million South Vietnamese people," a type of claim even democratic politicians in the United States could accept. But Pham Van Dong had made the issue the NLF's nebulous "program," designed to be all things to all men, a program which ostensibly stood in the way of accepting the genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam and engage in negotiations with it.

Whatever significance this hardening of the North Vietnamese position may have had in 1966, it was not at issue in 1965 except to the extent that American diplomacy chose to give the most extreme interpretation to Pham Van Dong's third point, the only one that was of any importance.

It may be suspected that the real reason for increasing the war effort was military. In April 1965, the United States feared the total collapse of the South Vietnamese military front. Experience has shown that diplomacy, no matter how sophisticated, however their "basis" may be, tend to reflect the relative positions of power. This is, in my view, why the American government in 1965 per­


ducted to engage in negotiations at that time. The American ability to bring its own "hardcore" to the bargaining table was relatively as balance, however, may easily have given the Communist side pause and forced it to negotiate for less than the existing balance of forces within South Vietnam seemed to indicate. In any case, negotiations in the first half of 1965—the last time they might have had a chance of solving the Viet Nam impasse—were desisted of irresolvable positions that were virtually mirror images of each other—of a Na­

The Viet Nam war again seemed bound to begin in the final months of 1965 and continue on both sides. It may even have passed the point of no return and may settle down as a grim, prolonged war. The Communist equivalent of the old-fashioned "war of attrition." If so, the fatal turning point came in February 1967, preceded and followed by weeks of fancy diplomatic footwork, false hopes, and phony peace formulas. As each move and maneuver comes into the news, it tends to live a life of its own, divorced from the events which led up to it or the consequences that flowed from it. It may seem even to India.

The basic North Vietnamese position went back to the four-point program enunciated by Pham Van Dong in February 1965. This had called, in substance, for (1) withdrawal of all United States military forces from South Vietnam, (2) neutralization of both South and North Vietnam, (3) settlement of South Vietnam's internal affairs "in accordance with the program" of the Geneva conference of 1954, and (4) peaceful reunification. Pham Van Dong had offered it as "the basis for the soundest political settlement of the Vietnam problem." If this basis were recognized, he said, "favorable conditions" for the peaceful settlement of the problem would be created and an international conference "along the pattern of the Geneva conference of 1954 could be reconvened.

In the surface, none of these four points appeared to be an insuperable obstacle to some form of peaceful negotiations. In his original letter to the Senate Relations Committee on February 18, 1966, Secretary of State Rusk said that the United States could accept three of the four points, that the only exception he took was to the third, which he called the "core of the Communist position," and his arguments were so cogent that Secretary Rusk had to engage in one of his most tortuous intellectual exercises.

Instead of being content, for diplomatic purposes, with the four points of the Geneva conference of 1954, as meaning no more and no less than what it said, he chose to reinterpret it according to the program of December 1965 issued in the heyday of Ngo Dinh Diem's regime. By this means Secretary Rusk sought to convince the committees that Pham Van Dong's third point implied prior recognition of the National Liberation Front as "the sole spokesman for the people of South Vietnam," which he said should control the Vietnamese military front. Experience has shown that diplomacy, however, may easily have given the Communist side pause and forced it to negotiate for less than the existing balance of forces within South Vietnam seemed to indicate. In any case, negotiations in the first half of 1965—the last time there might have had a chance of solving the Viet Nam impasse—were desisted of irresolvable positions that were virtually mirror images of each other—of a Na-
From this and other statements and incidents later that year—including records of a February 1964 meeting in which McNamara expressed a troubled conscience over the State Department’s handling of U Thant’s peace efforts—the U.S. government was made unmistakably clear. First, the impression was created early that there was nothing, and no one with whom, to negotiate. This position was gradually conditioned to mean that the United States had to be previously convinced of the other side’s intentions being “serious” and “meaningful.” Fourth, this in turn depended on Secretary Rusk’s “antennae” receiving a “key signal” in advance. Fifth, the “key signal” was nothing less than the other side’s precedent undertaking “to stop trying to impose their will by force on South Viet­nam.” That is, to agree to unilateral renunciation of the armed struggle. No doubt mere words would not have carried conviction with Mr. Rusk and the enemy would have had to satisfy some test of deeds to get the “key signal” through to his antennae.

In conclusion, the key issue increasingly became the cessation of American bombing of Vietnam. When North Vietnam was clearly ready to stop bombing, the more determined the North Vietnamese were to stop it before entering into anything resembling negotiations.

But the United States again demanded a price, this time for stopping the bombing, and henceforth the American negotiating position hinged on the concept of “reciprocity.” Throughout 1966, American spokes­men tried to define this accordion-like term. Secretary Rusk in August 4, 1966, said: “He usually demanded that the ‘other side’ had to give up its ‘aggression’ or ‘abandon the Vietnam problem under American force’ in return for a cessation of the bombing.” In the summer of 1966, President Johnson seemed to put forward a more consistent negotiating position. In late November, the United States had offered to stop the bombing immediately “if they will stop sending troops into South Vietnam.” This seemed to imply that North Vietnam did not have to withdraw troops, but the President went on to observe that the South Vietnamese could not decide the kind of government and country they wanted “while armed troops from North Vietnam are waging war against their people and against our forces.” He suggested that he expected far more than a cessation of North Vietnamese reinforcements exchange for a cessation of the bombing.

The various formulas employed in this period were simultaneously effective in conveying to North Vietnam considerable leeway in making known its decision to satisfy the American demand, but the same defect remained in the foreign policy confines to be “unconditional.”

The circumstances tend to support the assertion of Rowland Evans and Robert Novak that the reference to “unconditional” discussions, or the use of the Peace Bloc that amazed those who had seen the earlier version of the speech (January 30, 1966), added to the war establishment’s experience in making the key point—by McNamara’s references to Vietnam as “a serious and difficult problem,” the United States had assented virtually no one in South Vietnam. II

The American negotiating position can be traced back to April 1965. Until that time, the United States did not realize the national position because it did not believe in negotiations as a means of ending the war. After Secretary Rusk spoke disparagingly: “What is there to be negotiated? Who is going to negotiate, and to what end?” the complaints that what was missing was “some sort of recognition of the facts” indicates that a satisfactory basis of settlement can be found. A British correspondent, commenting on the same day, to an appeal from seventeen nations for negotiations without preconditions. It was probably too late for a satisfactory basis of settlement.

It was to look for an “antenna” and to be negotiated? Who is going to negotiate, to what end? Whether a different policy could be held, however, the American bomb­ing offensive was suddenly stepped up. On December 8 and 9, the United States dropped 10,000 tons of bombs in the area of Re'Neill and Puebla, 35 miles from the heart of Hanoi and a truck­ing depot only five were heavily attacked—Robert R. S. Robert Lodge had permitted the bombing of targets outside the limits of the North Vietnamese capital. For the next two weeks, a debate raged whether the Americans had demonstrated a will toiever to civilians, or to civilians. More significant per­

It took almost two weeks for American of the kind of arms admission that had caused civilian casualties as well as widespread damage to civilian areas, and the American bombing offensive of December 8 and 9, 1966, had published Harrison Salisbury’s eye-witness report of such dam­age. At this time, American officials still stressed that the bombs were aimed at “military targets,” that the civilian casualties were incidental, unavoidable, and, above all, not “deliberate.” On December 30, 1966, the military correspondent of The New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, disclos­ed that “United States ordinance is being used in the cordoned-up areas of Hanoi at an annual rate of about 500,000 tons, some­what more than the Army Air Forces ex­perience in the period December 1942-1945 World War II.” At this rate, which soon rose sharply, the problem arises whether the moral equation here is, to my mind, double bookkeeping. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else—“deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation. One who fires a machine gun into a crowd in order to kill a single person can hardly protest that he did not mean to injure anyone else “deliberately”—especially if he misses his intended victim. The moral consequence of the seriousness of the consequences are not more important than the delibera­tion of the motivation.
haye, but still unknown to the general public, was the fact that the bombings had abruptly cut short a seemingly promising peace move. The change of heart came about as a result of something that had occurred in somewhat similar circumstances exactly a year before.

The sequence of events was handled in a most peculiar way. At a news conference on February 2, 1967, President Johnson gave the impression that the "other side" had somehow been "forced" to make some move toward peace. At one point he said that he was not "aware of any serious effort"; at another he spoke of what "could happen"; and at still another that they had "not taken any [step] yet." On February 4, the President's Special Assistant, Professor Rostow, commented, "I think it would be as saying we have a serious offer to negoti- tate." One would be justified in interpreting these words to mean that some kind of "pre-negotiating" moves had been going on, and that what Cardinal Dulles had called the "peace plan" turned out to be a secondhand version by a French Foreign Ministry official.

Finally, on February 7, Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain reported that he knew all about "events in December" relating to what he referred to as "Polish discussions" and that he had been caused by a "very considerable two-way misunderstanding," the nature of which he did not specify. The Australian Communist journalist Waltair G. Gough later disclosed that these conversations had been "foiled" by the bombings of December 13-14. If, as Prime Minister Wilson had claimed, the problem had been caused by a "misunderstanding," the question still remained, why, with so much at stake, it could not have been rectified and the "peace plan" turned out to be a negotiating process.

For a time, indeed, it seemed that such an effort was being made. Until the end of 1966, the main obstacle seemed to be Hong's four points, despite the incongruity that three of them were acceptable to the United States and the only objectionable one had to be given the most extreme and deliberate interpretation to make it unacceptable. Early in January 1967, however, the Hanoi leaders appeared to have moved the four points as the main source of confusion and disagreement. In an interview with Italian Premier Dino L. Lamberti, Pham Van Dong referred to them as matters for "discussion" rather than as "conditions" prior to negotiations. At the same time, Secre- tary of State Rusk was quoted as saying that he expected to see these points as a way of bringing it about. According to Burchett, it was "clear as a bell" as to what kind of other steps the other side should take for this suspension of bombing." The President replied, "Just almost any step," though he had previously stressed the word "serious" rather than "any."--another acco- rdance that used terms--the latter received much publicity and was helped by the United States to create an atmosphere of goodwill that might have turned out to be a negotiating process, to use Professor Rostow's later words. (The complete correspondence may be found in the Department of State Bulletin, January 3, 1966, pp. 11-18.)

The peace approach. Oddly, circumstances had shown little promise of success. On the Washington Post's version on the ground that "this is an extremely interesting and delicate phase in what is or might turn out to be a negotiating process." But by then he, too, made "serious" the key word in the American attitude to such situations: "I'm think it would be as saying we have a serious offer to negoti- moral enormity on the scale of 6,000,000 Hiroshima deaths, could not be denied the world not because a bomb was used but because of unprecedented destructiveness. If there was a new beginning between two terror and an atomic or nuclear bomb, we have already prepared the ground, psychologically and morally, for using weapons of unprecedented power.

On November 11, 1965, two well-known Italian visitors to Hanoi, one of them the former Mayor of Manchester, were received by Ho Chi Minh and Pham Van Dong. They went away with what they regarded as a statement of two conditions considered necessary by the North Vietnamese for peace negotiations: (a) a total cease-fire in North and South Vietnam, without the prior evacuation of any United States troops, and (b) acceptance without the key of the Geneva Agreements, and at still another that they had "not taken any [step] yet." On February 4, the President's Special Assistant, Professor Rostow, commented, "I think it would be as saying we have a serious offer to negoti- tate." One would be justified in interpreting these words to mean that some kind of "pre-negotiating" moves had been going on, and that what Cardinal Dulles had called the "peace plan" turned out to be a secondhand version by a French Foreign Ministry official.

Finally, on February 7, Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain reported that he knew all about "events in December" relating to what he referred to as "Polish discussions" and that he had been caused by a "very considerable two-way misunderstanding," the nature of which he did not specify. The Australian Communist journalist Waltair G. Gough later disclosed that these conversations had been "foiled" by the bombings of December 13-14. If, as Prime Minister Wilson had claimed, the problem had been caused by a "misunderstanding," the question still remained, why, with so much at stake, it could not have been rectified and the "peace plan" turned out to be a negotiating process.

For a time, indeed, it seemed that such an effort was being made. Until the end of 1966, the main obstacle seemed to be Hong's four points, despite the incongruity that three of them were acceptable to the United States and the only objectionable one had to be given the most extreme and deliberate interpretation to make it unacceptable. Early in January 1967, however, the Hanoi leaders appeared to have moved the four points as the main source of confusion and disagreement. In an interview with Italian Premier Dino L. Lamberti, Pham Van Dong referred to them as matters for "discussion" rather than as "conditions" prior to negotiations. At the same time, Secre- tary of State Rusk was quoted as saying that he expected to see these points as a way of bringing it about. According to Burchett, it was "clear as a bell" as to what kind of other steps the other side should take for this suspension of bombing." The President replied, "Just almost any step," though he had previously stressed the word "serious" rather than "any."--another acco- rdance that used terms--the latter received much publicity and was helped by the United States to create an atmosphere of goodwill that might have turned out to be a negotiating process, to use Professor Rostow's later words. (The complete correspondence may be found in the Department of State Bulletin, January 3, 1966, pp. 11-18.)

The peace approach. Oddly, circumstances had shown little promise of success. On the Washington Post's version on the ground that "this is an extremely interesting and delicate phase in what is or might turn out to be a negotiating process." But by then he, too, made "serious" the key word in the American attitude to such situations: "I'm think it would be as saying we have a serious offer to negoti- moral enormity on the scale of 6,000,000 Hiroshima deaths, could not be denied the world not because a bomb was used but because of unprecedented destructiveness. If there was a new beginning between two terror and an atomic or nuclear bomb, we have already prepared the ground, psychologically and morally, for using weapons of unprecedented power.

On November 11, 1965, two well-known Italian visitors to Hanoi, one of them the former Mayor of Manchester, were received by Ho Chi Minh and Pham Van Dong. They went away with what they regarded as a statement of two conditions considered necessary by the North Vietnamese for peace negotiations: (a) a total cease-fire in North and South Vietnam, without the prior evacuation of any United States troops, and (b) acceptance without the key of the Geneva Agreements, and at still another that they had "not taken any [step] yet." On February 4, the President's Special Assistant, Professor Rostow, commented, "I think it would be as saying we have a serious offer to nego-
in the last day by "serious and responsible people," one of them, no doubt, Premier Kosygin.

The next point of particular interest in President Johnson's letter is why this proposal was not accepted. It seems to me that the reasons: a halt in the bombing would tell the world that discussions were going on and indicate that the United States would not force North Vietnam to use the halt to "improve its military position." The American counter-proposal was then put forward, which would have given the belligerents very dire eventualities.

I am prepared to order a cessation of bombing against your country and the stopping of infiltration into South Vietnam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and by sea has stopped. These acts of resupply, both sides would realize, would cease.

Thus, at worst, the United States was quite capable of holding its own in the military position. It might have made more sense for North Vietnam to worry about what the United States could do to improve its military position. The President's reply, "then, could hardly be taken seriously."

The second objection raised by President Johnson was more troublesome—but only if South Vietnam could not be accepted. Both sides were capable of improving their military positions in South Vietnam. Moreover, the transport facilities of the United States for South Vietnam are better than those of North Vietnam. Indeed, the Têt truce was actually used by both sides to bring in new equipment and troops. United States officials charged that North Vietnam made an unprecedented effort to move arms and supplies into the South.11 But US Air Force officials in Saigon reported that US cargo planes had carried a one-day record of 2763 tons of equipment to US troops on February 8, the first day of the truce and the very day which the United States had requested to "prove" North Vietnam's military position.

President Johnson did not go farther than to "call attention to..." The first "difficult-questions" the United States terms than United States acceptance of North Vietnam's "resupply effort." The President's reply, "then, could hardly be taken seriously."

On March 15, President Johnson himself began to demonstrate the fact that the enemy's tactics had been adapted to "a war of infiltration, of subversion, of ambush; pitched battle is not, rarely, the primary activity, are they decisive?" It was almost certainly true that North Vietnam would try by all means possible to improve its military position during the truce and thus endanger more American lives; it was questionable whether North Vietnam could improve its position so much or so unilaterally as to change the balance of power in South Vietnam; and it was extremely doubtful whether fewer American lives would be lost by risking an improvement in North Vietnam's military position to get an extension of the truce. President Johnson urged an "indefinite and unconditional" extension of the truce and renewed his offer of a "full-scale halt" to the bombing of North Vietnam, "which, he said, could "bring about a favorable climatic for..." To "prove" the President's reply was only one of three that were placed in the White House and State Department at their request.

Thus, it appears, only three days elapsed between the time Ho Chi Minh received President Johnson's letter in Hanoi and the President's decision to try to "prove" the President's reply was only one of three that were placed in the White House and State Department at their request.
to outside pressures than to their inner convictions. It had taken its allies more than a year to get North Vietnam to talk about the possibility of a cease-fire, and after the Johnson-Kosygin meeting in London. The tenousness of the President's reasoning for the start of the bombing was evident. The Johnson-Kosygin plan could hardly have been attacked for making his proposals; the only thing apparent was strong evidence of the insincerity and Ho Chi Minh's disapproval; Secretary Russek could, in effect, enter a plea of Johnson's proposal, side, the Senator's alleged sins. The first impulse of the State Department was evidently to embrace the Senator's proposals to death.

The Johnson-Russek correspondence became known, Secretary Russek's line of defense seemed to have been based on the assumption that the truth would not come out publicly. On February 27, President Johnson described, with uncharacteristic understatement, the three new military actions of the preceding five days as a "step up" and "more far-reaching." He repeated a point in these terms: "Our principal objective is to provide the maximum deterrent to people who believe aggression pays with no minimum cost to us and to them." As always, the "maximum deterrent" and "minimum cost" had been forced up to higher and higher levels. Though he had not concealed his misgivings, Senator Robert F. Kennedy waited until March 9, 1967, to negotiate for a compromise plan which, according to the Senator, had to be accepted as a whole; it did not satisfy the North Vietnamese "infiltration" into South Vietnam, was made in mid-February, but unfavorable weather conditions and technical preparations had delayed the operation far longer than was predicted. The United States was constrained to make some gesture at the tenure of the President's reasoning for the start of the bombing without the consent of the President. The President's reasoning for the start of the bombing was evident. The Johnson-Kosygin meeting in London. The tenousness of the President's reasoning for the start of the bombing was evident. The Johnson-Kosygin plan could hardly have been attacked for making his proposals; the only thing apparent was strong evidence of the insincerity and Ho Chi Minh's disapproval; Secretary Russek could, in effect, enter a plea of Johnson's proposal, side, the Senator's alleged sins. The first impulse of the State Department was evidently to embrace the Senator's proposals to death.

The Johnson-Russek correspondence became known, Secretary Russek's line of defense seemed to have been based on the assumption that the truth would not come out publicly. On February 27, President Johnson described, with uncharacteristic understatement, the three new military actions of the preceding five days as a "step up" and "more far-reaching." He repeated a point in these terms: "Our principal objective is to provide the maximum deterrent to people who believe aggression pays with no minimum cost to us and to them." As always, the "maximum deterrent" and "minimum cost" had been forced up to higher and higher levels. Though he had not concealed his misgivings, Senator Robert F. Kennedy waited until March 9, 1967, to negotiate for a compromise plan which, according to the Senator, had to be accepted as a whole; it did not satisfy the North Vietnamese "infiltration" into South Vietnam, was made in mid-February, but unfavorable weather conditions and technical preparations had delayed the operation far longer than was predicted. The United States was constrained to make some gesture at the tenure of the President's reasoning for the start of the bombing without the consent of the President. The President's reasoning for the start of the bombing was evident. The Johnson-Kosygin meeting in London. The tenousness of the President's reasoning for the start of the bombing was evident. The Johnson-Kosygin plan could hardly have been attacked for making his proposals; the only thing apparent was strong evidence of the insincerity and Ho Chi Minh's disapproval; Secretary Russek could, in effect, enter a plea of Johnson's proposal, side, the Senator's alleged sins. The first impulse of the State Department was evidently to embrace the Senator's proposals to death.

The Johnson-Russek correspondence became known, Secretary Russek's line of defense seemed to have been based on the assumption that the truth would not come out publicly. On February 27, President Johnson described, with uncharacteristic understatement, the three new military actions of the preceding five days as a "step up" and "more far-reaching." He repeated a point in these terms: "Our principal objective is to provide the maximum deterrent to people who believe aggression pays with no minimum cost to us and to them." As always, the "maximum deterrent" and "minimum cost" had been forced up to higher and higher levels. Though he had not concealed his misgivings, Senator Robert F. Kennedy waited until March 9, 1967, to negotiate for a compromise plan which, according to the Senator, had to be accepted as a whole; it did not satisfy the North Vietnamese "infiltration" into South Vietnam, was made in mid-February, but unfavorable weather conditions and technical preparations had delayed the operation far longer than was predicted. The United States was constrained to make some gesture at the tenure of the President's reasoning for the start of the bombing without the consent of the President. The President's reasoning for the start of the bombing was evident. The Johnson-Kosygin meeting in London. The tenousness of the President's reasoning for the start of the bombing was evident. The Johnson-Kosygin plan could hardly have been attacked for making his proposals; the only thing apparent was strong evidence of the insincerity and Ho Chi Minh's disapproval; Secretary Russek could, in effect, enter a plea of Johnson's proposal, side, the Senator's alleged sins. The first impulse of the State Department was evidently to embrace the Senator's proposals to death.
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The differences were soon spelled out more sharply. On the day of Senator Kennedy's speech, Democratic Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington, a member of the Armed Services Committee, and his Republican counterpart, Senator Barry Goldwater, had different opinions on the war. Goldwater, a strong supporter of the war, argued that political and economic future of free Asia held the key to the defense of Vietnam. At another point in the same talk, he seemed to be saying more than he intended by referring to "the temple." When he asked what the "friendly" and "diplomacy" meant, he implied that it had been the United States policy not to recognize North Vietnam's right to control them as much as the United States wanted to believe; their morale was bound to improve. The United States, powerful and strong, would control the fighting. The two sides, amounting to de facto division of South Vietnam into groupings of the two sides, mounting to de facto division of South Vietnam into groupings of the two sides, amounting to de facto division of South Vietnam into groupings of the two sides, amounting to de facto division of South Vietnam into...
the United States had many times ruled out. The very nature of guerrilla warfare made an old fashioned display of fire, bombing if the fixed line, incongruous. The Viet Cong guerrillas and even the North Vietnamese regulars cooperated in using this weapon of the war, would not be made to "stand still," suddenly and indefinitely, without risking their disintegration as a fighting force, a danger not faced by the United States. The idea was introduced at a very late date, after the diplomatic breakdown of the preceding two years. And the idea of bombing against key North Vietnamese economic centers, already largely or partially destroyed, the time was not propitious for another attempt as a face position. In addition, the insuperable practical problems and represented a sharp political shift in favor of the United States and allied forces.

At the United States-South Vietnam conference on Guam on March 20-21, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky may have blurted out, as he had done before on other matters, what "peace talk" means. To him, "Honorable peace," much more than 400,000. South Vietnam, 45,000, Australia, 140,000, New Zealand, more than 50,000, 450,000. The North Vietnamese forces in the South were estimated at about 50,000. President Johnson's proposal on March 9 for "just and lasting peace" was not made to be a total surrender as well as a mutual commitment. Premier Ky was not the only one to misuse these terms, but he did it almost any reciprocal action," he had not intended these words to be taken literally.

But—and this was the critical question—was this policy of "reciprocity" mean anything? Rich power like the United States and a weak, poor power like North Vietnam?

A power which has been bludgeoned into the American side by war up from a position of some strength, though they may be strong in different ways, as in the bargaining power between private corporations and trade unions. The Japanese came to "peace talk" abdomen the USS Misisouri in September 1945, with no sense of being a negotiating power. A "peaceful settlement" may be a surrender as well as a mutual commitment. The bombing of Germany later in the war. But the positions were unambiguously unequal because the sides were so different.

When President Johnson called on February 2 for "just and lasting peace," it should be noted, did not offer a military truce or ceasefire in the North but not in the South. By stopping mass movement to the South, which was undoubtedly what would have been required, and by making mainly and tactically, it sustained the forces which it already had in the South because it could not provision them by sea. If the United States was able to do just as the United States felt that it could not accept any offer which might discourage or demoralize its South Vietnamese partners. This truce would have reduced the leaders doubts felt the same way about their own troops and protect in the South. President Johnson's proposal on March 9 for "just and lasting peace" was to be a surrender as well as a mutual commitment. In the end, this was far considered part of its own country, not against the United States, which it considered its main enemy. Germany's indiscriminate bombing of Britain in late 1940 was answered with equally indiscriminate and even more damaging bombing of Germany later in the war. The United States bombing raids were resumed on North Vietnam that month, and President Nikola V. Podgorny pledged the Soviet Union to continue to provide North Vietnam and "the South Vietnamese patriots" with the necessary assistance.

On April 16, 1967, Secretary McNamara's and Senator Manfield's testimony are dealt with at length in my forthcoming book, Abuse of Power.
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tions with escalating Soviet aid. The most recent turning point, then, was almost as much a turning point in the presidential campaign as on North Vietnam. Indeed, for some time, United States policy makers had been watching with interest the struggle between Hanoi and Saigon with mixed feelings: it gave North Vietnam more and more effective arms for fighting American troops, but it also gave the Soviet Union, in North Vietnam's military planning and capability. Secretary Rusk's unusual solicitude for Soviet interests is evident in his assessment of the "prudence" of the present Soviet generation and had commended it to the Chinese. Two months later, he inferentially excoriated the Chinese for their treatment of Saigon, the latter's prisoner or puppet. In the United States, the Soviet role in the war, at least for public consumption.

We have here a strange combination of giving the Soviets credit for wanting a settlement, and then blaming them for not being able to do anything about the bombing of North Vietnam and of holding them partially responsible for our predicament. It typifies the temptation into which the United States had been led by its disproportional investment in the Vietnamese war. In a larger scale, the United States seems to be faced with a variety of frustrations in South Vietnam at the same time that it is able to do almost as it pleases in North Vietnam. So long as the American leaders consider the bombing to be one of their few assets and bargaining levers, they are bound to try to hold on to it. It is their own ignorance of how much punishment does North Vietnam and enhance the embarrasment of its allies. The power at the heart of the picture, however, is the United States, which is so great and so unprecedented that the only questions are how much power it is willing to use and how much punishment North Vietnam is willing to take. Inescapably, the more punishment the United States is capable of and the more power it is willing to use, the greater its ability to pressure Hanoi to de-escalate militarily.

This is the vicious circle which was set in motion by transferring the main arena of the war from South to North Vietnam and by deciding to use bombing to impose the will of the United States on North Vietnam. Only a few days ago, the bombing and reconsider the problem of South Vietnam on the basis of genuine reciprocity—among the Vietnamese. Once the United States commits itself to the bombing, the bombing becomes a problem of its own. As no other weapon can be so important as the bombing, the balance, there could be no meaningful reciprocity, unless a great Communist power reciprocity. Instead of bringing peace nearer, this concept is more likely to bring about a Vietnamese equation of the 1960s mistakes crisis in circumstances far less favorable to the United States. In 1962, the United States could claim to be directly threatened by offensive missiles. But in 1967, the United States is not directly threatened, and cannot appeal to world opinion on two counts: it is not really interested in playing at its own game. The escalation of the war in Vietnam is bound to bring about a greater sense of Vietnamese leadership. Those who wish to taunt or goad the Vietnamese, if not the Chinese, to put up or shut up are living in a fantasy world if they think that the Chinese can be frightened by the war being followed in Vietnam. On the contrary, there has been and continues to be a stubborn and intransigent resistance to the Vietnamese that can go escalate their side of the war. And if the war over Vietnam in some form materializes, it will be under another instance of the "politics of Inadvertence?"

When one gets away from each individual move and maneuver, and views them as a whole, the past two years, the guidelines of American policy emerge quite clearly—to separate North Vietnam from the Soviet Union, and to separate North Vietnam from the Viet Cong in the South. Even if the United States were successful in either or both of these objectives, the war in the South would anyway still go on. And this is certainly not on the vast scale as at present. But neither of these objectives has been achieved; on the contrary, North Vietnam is likely to gird itself for an even more determined effort in the South, escalating the Northern role in the South. The American propaganda line: that the war in the South could not go on without the North's "collaboration" - and insisted that the North should get out of the South. That line was conceived to justify U.S. bombing of the North, but it does not help to facilitate the North's withdrawal from the South. The main thing that has been achieved by the recent diplomatic maneuvers is what Washington considers to be a more favorable public-relations ambience for making the war bigger, bloodier, and beyond the point of Johnsonian diplomacy which the American press has recently been celebrating. Recent events showed that the its disavowal. The North Vietnamese are not capable of ending the war in South Vietnam. Their own interests and need to save face have infinitely complicated them to avoid it. If the situation should, as distinguished from being a source of embarrassment, for it has proved unsatisfactory from Wash­ington's point of view, the next step was to consider the enormous importance which Soviet-bloc aid to North Vietnam and had assumed, these were singularly am­bitious, and he realized that it was better to accept the Soviet role in the war, at least for public consumption.

But if the Soviets could not tell Hanoi what to do, they still had to tell themselves what to do. By giving North Vietnam so much aid since 1965, they had committed themselves to make a commitment to the South, and possibly to South Vietnam, that the United States would be unable to sustain its efforts, and the Russians are therefore partly responsible for the prolongation of the war. The only way to break the circle is to halt the fighting and reconsider the problem of South Vietnam. The only way to break the circle is to halt the fighting and reconsider the problem of South Vietnam. The only way to break the circle is to halt the fighting and reconsider the problem of South Vietnam. The only way to break the circle is to halt the fighting and reconsider the problem of South Vietnam. The only way to break the circle is to halt the fighting and reconsider the problem of South Vietnam.

The Presiding Officer [Mr. MONToya in the chair]. Pursuant to the order previously entered, the Sena­tor from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will my colleague from West Virginia yield briefly?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy to yield to my colleague from West Virginia.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MCCLELLAN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote on the treaty this afternoon, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN without objection, is so ordered.

BENZENOID CHEMICAL INDUSTRY IMPORTANT TO AMERICAN ECONOMY—PENDING TRADE NEGOTIATIONS UNSATISFACTORY TO MANY CHEMICALS PRODUCERS IN 42 STATES—SENATOR RANDOLPH AND OTHER SENATORS JOIN IN OPPOSITION TO ABANDONMENT OF THE AMERICAN SELLING EFFORTS WHICH SYSTEMATIZED TRADE IN CHEMICALS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the administration's approach to trade negotiations involving the American sell-
ing price system of customs valuation has been a matter of considerable concern to many Members of the Senate and House of Representatives. Among the products covered by this system are benzenoid chemicals, manufactured by 116,000 workers in 42 States. In West Virginia, 7,000 workers in this particular industry will be adversely affected if the ASP system is abandoned by the United States.

The U.S. special representative for trade negotiations, Ambassador William M. Roth, has announced that he is discussing with our foreign trade partners the abandonment of this system of customs valuation during the Kennedy round of trade negotiations in Geneva. I remind Senators that this has been the traditional basis of valuation for benzenoid chemicals. Although Ambassador Roth indicates that he will not present Congress with an established fact, his actions unfortunately seem not to have comported fully with what I believe to be—and I speak with conviction to his promises to Congress.

Last October members of the West Virginia congressional delegation wrote to the President expressing strong opposition to the conclusion of the American selling price method of customs valuation on the ground of the severe economic injury that would be caused to the benzenoid chemical workers in our State by low-labor-cost foreign imports. In acknowledging our letter, the President's Office stated that our correspondence would be brought to Ambassador Roth's attention.

For the past several months, although Ambassador Roth's discussions on ASP continued at Geneva, we failed to receive any information from him or from his staff.

On January 15, 1967, I wrote to Ambassador Roth, asking that the conclusions in the Tariff Commission's report of October 3, 1966, assessing the economic impact of the proposed conversion from the American selling price system, be made public.

I felt that through the publication of these conclusions, industry and its workers could learn of the outcome of an investigation in which they participated and aided.

Ambassador Roth requested the Tariff Commission's investigation under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which, to my knowledge, contains no language restrictions on the public release of the Commission's conclusions. Indeed, that section requires the Commission to release "all the information at its command" to the President, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

My only request was that Ambassador Roth release the conclusions of the Tariff Commission with respect to economic impact; I did not request all of the information in the report or any of the confidential underlying data.

In his reply to my letter, which was, I think, a tardy reply—the reply came nearly 2 1/2 months after the letter was sent—Ambassador Roth stated that the Tariff Commission's conclusions would not be "meaningful" and were "hardly intelligible without access to the confidential business information upon which the Commission relied and which could not under any circumstances be disclosed."

Ambassador Roth did state that the Tariff Commission had reached conclusions with respect to economic impact on "each and every item and sub-item of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, which is purported as part of the conversion of the ASP system with respect to benzenoid chemicals and rubber-soled footwear."

Mr. President, it is difficult for me to conceive that those in our Government familiar with the industries involved, in the States that I have mentioned—covering 116,000 workers, 7,000 of these workers in West Virginia, and also the producers of the products themselves—would not be able to understand the conclusions of the Tariff Commission.

Indeed, it would seem more appropriate for Ambassador Roth to release the Commission's conclusions, in order that the benzenoid chemical industry affected by the abandonment or alteration of our present system could make independent judgments with respect to whether the Commission's conclusions are meaningful and intelligible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the President, and the correspondence which I entered into with Ambassador Roth on this issue, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
October 24, 1966.

The President,
The White House.

Dear Mr. President: We, the undersigned members of the West Virginia Congressional delegation, wish to communicate to you our deep concern over the possible elimination of the American Selling Price method of customs valuation.

We believe it necessary to underscore the importance of the American Selling Price method of customs valuation to the continuing prosperity of West Virginia and the Nation as a whole.

The synthetic organic chemical industry in West Virginia employs over 13,000 workers, and over 7,000 of these are directly involved in benzenoid production. The Department of Labor's statistics indicate that the national average annual earnings of each synthetic organic chemical worker exceed $8,000. Consequently, the benzenoid chemical industry contributes approximately $60,000,000 to the direct annual wages of these benzenoid workers in West Virginia, as well as providing additional income for supporting industries.

It is our belief that removal of the American Selling Price system will result in substantial injury to the synthetic organic chemical industry, such as dyes. The National Council of Importers in presenting its case to the Tariff Commission stated that if the benzenoids was relatively inelastic and that any tariff action which resulted in a decrease in demand would result in a decrease of 90% of the decrease. In short, the present U.S. market prices of these chemicals, which yield a relatively modest profit in comparison with others would fall.

In the case of dyes, a majority of the domestic industry's production will be classified for customs purposes as "benzenoid chemicals" (Tariff Act 4065.050) on which protection will be reduced by over 50%. The Tariff Commission proposed this classification in order to comply with "the request of the Special Representative" and "sound standards of tariff nomenclature." (TC Publication 181, p. 55, July 25, 1966)

We are concerned that the Special Representative did not allow the Tariff Commission to propose alternative products made in the United States and products made only abroad. If the object of the Commission's investigation is to determine truly equivalent connected rates of duty, the Special Representative's request should have given it enough latitude to do so.

We feel that the West Virginia industry and its workers will not be able to withstand the assault of low-cost benzenoid imports that will take place where this American Selling Price method is abandoned. Moreover, there are serious questions concerning the adequacy of the dumping standard affected by the abandonment of the American selling price method, which would adversely affect the economy of our region.

Sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator.
ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S. Senator.
HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Member of Congress.
JOHN J. MCCAIN, Member of Congress.
KENN HECHLER, Member of Congress.
ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Member of Congress.


HON. WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

Dear Ambassador Roth: On October 21, 1966, the West Virginia Congressional delegation wrote to the President expressing its strong opposition against the abandonment of the American Selling Price method of customs valuation. In acknowledging our letter, Mr. Ambassador Staggers stated that this correspondence would be brought to the attention of the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

While I have failed to receive any communication from your Office with respect to ASP during the past two months, I understand that it has been the subject of extensive discussions by your negotiators and by foreign governments at the GATT negotiations in Geneva. Furthermore, I have reviewed a copy of Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal's December 8 speech at Kronberg, Germany, in which he mentioned that, in the course of other things, he offered to negotiate away ASP for "a good arrangement" which would be submitted to the Congress for approval. In view of your communication to Congress that no decision has as yet been made concerning the abandonment of ASP, I am concerned over your efforts to have ASP as a bargaining counter with our foreign trading partners. Indeed, Ambassador Blumenthal's remarks could possibly be viewed as indicative of a willingness to sacrifice the economic vitality of the West Virginia benzenoid chemical industry for trade concessions to hypothetical industries in other parts of the United States.

I have received information which points to the likely possibility of the industry being forced to transfer plants and jobs abroad as a result of the lower tariffs embodied in the Tariff Commission's proposed converted rates of duty.

Regardless of one's point of view on the merits of ASP, it seems that the members of Congress and the people affected need to
know the facts. I understand that on October 3, 1966, the Tariff Commission sent a report consisting of confidential business information of its converted rates. Although this report may contain confidential information, it appears that conclusions can be reached without reliance on the confidentiality of the report. Therefore, I sincerely request that you make public the conclusions of the Tariff Commission's report. The report of the Tariff Commission was requested by the President, in a letter of July 27, 1966. The President specifically requested that the conclusions be of any value. We requested this report of the Tariff Commission of October 3, 1966, concerning the ASP. We have conducted an intensive inquiry into the economic impact of reducing tariffs has a considerable bearing on the offers that we might make in the context of the negotiations with other countries.

First, you urge that the conclusions of the Tariff Commission be released of its converted rates. Although this report may contain confidential information, it appears that conclusions can be reached without reliance on the confidentiality of the report. Therefore, I sincerely request that you make public the conclusions of the Tariff Commission's report. The report of the Tariff Commission was requested by the President, in a letter of July 27, 1966. The President specifically requested that the conclusions be of any value. We requested this report of the Tariff Commission of October 3, 1966, concerning the ASP. We have conducted an intensive inquiry into the economic impact of reducing tariffs has a considerable bearing on the offers that we might make in the context of the negotiations with other countries.

I note that there is no provision in section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. Sec. 1332) under which the Commission's investigation was conducted, that restricts the release of any conclusions. Subsection (d) thereunder provides that the information collected by the Commission is for the assistance of the President and the Congress, although subsection (g) only requires the Commission to release “all information at its command,” to the President, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, other members of Congress and the public. We, therefore, are in a position to reconsider our conclusions, and to bring others to light if necessary.

I considered the treatment of the American Selling Price question a matter of utmost importance to the Senate, House, and Committee on Finance of the Senate, other members of Congress and the public. We are determined to make as objective and thorough an exploration of the problem of ASP as possible. I frankly think that to disclose only the conclusions of the Tariff Commission's report of October 3, 1966, concerning the ASP would create confusion and misunderstanding.

More importantly, I would emphasize that it was in accordance with a principle established by Congress itself in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (TEA) that we requested the Tariff Commission's report to be confidential. Under section 221 of the TEA requires the Tariff Commission to advise the President of the probable economic impact of reducing tariffs. In much the same way, the President is considering for purposes of a trade negotiation. The legislative history of section 221 clearly anticipates that this advice and also to be made available to the TEA, and our letter therefore provided that our letter in effect constituted a Presidential request under Section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The advice given by the Tariff Commission on the probable economic impact of converting the ASP into a meaningful, and indeed hardly intelligible, without access to the confidential business information which the Tariff Commission has relied and which could not under any circumstances be disclosed. According to this, in a letter of July 27, 1966, the President understands it is as possible about this complex problem. In fact, I think that to disclose only the conclusions of the Tariff Commission's report of October 3, 1966, concerning the ASP would create confusion and misunderstanding.

I was seriously doubt whether disclosure of the conclusions of the Tariff Commission's report of October 3, 1966, concerning the ASP would be of any value. As you acknowledge in your letter, the report consists of confidential business information. Indeed, such information was, to a very large extent, the basis upon which the Tariff Commission's conclusions were made. These conclusions are stated in a summary form with respect to each and every item and sub-item of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. The Commission has proposed as part of the conversion of the ASP with respect to benzenoid chemicals. These conclusions are not meaningful, and indeed hardly intelligible, without access to the confidential business information upon which the report of the Tariff Commission's conclusions is based.

Under section 221 of the TEA, and our letter therefore provided that our letter in effect constituted a Presidential request under Section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930. Under that section the President may impose whatever conditions he wishes upon the disclosure of reports prepared by the Congress itself in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (TEA) that we requested the Tariff Commission's report to be confidential. Under section 221 of the TEA requires the Tariff Commission to advise the President of the probable economic impact of reducing tariffs. In much the same way, the President is considering for a trade negotiation. The legislative history of section 221 clearly anticipates that this advice and also to be made available to the TEA, and our letter therefore provided that our letter in effect constituted a Presidential request under Section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The advice given by the Tariff Commission on the probable economic impact of converting the ASP into a meaningful, and indeed hardly intelligible, without access to the confidential business information which the Tariff Commission has relied and which could not under any circumstances be disclosed. According to this, in a letter of July 27, 1966, the President understands it is as possible about this complex problem. In fact, I think that to disclose only the conclusions of the Tariff Commission's report of October 3, 1966, concerning the ASP would create confusion and misunderstanding.

More importantly, I would emphasize that it was in accordance with a principle established by Congress itself in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (TEA) that we requested the Tariff Commission's report to be confidential. Under section 221 of the TEA requires the Tariff Commission to advise the President of the probable economic impact of reducing tariffs. In much the same way, the President is considering for purposes of a trade negotiation. The legislative history of section 221 clearly anticipates that this advice and also to be made available to the TEA, and our letter therefore provided that our letter in effect constituted a Presidential request under Section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930. Under that section the President may impose whatever conditions he wishes upon the disclosure of reports prepared by the Congress itself in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (TEA) that we requested the Tariff Commission's report to be confidential. Under section 221 of the TEA requires the Tariff Commission to advise the President of the probable economic impact of reducing tariffs. In much the same way, the President is considering for purposes of a trade negotiation. The legislative history of section 221 clearly anticipates that this advice and also to be made available to the TEA, and our letter therefore provided that our letter in effect constituted a Presidential request under Section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930.
require implementing legislation by the Congress. Should you proceed with the plans as you proposed in your letter, the Congress of will be placed in a most difficult situation. We will be asked to review and pass legislation on ASP without indispensable information. You note that you will not recommend to the President any course of action on ASP which would prejudice the Commission's "command" to make an "adequate" adjustment to new import competition resulting from abandonment of ASP, only request but will be entitled to more than this assurance. A thorough analysis of ASP will require, at the least, access to the Tariff Commission's conclusions and the non-confidential data. As with prior Presidential decisions under the Escape Clause and the Antidumping Act, the conclusions of the Commission's decisions can be made public in Escape Clause and Antidumping Act investigations, in which the question of economic impact or injury is dominant, why can they not be made public in the ASP investigation? Since the Tariff Commission finds a way to disclose the confidential information, I suggest that such a report could be released on ASP. In other words, if the various provisions of the Commission's conclusions that may be negotiated on ASP, the Congress will be concerned both with the impact on investments and jobs, and with the industries on the basis of the U.S. economic, I do not see how Congress can approach these questions without having access to the report of the Commission followings hearings on ASP. I am confident that the Congress will be interested in the Commission's conclusions on ASP. You have not dispelled the very real concern, expressed by many members of Congress, that the Commission, which was not familiar with ASP, even as a separate package, whether to use your term to the authorized negotiators under the TEA, and we will be faced with a fait accompli. As a second reason for refusal to make the Commission report, the question of the authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (TEA), specifically Section 221. Your letter states that the Commission report under that section as a basis for your request that the ASP investigation report be confidential. I would reframe my requestcomed points on many occasions—your office has no legislative authority to negotiate on ASP. ASP is a separate package unrelated to the general Kennedy Round agreement; and, indeed, ASP is from the Commission's point of view, the scope of the TEA and Kennedy Round. For these reasons, your actual request for the Tariff Commission's investigation made under the 1930 Tariff Act, which does not appear to contain the same legislative history as Section 221 of the TEA. As I pointed out in my letter of February 15, the T.S. negotiators' position by revealing data that would give away the "likely limits" of our negotiators' authority, and that the adverse conclusion from your agreement would be to the probable economic impact of reduced tariffs is a considerable bearing on the question of whether or not that final authority for an agreement on ASP rests with the Congress—this is your limit. It may well be that substantive consultation with the Congress on the issues of ASP, and not just on procedures, could benefit your negotiating position by stressing what the Congress believes is the situation and what its own reaction would be to any possible modification. In any event, you have noted that it has been U.S. policy to make the maximum proposal at the outset in order to encourage maximum offers downstream. Perhaps, in these circumstances, it would seem that the other countries already know the "limits" of the U.S. proposal. Further, should the U.S. not desire to undercut our negotiators or our trading position, but it is my feeling that ASP is one of the T.S. position on ASP has been revealed by our negotiators. It is my feeling that open discussion with the industry and the Congress, when the Commission has the final authority for an agreement, would be more beneficiai, to all concerned.

As we are aware, on June 29, 1966, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 100, expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should not enter into any agreement affecting ASP before obtaining prior legislative authority. You have apparently chosen to ignore this Resolution and to continue ASP negotiations (or "discussions"). On June 30, 1966, you wrote to the U.S. Senate: "I am, of course, quite willing to keep the Congress fully informed at every step." You also stated: "...negotiators, whether or not to offer a modification of the ASP system, will be public hearings will have been held. This will permit the Congress, as well as interested parties, to issue in public hearings and regarding any possible modification of the ASP system." The question of whether or not to offer a modification of the ASP system was answered in its conclusions—is at the heart of the ASP issue. I do not see how one can be kept informed in a meaningful way if we do not have essential facts for arriving at a judgment.

You state that you and your colleagues have exchanged views with the domestic industry on "all aspects of the problem of ASP." It is my understanding that the domestic industry has not been informed of any conclusions of the Commission nor has it been informed as to any conclusions which your office may have reached in the course of the T.S. Commission's conclusions. The industry has not been advised as to what proprio clauses or antidumping negotiations are being considered as to what steps can be taken to assure that the industry can compete on a level footing with new competition after the abandonment of ASP.

I am, of course, gratified that you are concerned with which of the two questions the members of the Congress have expressed about the impact of eliminating the ASP system on firms and workers in the benzene chemical industry. You state that your efforts were conducted with respect to this question. We will be called upon to make an intensive inquiry into the question before acting on any possible legislation; in that connection it will require all of the data that would permit it to arrive at reasonable and sensible conclusions. I seriously doubt that the Congress will accept your office's conclusions in lieu of the Tariff Commission's.

You note that your concern is based upon a seeming conflict in what you have promised with respect to the ASP issue and in fact is taking place. You have promised to keep the Congress fully informed, but refuse to release any information concerning the economic impact of abandonment of ASP. You present a fait accompli, but your negotiators continue to negotiate for "reciprocal" concessions and you are concerned lest the limits of their negotiating authority be disclosed.

In light of these facts I respectfully request that you reconsider the refusal to make public the conclusions of the Tariff Commission and I urge that these conclusions be made available now.

On behalf of the President thanks for your attention to this matter and with best wishes, I am, truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1967.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: Thank you for your letter of March 25, 1967 concerning the Tariff Commission's confidential report on the probable economic impact of eliminating the American selling price (ASP) system through a conversion of ad valorem rates. After a careful consideration of your letter, I continue to feel that the conclusions in this report should not be made public. I should, however, like to comment on some of the points made in your letter.

You state on the first page that, if an agreement is achieved, you might seek back to the Congress, a thorough analysis of ASP will require access to the Tariff Commission's confidential report on the probable economic impact of eliminating the American selling price (ASP) system. If the Congress is asked to consider legislation to implement an ASP agreement, I would expect that the Ways and Means and Finance Committees would request the Commission in the customary way to submit a full report on the agreement, including all the pertinent information which it could make available. In this way, the Congress would obtain the maximum assistance from the Tariff Commission at the time when it was most useful and valuable.

At the top of the second page, you ask why, since the Tariff Commission's conclusions on chemicals continue to be confidential, you have not dispelled the very real concern that the Congress will be faced with a fait accompli. It is my understanding that the domestic industry has not been informed of any conclusions of the Commission nor has it been informed as to any conclusions which your office may have reached in the course of the T.S. Commission's conclusions. The industry has not been advised as to what proprio clauses or antidumping negotiations are being considered as to what steps can be taken to assure that the industry can compete on a level footing with new competition after the abandonment of ASP.

I am, of course, gratified that you are concerned with which of the two questions the members of the Congress have expressed about the impact of eliminating the ASP system on firms and workers in the benzene chemical industry. You state that your efforts were conducted with respect to this question. We will be called upon to make an intensive inquiry into the question before acting on any possible legislation; in that connection it will require all of the data that would permit it to arrive at reasonable and sensible conclusions. I seriously doubt that the Congress will accept your office's conclusions in lieu of the Tariff Commission's.
balancing agreement, the implementation or non-implementation of which will therefore have no impact whatsoever upon the Ken­
ney negotiations and agreements of reciprocal or con­
cessions. In this way, we believe that the Congress will be able to consider the agree­
ment on its merits and without constraint of any kind.

At the top of the third page, you indicate that an agreement was requested by the President under section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930, the Senate Finance Committee is apparently in a position to support the request. The Tariff Commission release the report to the Committee as well. It is my understanding, however, that insofar as the Senate Finance Committee or by either branch of the Congress. This section in no way pro­
vides that a confidential report requested by the Senate Finance Committee prior to its release by that Committee?

On this page, I also express my confidence that the U.S. position on ASP has been re­
vealed by our negotiators and that open discus­sion of the issue would be more benefi­
cial to our negotiating position. I recall in my previous letter that publication of the Tariff Commission's conclusions would tend to weaken our negotiators' position at whatever stage the negotiations on ASP may have reached. The important question is not whether the U.S. position on ASP has or has not been revealed—keeping in mind that such a position may vary during the course of the negotiations, but rather the negoti­
ating position as a whole. We have already gained from having a sense of the likely limits of our final negotiating position on ASP.
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ating position as a whole. We have already gained from having a sense of the likely limits of our final negotiating position on ASP.

You will find on this page one statement that we have been exchanging views with the domestic industry on "all aspects of the problem of ASP," and then point out that this may have been of the Tariff Commission's conclusions, nor of our conclusions, nor of what proposal has been in the亚洲 have not been revealed—keeping in mind that such a position may vary during the course of the negotiations, but rather the negoti­
ating position as a whole. We have already gained from having a sense of the likely limits of our final negotiating position on ASP.

You will find on this page one statement that we have been exchanging views with the domestic industry on "all aspects of the problem of ASP," and then point out that this may have been of the Tariff Commission's conclusions, nor of our conclusions, nor of what proposal has been in the亚洲 have not been revealed—keeping in mind that such a position may vary during the course of the negotiations, but rather the negoti­
anging position as a whole. We have already gained from having a sense of the likely limits of our final negotiating position on ASP.

You will find on this page one statement that we have been exchanging views with the domestic industry on "all aspects of the problem of ASP," and then point out that this may have been of the Tariff Commission's conclusions, nor of our conclusions, nor of what proposal has been in the亚洲 have not been revealed—keeping in mind that such a position may vary during the course of the negotiations, but rather the negoti­
anging position as a whole. We have already gained from having a sense of the likely limits of our final negotiating position on ASP.

You will find on this page one statement that we have been exchanging views with the domestic industry on "all aspects of the problem of ASP," and then point out that this may have been of the Tariff Commission's conclusions, nor of our conclusions, nor of what proposal has been in the亚洲 have not been revealed—keeping in mind that such a position may vary during the course of the negotiations, but rather the negoti­
anging position as a whole. We have already gained from having a sense of the likely limits of our final negotiating position on ASP.

You will find on this page one statement that we have been exchanging views with the domestic industry on "all aspects of the problem of ASP," and then point out that this may have been of the Tariff Commission's conclusions, nor of our conclusions, nor of what proposal has been in the亚洲 have not been revealed—keeping in mind that such a position may vary during the course of the negotiations, but rather the negoti­
anging position as a whole. We have already gained from having a sense of the likely limits of our final negotiating position on ASP.

You will find on this page one statement that we have been exchanging views with the domestic industry on "all aspects of the problem of ASP," and then point out that this may have been of the Tariff Commission's conclusions, nor of our conclusions, nor of what proposal has been in the亚洲 have not been revealed—keeping in mind that such a position may vary during the course of the negotiations, but rather the negoti­
anging position as a whole. We have already gained from having a sense of the likely limits of our final negotiating position on ASP.
quences that would inevitably flow from ASP removal.

I would also like to compliment the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Russ-
corr] for his excellent presentation to the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manu-
facturers Association at their monthly luncheon meeting in New York last week with the aim of warning of the potential harmful effects that separate unauthorized negotiations in the Ken-
ney round could have on the role of Congress in shaping future U.S. trade policy.

This is part of a so-called compromise proposal that was submitted by the Secretary General of GATT, Sir Eric Wyndham-White, in an effort to break the negotiating stalemate in chemicals. The Secretary General's compromise in-
volves American selling price and the method of achieving its repeal. Not only would American selling price be scrapped—the United States would have to agree to a 20-percent reduction in all its chemical tariff rates. Many ben-
zenoid chemical products are now protected by a much higher rate, especially those with a high labor-cost content, which places the domestic industry at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis the European and Japanese industries.

As I have said, that is due to the higher living of Americans. We believe this fact alone is
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tative to determine an equivalent rate of con-
version and to estimate the probable eco-
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I interpolate to say that if the Ameri-
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I wish.

We would welcome an opportunity to dis-

The letter of October 10, 1966,
addressed by the Members of the Texas
dlegation in Congress to the President
at the White House, which was followed
by another letter dated April 14, 1967,
addressed by my colleague in the Senate
and myself to the Secretary of the
Members of the Texas delegation in Congress,
two or three of whom we did not have
time to reach, calling attention to the
letter of October 10, 1966, in which we

I ask unanimous consent to have

The President,

The White House, Washington, D.C.

I wish to bring to your attention our grave concern over the
attempt of your Special Trade Represen-
tative to make an agreement that would

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you will recall, we
wrote to you on October 18, 1966, expressing
our concern over the attempts of your Spe-
cial Trade Representative to negotiate a
trade agreement that would include aboli-
tion of the American Selling Price system.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
October 18, 1966,

American selling price system of
import valuation. You are, of course, aware of the extensive benzenoid chemical industry in the United States and the need not exist without the protection afforded it by
ASP.

In the State of Texas there are over 26,000
workers engaged in the production of syn-
thetic organic chemicals. Of this number,
approximately one-half are primarily in-
volved in benzenoid production. We
We had hoped that our expression of concern, along with the concern of other members of Congress, would prevent negotiations in this area by your Special Trade Representative. However, the events of the past six months have proven this hope illusory.

Your Special Trade Representative, after receiving the Tariff Commission's report of the probable imposition of a 150% excise tax and a 50% rate reduction, refused to disclose publicly or to interested Members of Congress the conclusions of the Commission. The Commission's conclusions must immediately be disclosed else the Congress and the American people will be denied the opportunity to obtain the facts necessary to judge the merits of your Special Trade Representative's position.

Most disturbing of all, however, are the reports appearing in the press concerning negotiating proposals for chemicals in the Kennedy Round. These reports are based upon a so-called "compromise" whereby the U.S. would agree to reduce its chemical tariffs in the Kennedy Round, depending on whether or not this would produce a 20% reduction by the European producers. Only if the Congress agreed to this "compromise" would the United States agree to provide implementing legislation for abandoning ASP would our trading partners further reduce their chemicals by 30%. Furthermore, the U.S. would be forced to agree to a 20% ceiling on all chemical tariff rates under the terms of the reported compromise.

The imbalance in the Kennedy Round portion of this compromise proposal attempts to make the Congress ultimately responsible for the elimination of chemical tariffs in the Kennedy Round, depending on whether or not it provides the implementing legislation for abolishing ASP. This "gun-to-the-head" approach is indefensible and we are disturbed over the press reports that it has been favorably considered by your Special Trade Representative. Also, the placing of a 20% tariff ceiling on categories of competitive benzenoids that are not present in the United States has expired. The U.S. exchange rate has to be changed for it to be effective.

The action of the President's special trade representative so far in this matter has run counter to the expressed intention that the U.S. should play an active role in the Kennedy Round. The Senate, the House, and the administration have all indicated that they plan to do this. The President's special trade representative has continued to attempt to keep the U.S. system of import valuation as it applies to benzenoids along with government officials. No

I think it is important that those of us who are discussing this subject impress the Members of the Senate and the interests of the people of this country that the total value of production last year of benzenoids was approximately $3.5 billion in the United States.

I should like to point out in 1966 we had imported 1,666 million pounds of benzenoid products from other countries. This was an increase of about 30 percent over the imports of 1965.

In the face of that fact, I say to the Senator from West Texas and my colleagues, that increase certainly was bad enough. What will happen now if we abandon ASP? The bars will be literally let down to an influx of products that will cause deterioration of this industry in the United States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for pointing out how important this domestic production is to the United States. In terms of the reported 1$3.5 billion and its jobs for 116,000 American workers.

But I point out that what is of greater importance to the people of the United States is that we would go back to our previous position prior to World War I, when there was a virtual monopoly of American Markets by European producers in the chemical industry. That was money flowing out of the United States.

If this proposed tariff adjustment—so called—becomes a part of the Kennedy round of negotiations now going on, not only would it result in a great loss to this industry, but it would result in imports of $3.5 billion being taken away from the domestic chemical industry. We are worried today about the outflow of gold. It is nothing like it would be if the European producers take over the American market as was true in the period before 1917. At that time we had a comparatively primitive economy. Today we have a vast industrial complex and we use many chemicals. It would result in a further deterioration of our gold supply, as well as a loss of jobs and a loss of American markets. This domestic industry should be protected by the government of the European chemical industry.

That is exactly the situation American industry would be in; and once they got that monopoly back, as they had it in 1914, four out of the American consumer would pay through the nose. That is, American industry, this great industry of ours, the greatest industry in the world, would, in my opinion, if this round goes through within 3 days be paying through the nose to European industry, to the tune of billions and billions of dollars a year, for these basic and valuable chemicals.

I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] wishes to comment upon this matter.
concessions are made by the European negotiators without the advice and counsel of these industry representatives.

Once again, I want to say that I am pleased to join in this discussion. I look forward to continuing to work with this committee on the important interest of job security for the workers in the benzenoid chemical industry and in the interests of a healthy chemical industry for the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I recommend the able Senator from South Carolina for his contribution to the discussion of this very serious problem. The industry and its workers are vitally concerned, and I am sure that the negotiations which are now in progress are not going very well, for the United States of America, at least in this industry and perhaps in others.

Mr. President, I wish the Record to indicate that approximately 11 Senators have indicated an intense interest in this subject. Some of those Senators have had commitments that they necessarily, because of their other obligations, have had to drop and cannot be present on the floor. Others, however, besides those Senators who have spoken, will address themselves to this subject; and it is my hope that they will be able to make speeches, because the Record should reflect that these Senators are equally alarmed over the course of present negotiations. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia is absolutely correct in insisting that the Tariff Commission report evaluating the impact of the removal of the American selling price issue be made available to the Members of this body whom whose constituents would be affected by such a move.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has one of the largest concentrations of manufacturing facilities in the coal tar and coal tar chemicals industry, of which dyes and dye intermediates are the most important part. The elimination of the American selling price system would put the dyes and dye intermediates industry in a very serious state for the people of Pennsylvania and the Nation.

I am in complete agreement with the Senator from West Virginia in his remarks here today. I urge the members of the Tariff Commission and the President to be forthright in making available this important report to the Senators who have spoken here today and to others who have an interest in this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I wrote the Honorable William M. Roth, Special Representative, Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, dated April 24, 1967, be printed in the Record.

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


HON. WILLIAM M. ROTH, JR., ESQ., SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE, OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR AMBASSADOR ROTH: No doubt you are aware of the vital concern in this Senate over the present situation at the Kennedy Round trade negotiations. Some have described that situation as a picture of dense fog surrounded by swirling mist. But granted that we have not soared as high as some (who tired of success in negotiations), there remains a disturbing background, especially as to its effect on the matter of the American Selling Price and the Tariff Commission Report of October 3, 1966. I strongly question the course which has been taken in regard to its ASP-coal tar chemicals. The American selling price negotiation is apparently taking place on the basis of a secret report on possible economic effect of this very negotiation. I can well understand that one would want to go to the conference table well-armed and with no disclosures to the other side. But not having seen the Report, we can conclude that the very least only that the findings as to coal tar chemicals are in question. Then why should we not strongly protest discussion of ASP-coal tar chemicals at Geneva? We are told that coal tar chemicals will be protected in any event along the lines of the present report and proper in the Report. But we have not seen the Report—so, finally, the snake bites its own tail.

The coal tar chemical industry is vital to the Senate and to our Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I would be derelict in my duties and the duties of the Senate if I did not stress the fact which threatens to eliminate that industry. I cannot make blithe assumptions that all is well and that lightly we may conclude that under the present circumstances any ASP negotiation agreement which would be presented to the Senate would be legitimate issue but not begotten.

I think this situation dictates release of the Tariff Commission findings as to the coal tar industry.

Sincerely,

HUGH SCOTT.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. At this point I yield to my colleague, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge].

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I would like to extend my friend from West Virginia for his forthright presentation of the American selling price issue. As a member of the congressional delegation to GATT who has closely followed the course of the beginning, I recommend his remarks to every Senator as a correct statement of the issue.

Georgia, no less than West Virginia has a vital stake in the American selling price system. Chemicals, how compose the second largest industry in Georgia, a substantial percentage of which fall into the benzenoid category. Loss of ASP will not only result in transfer of many of these plants and thousands of jobs abroad, it will also mean loss of Georgia's two rubber footwear plants, plus her prospects for future investments.

Last year I joined with Senator Ribicoff in cosponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 100, which was intended to express the sense of the Congress that no agreement affecting the American selling price system be entered into by our trade negotiators without obtaining prior authority from the Congress. Although this resolution was approved overwhelmingly by the Finance Committee and subsequently passed by the Senate with only one dissenting vote, negotiations on ASP are still being pressed. Also, I might point out that the entire Georgia congressional delegation joined in a letter last fall to the President stressing the importance of ASP to the jobs and investments of the benzenoid chemical and rubber-footwear industries and urging that negotiations be discontinued.

In view of the unreasonableness of the European negotiating offers in the chemical sector, which suggests to me that they have no honest interest in the elimination of ASP other than for tactical purposes, I submit that it would be wiser to withdraw ASP from negotiations in the Kennedy round and subject it to a long and careful study by both the Congress and the administration.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Georgia is knowledgeable in trade matters, an expertise he has developed as a member of the Finance Committee. I am grateful for his cogent comments and support.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, a little while ago the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] presented a well-documented and well-reasoned statement in support of retention of the American selling price system in connection with our current trade agreement negotiations, and I fully concur in his views.

As my good friend from West Virginia has effectively pointed out, the Special Trade Representative has shown little apparent interest in the express will of the Senate throughout the American selling price controversy, despite passage last year of Senate Concurrent Resolution 100 which clearly put the Senate on record in opposition to any modification of the American selling price system in absence of a prior delegation of such authority by the Congress. Any way you look at it, if the Senate desires, it would seem to put the Special Trade Representative on a direct collision course with the Senate.

Furthermore, I cannot understand why this Administration, with requests of Senators to disclose publicly the conclusions reached by the Tariff Commission in its assessment of the probable economic consequences of elimination of the American selling price system, his justification for treating the Tariff Commission's conclusions as being confidential do not appear to be warranted. I do not feel that the negotiations concerned that these conclusions be made available to them at the earliest possible time, so that they may prepare to defend themselves as well as to inform the Congress when the time comes for it to consider any international agreement which would abolish the American selling price system.

The State of North Carolina has an important stake in this issue because of its growing benzenoid chemical and rubber-footwear industries, both providing substantial employment and economic activity in my State, and I am afraid severe damage will be done to these industries if the American selling price system is abandoned. I ask unanimous con-
sent that the letter from the North Carolina congressional delegation to the President, dated October 12, 1966, urging that no trade agreement for elimination of the American selling price system be entered into, be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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


The President.
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The undersigned members of the North Carolina congressional delegation herein indicate our respectful opposition to any international commitment the result of which would be the abandonment of the American Selling Price method of customs valuation. The system now in use has made it possible for North Carolina to develop an important benzenoid chemical industry, and the abandonment of that system would put it in jeopardy.

1,500 people are employed in North Carolina organic chemical plants and 1,500 of these are directly involved in benzenoid production. We are interested in maintaining these jobs and in maintaining this industry in a healthy condition.

The United States Tariff Commission has been studying this problem and our information is that in its interim report the Commission has proposed a set of converted rates of duty which would apply if the ASP is abandoned. We are further advised that this would result in a tariff reduction of more than 50 per cent. The majority of domestic dye production. Moreover, the reduction in tariff protection would not even be spaced over a five-year period, as is the case with respect to other tariff reductions under the Trade Expansion Act. The benzenoid industry in North Carolina can ill afford any tariff reduction, even if it should be spaced over a five-year period; and it certainly cannot stand a 50% reduction imposed at once.

The abandonment of the ASP will in our judgment have a disastrous effect upon this important industry in our State.

We have been informed that the New Jersey delegation have expressed to you views similar to those we submit herewith. We also understand that Congressman Peter W. Rodino, Jr., has set aside an appointment with you to discuss this problem and we would like an opportunity to attend if you grant him a conference and thus indicate our support for maintaining the ASP.

Respectfully,

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the capable Senator from North Carolina for his informative and helpful statement. People of North Carolina as well as West Virginia and other States have a significant interest in maintaining the present system of valuation on benzenoid chemicals.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the very instructive remarks made by the Senator from West Virginia and others on the American selling price system. Let me say in general that I endorse the view that our trade negotiators should not proceed to negotiate on ASP without first obtaining statutory authority to do so from the Congress. I also support the contention that the special trade representative should make immediate public disclosure of the Tariff Commission's conclusions on the probable economic consequences of ASP removal. The latter step is made imperative by considerations of fairness to the domestic benzenoid chemical and rubber footwear industries, and the need of Congress to have all relevant information at hand before making its decision on so crucial an issue.

In the State of South Carolina there are approximately 4,000 workers engaged in the production of synthetic organic chemicals. Roughly half this number are benzenoid chemical workers who will be forced to join the ranks of the unemployed if the American selling price system is jettisoned in Geneva.

Last year, fearing such a consequence, the entire South Carolina delegation joined in a letter to the President urging that no agreement be entered into for removal of ASP. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, which incidentally was never replied to, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,

The President.
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We, the undersigned members of the South Carolina congressional delegation are compelled to raise our voices in opposition to abandonment of the American Selling Price system of import valuation. South Carolina can ill afford to lose its benzenoid chemical industry which would be the inevitable consequence of ASP removal.

The total number of workers employed by the synthetic organic chemical industry in South Carolina is 3,819. Of this total, over half are directly engaged in production of benzenoid chemical products. Inadequate protection of this synthetic organic chemical industry would result in the destruction of this vital industry and the many employment opportunities it generates.

We respectfully refer you to the voluminous evidence presented the Tariff Commission by the synthetic organic chemical industry wherein it is shown conclusively that a conversion of ASP to export valuation and a 30% reduction in the tariff will simply enable foreign producers to price domestic producers out of existence. Indeed, in the Tariff Commission's report of July 25, 1966 it is admitted on page 88 that the Commission has no satisfactory alternative which would provide for future imports protection equivalent to that afforded by the ASP system.

While we recognize that the making of international trade agreements is the sole responsibility of the Executive Branch, we also feel that as representatives of a major domestic industry and its workers is a responsibility shared by the Congress and the Executive. Since it is inescapable that severe economic consequences will flow from the elimination of ASP, we believe that the Congress should be free to measure beforehand the probable economic consequences to the benzenoid industry unstrained by an unwise international commitment not of its making.

We understand that other delegations have made similar comments in regard to ASP elimination. We would like to add that we, too, would welcome an opportunity to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,
STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
DONALD ROSS,
U.S. Senate,
WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Secretary.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the President and his new special trade representative, Ambassador Roth, will take-careful note of the attitudes expressed here today and be guided by them in our future trade negotiations in Geneva.

Routine Morning Business

The President. Pursuant to the order heretofore entered, the time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired. The Senate will now proceed with the transaction of routine morning business.

Message from the House—Enrolled Joint Resolution Signed

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 49) to designate April 29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days."

Executive Reports of Committees

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

William W. Siert, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

By Mr. HARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce:

David A. Carter, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

Bills Introduced

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BAXMAN, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. HARTREK):

S. 1816. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act to provide for the deduction of the term "age" as used with respect to the labeling and advertising of whisky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance. (See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTREK:

S. 1815. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,000; to the Committee on Finance. (See the remarks of Mr. Hartrek when he
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will now be considered, as an amendment referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1614) to amend section 5 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act to provide a definition of the term "age" as used with respect to the labeling and advertising of whisky, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Fulbright (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1614

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (27 U.S.C. 255) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"As used in subsections (e) and (f), the term "age" means the number of years that any American type whisky produced on or after July 1, 1936 (other than corn whisky, straight corn whisky, blended corn whisky, and a blend of straight and blended corn whisky) has been remained in charred new oak containers, or that after distillation and before bottling, such whisky has been kept in charred new oak containers.

In prescribing standards of identity for the purposes of subsections (e) and (f)—

(1) the designation of any whisky produced on or after March 1, 1936, as "rye whisky", "bourbon whisky", "wheat whisky", "malt whisky", or "rye malt whisky" shall be prohibited and be replaced by the designation of any whisky produced on or after July 1, 1936, as "straight" (other than straight corn whisky) shall be prohibited unless it has been kept in charred new containers for a period of not less than twenty-four calendar months.

The $600 INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION IS OBSOLETE

Mr. Hartke. Mr. President, today I am offering a bill to increase the individual exemption from income taxes to those days? Fortunately, wages are not expected to stay at these high levels. In 1942 under wartime need for increased production of the war effort, a revision of the work produced in the fall of 1949 dealing with city worker's wages, the adjusted budget for the year ended July 1, 1949, the cost of living has risen drastically—but the $500 remains where it was 20 years ago.

What is the minimum mean of life for American family today? How does it compare with the minimum means left uninsured for the average American family?

In 1948, when the $500 was lifted to $600, a family of four had an exemption of $2,400. But these were 1948 dollars. Since then, the economic conditions have long since passed, the economy has prospered, the cost of living has risen drastically—but the $500 remains where it was 20 years ago.

What is the minimum mean of life for American family today? How does it compare with the minimum means left uninsured for the average American family?

In 1948, when the $500 was lifted to $600, a family of four had an exemption of $2,400. But these were 1948 dollars. Since then, the economic conditions have long since passed, the economy has prospered, the cost of living has risen drastically—but the $500 remains where it was 20 years ago.
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In 1948, when the $500 was lifted to $600, a family of four had an exemption of $2,400. But these were 1948 dollars. Since then, the economic conditions have long since passed, the economy has prospered, the cost of living has risen drastically—but the $500 remains where it was 20 years ago.

What is the minimum mean of life for American family today? How does it compare with the minimum means left uninsured for the average American family?

In 1948, when the $500 was lifted to $600, a family of four had an exemption of $2,400. But these were 1948 dollars. Since then, the economic conditions have long since passed, the economy has prospered, the cost of living has risen drastically—but the $500 remains where it was 20 years ago.

What is the minimum mean of life for American family today? How does it compare with the minimum means left uninsured for the average American family?

In 1948, when the $500 was lifted to $600, a family of four had an exemption of $2,400. But these were 1948 dollars. Since then, the economic conditions have long since passed, the economy has prospered, the cost of living has risen drastically—but the $500 remains where it was 20 years ago.
the purchase of one suit every 2 years, five shirts a year and not quite two pairs of shoes annually. The wife’s dress allowance is 3 1/2 new dresses a year, one of them being a new dress every 5 years. The family is expected to be a rented house or apartment with five rooms and bath, whose standards are those set by the American Public Health Association and the U.S. Public Housing Administration. The budget allows not for new cars but for the purchase of a used car every 3 years—and for only 74 percent of most city families; calculations for New York, Philadelphia, and Boston for family car ownership by only half the families.

Updating the budget and applying it to current costs, the research done by the labor group revealed that for a family such as that described, the cost of food for this four-member family would average in 20 major cities, $2,005; housing, $1,512; clothing, $604; medical costs, $400. The total overall cost for this city worker’s family budget came to $6,877.

Other economic studies have placed the needs of families in the same general range within the last 2 or 3 years. For a 2-person family, the same calculations give a sum for the year and for a family of five, with the oldest child not over 16, the total budget comes to $8,020.

This, of course, is considerably more than the amount that many thousands and even millions of families spend. For this income, $3,000 is often cited as the poverty line. Yet our present $800 exemption provides only $2,400 deductible for a family of four. A $1,000 exemption for four would still be more than 50 percent below the family budget I have been noting.

We have been concerned in recent weeks about achieving equity in the tax structure as it applies to businessmen. They have spokesmen whose voices are heard, and I have no objection to that—we need the views of the business community when we attempt to provide a reasonable and desirable tax structure as it affects business. But there is a need for equity to the small- and middle-sized income person, the individual and the family, as well—and they have no voice or vote in this type of discussion.

We in the Congress, and particularly those of us who have responsibilities in the Finance Committee for the tax structure, as well as those of us who sit on the Consumer Subcommittee so recently established in the Commerce Committee, must be the initiators and the guardians of the welfare of the unorganized common man.

The times have changed. This is no longer 1948, and a lot has happened to the economy in the last 20 years to make features of that era outdated. Outmoded certainly is the $600 exemption, unrealistic, inequitable, an undeserved penalty for the taxpayer who is in the lower brackets. To refer once more to the Treasury paper I have cited:

Perhaps the major function of the exemptions is to determine minimum levels of income, so that...

We are in all too many instances today taxing the poor, those whose incomes are below the income level needed for adequate living standards of decency, perhaps even for some who are below the income level which we designate as that of poverty. It is time we stopped taxing the poor and gave them an opportunity to live in the spirit of the Nation. An exemption of $600 per person—I might remind you also that until 1939 it was $1,000 for a single person and $3,500 for a married couple without any exemption of $600 per person is unrealistic and unfair. It should be changed to $1,000.

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

The S. (S.1615) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,000, introduced by Mr. Harrington, as read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 202 OF THE HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1955. This bill would authorize loans to private, nonprofit organizations to finance the construction or improvement of museums, theaters, and other similar facilities to be used for cultural or educational purposes.

This bill is an outgrowth of an amendment I offered last session to the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1964. The amendment, which became section 1006 of that act, authorized loans to public bodies for the construction of various types of cultural facilities under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

Under that title, the Federal Government extends credit through the Land and Facilities Development Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the construction of cultural facilities by public bodies, directly to municipalities which cannot otherwise obtain credit on reasonable terms and conditions. In 1965, loans approved under this program totaled 106, for $76.4 million. Ninety percent of the loans were to towns of under 5,000 in population, and they covered such projects as hospitals, harbors and dock projects, sewers, water and gas distribution systems, airports, municipal buildings, nursing homes, fire stations, golf courses, swimming pools, street improvements, and parking facilities.

The amendment I offered last session authorized loans to private, nonprofit organizations to finance the construction of works for the storage, treatment, purification or distribution of water, or the construction of sewage, sewerage, and sludge disposal facilities, in such works or facilities are needed to serve a smaller municipality or rural area, and there is no existing public body able to construct and operate such works or facilities. The existing legislation, then, authorizes loans to private, nonprofit corporations, but restricts their use to public bodies. And it is stated that loans to municipalities, however, can be used for much broader public purposes, including cultural facilities.

Mr. President, the bill I offer today would correct this disparity. Cultural facilities, such as science museums, serve a distinct public purpose, a very important public purpose. Millions of schoolchildren visit museums every year, and without such museums book learning come to life in exhibits and displays. It is my firmly held belief that these museums, and other similar cultural facilities, should be eligible to receive public facilities loans whether they are municipal or private, nonprofit institutions, or analogy to the eligibility of both types of institutions for water and sewer facilities loans under the public facilities loan program.

The need for such assistance is clear. The National Endowment for the Arts has prepared, at my request, a short memorandum outlining the nature of more than 200 requests for assistance for the arts which it has been unable to meet. It makes clear that this number is only a very small percentage of the total demand, because of the repeated statements by the chairman of the endowment, Roger Stevens, that such requests cannot be met. The memorandum does not give a geographical breakdown of the requests for assistance, but it is my understanding that cities in all parts of the country are represented.

A specific illustration of the need for broadening the public facilities loan program is provided by the situation of the Museum of Science in Boston, Mass. The museum, widely recognized as one of the world’s finest, is situated on State land. This makes it ineligible, under Massachusetts law, for a regular mortgage loan. It is also a nonprofit corporation, which makes it ineligible for grant or loan funds under existing Federal programs. Yet the museum needs an estimated $8 million for expansion of its facilities to bring learning to life in exhibits and displays. It is my understanding that cities in all parts of the country are represented.

The Boston Museum of Science is not an isolated example; hundreds of cities in the United States have similar institutions facing similar problems of capital extension of land. Mr. President, I want to emphasize one point: that this bill neither requests nor requires any increase in authorization or appropriation. Loans under the pub-
When the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act was passed, it included a provision stating that projects which could be supported under this Act would include loans or grants for the construction or renovation of museums, art centers or galleries, theaters or other centers for the performing arts, and other cultural facilities. The problem addressed to the National Endowment for the Arts by private, non-profit organizations is that the most frequently repeated inquiry has been requests for financial assistance to build a cultural center. In almost every community there is a yearning, a desire to do something in this area.

Many inquiries, of which these are examples, are received from community arts associations, one from a community theatre group; three from children's theatre groups; four from community arts councils; a band shell; a community arts association, and one from a music and arts association; one from a light opera association; and one from a school of arts.

Theaters: Of the many inquiries relating to construction of theatres, the bulk—58, including two seeking funds for renovating an existing community theatre group; three from children's theatre groups; four from community arts councils; one from a music and arts association; one from a light opera association; and one from a school of arts.

The bill (S. 1618) to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to authorize loans to private non-profit organizations to finance specific projects for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of museums, art centers or galleries, theaters or other centers for the performing arts, and other similar facilities to be used for cultural or educational purposes.
from the Endowment due to its limited budget. The twenty-six private citizens, individuals, and public and private corporations which give to the Endowment, which is advisory to the Endowment, determined that this present policy should be abandoned. This policy, described above, is believed to represent only a small percentage of the needs for the construction or improvement of facilities across the nation.

The Endowment is certain that a much greater volume of requests for assistance in this field will find no answer if the Endowment is in a position to encourage such applications as part of its announced programming.

MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND HAYDEN PLANETARIUM,
HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. SENATE,
WASHINGTON, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am delighted to hear that you plan to propose legislation which would make it possible for museums and other cultural institutions to borrow funds from the federal government for the construction or improvement of their capital facilities. I am also pleased that low-cost loans are among the facilities included in your program.

The availability of such funds to both private and public cultural and educational institutions might well lead to a significant renaissance of these facilities across the country. And, to meet these needs for a world dominated by incredible and amazing changes, the availability of federal grants to both large and small cultural and educational institutions might well lead to a renaissance of these facilities across the country.

The extraordinary growth of our population, and the vast increase in interest by a vast cross-section of the public in science, art, and history, is taxing the facilities of virtually all of our museums to the bursting point. Meeting this clearly demonstrated need for expansion promptly and effectively inevitably involves large capital costs for both additional exhibit-space and adequate parking facilities. And, to meet these needs promptly, and to meet the rising costs of capital funds campaigns or very substantial borrowing—frequently by institutions which cannot afford either because of limited local resources on a crash basis—or lack of adequate collateral for a typical mortgage loan.

Our problem is highly relevant to national purposes. The estimate is of a need of $8 million to increase the size of our plant and to meet a clearly demonstrated and urgent need—and there are few needs more urgent today in this whole country. Prominent careers in science and re-educating our adult citizens so that they will be able to understand, intelligently and effectively in a world dominated by incredible and constant scientific change and advance.

We would have liked to borrow most or all of this $8 million, construct and equip the needed additions to our plant at once, and get them open to the public, which needs them so much.

However, we are situated on State property, so we cannot take out a mortgage loan—and, even if we could, the current raised costs have made it imprudent for us. We are, also, like many others, a private educational corporation so, under present statutes, the government can not either loan or appropriate funds to help us—even though this is easy to demonstrate to be in the public interest.

We are proceeding to raise these funds through a capital campaign and have secured slightly over half the needed sum—and during these years have been aware that our goal has inflated better than 10% away ahead of us.

Our capacity to raise funds for this project is demonstrated and we do not seek a federal handout. However, we would like to be able to accelerate our expansion as rapidly as possible. A federal loan, which would be repaid as rapidly as gifts and bequests for this purpose were received.

Legislation which would permit such a procedure is badly needed. The Endowment has been told that the present policy has cost the Arts millions of dollars to scores of smaller rural museums as well as to our larger city ones. There is nothing more costly or inefficient today than deferred piecemeal plant construction.

Conductons on spear-heading this vitally important legislation, I hope that your efforts will meet with speedy success.
Ever sincerely,
BRADFORD WASHBURN,
Director.

CAREER INCENTIVES FOR CERTAIN PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

MRS. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Brewnster) I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend titles 10 and 37 to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces.

This bill was passed by the House of Representatives last session, and arrived here in the Senate too late for action.

The purpose of this bill is very simple. It is to provide pay and rank benefits for those officers of the Armed Forces who have received professional training and degrees which are required in order to perform their military duties. Such officers would include attorneys, optometrists, podiatrists, pharmacists, and psychologists. Right now, we are considering sweeping changes in our selective service laws, changes which might make it even more difficult than at present to recruit the professionally trained men needed by the Armed Forces. This bill would, in my opinion, make it much easier to obtain the needed services of these skilled men.

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

The bill (S. 1619) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces introduced by Mr. McNamara (for himself and Mr. Brewster), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATION MAKING IT A CRIMINAL OFFENSE TO BURN OR MUTILATE A U.S. FLAG

MRS. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill making it a criminal offense to burn, deface, mutilate, or trample upon the flag of the United States. I ask that this bill be printed in the Senate Record this week. A number of senators have during the past few months expressed to me their concern over the use of our national symbols.

While this bill has the same purpose as other bills that have been introduced, it has some distinctions which in the long run may prove to be of the utmost importance.

The incidents which took place in Sheep Meadow of Central Park in New York City are well known and do not require any further elaboration. It will suffice to say that the burning and mutilation of our national symbols—this on the 100th year of the birth of our Nation—was a deplorable act. The deplorability which brought this about stands in stark contrast to the patriotism and bravery of their fellow citizens. There is more on the horizon of the battle for freedom.

This Nation has a history of tolerating and even encouraging dissent and criticism of public officials and actions of the Government. As a matter of fact, I myself, feel no compunction against criticizing certain actions of my Government when in my judgment criticism is in the public interest. However, a line must be drawn when it comes to open and callous destruction of one of the cherished symbols of all the ideals for which our country stands. To openly burn the flag of the United States is the act of a traitor and certainly transcends the bounds of responsible dissent.

In my judgment, it is an unfortunate oversight that Congress has never seen fit to make a violation of the national symbols a violation of Federal law. It should be a Federal offense to defile the symbol of our Federal Union of States. I am pleased, however, to note that there is a bill introduced in the House moving ahead on legislation of this nature. There have been several bills introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and in the interest of focusing on this subject, I have introduced this bill here today.

The bill I am introducing is a carefully conceived proposal designed to end the act of any assault upon our constitutionality before the highest Court of our land. There is no question but that the first conviction obtained under the terms of any bill of this nature would be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1619) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces introduced by Mr. McNamara (for himself and Mr. Brewster), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1262) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for profitmaking purposes at its next printing.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mccarthy], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) proposing a constitutional amendment relative to equal rights for men and women, at the next printing of the joint resolution.

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

GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND'S SPEECH TO THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on yesterday the commander of the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, delivered an outstanding address before the annual luncheon meeting of the Associated Press in New York. General Westmoreland's prepared address and his response to the questions raised in his prepared remarks constitute a rousing endorsement of the necessity for the United States to bring about a successful conclusion to the war in Vietnam.

There is much food for thought contained in his observations. His strong stand adds another star to his outstanding performance in leading our troops under the most trying of circumstances.

All citizens of the State of South Carolina, and indeed the Nation, are justly proud of this man and his performance and accomplishments in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of General Westmoreland's remarks, as well as any questions which followed, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and comments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEXT OF GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S REMARKS AT AP MEETING

(New York, April 24.—Here is the text of Gen. William C. Westmoreland's speech on Vietnam at Monday for the annual meeting of the Associated Press:)

A COMMANDER'S VIEW OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Almost 40 months ago I last visited this hotel just before leaving for duty in Vietnam. I came by to see my friend, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Gen. MacArthur said to me: "I see you have a new job. I know you realize that this new assignment carries with it great opportunities, but it also is fraught with hazards."

I now wonder whether this occasion is an opportunity or a hazard.

The situation in Vietnam has been accorded the most intensive news coverage in history. As a result, every American should know, by now, his own part of the war. How accurate is this image? Do most Americans fully appreciate the character of the war and its complexity? Today I hope to contribute to better understanding.

What kind of a war is being fought in Vietnam? How is it being fought? How is it going? What lies ahead? These questions I will address.

The Vietnamese—and we, their allies—are involved in a total undertaking—a single, all-out effort to defend the freedom and the state of the people of Vietnam, the independence of the free nations of Asia, and the American people. Our reputation and the honor of our country are at stake. At one and the same time, we must fight the enemy, protect the people, and help them build a nation in the pattern of their choice.

THE REAL OBJECTIVE

The real objective of the war is the people. If the enemy could take Saigon, or the heavily populated area of the Delta, or both, the war would be over—without negotiation or conference. He lost this chance two years ago, and I can promise you that his military tactics alone will not win him another opportunity. Yet, despite his staggering combat losses, he clings to the belief that his military defeat is a political victory. The combination of psychological and political warfare—both here and abroad—he has gained support which give him hope that he can win politically that which he cannot accomplish militarily.

Many myths about the Vietcong still persist, but I hope I can dispel some of them here and now.

The doctrine of conquest in South Vietnam is from the book of Mao Tse-tung. It is the standard three-phase pattern—the combination of subversive political cells, guerrilla units, and conventional military force.

Between 1954 and 1963, political cells, trained and directed from North Vietnam, were installed throughout South Vietnam. At this time, South Vietnam had a heavily populated area of the Delta, or both, the war would be over—without negotiation or conference. He lost this chance two years ago, and I can promise you that his military tactics alone will not win him another opportunity. Yet, despite his staggering combat losses, he clings to the belief that his military defeat is a political victory. The combination of psychological and political warfare—both here and abroad—he has gained support which give him hope that he can win politically that which he cannot accomplish militarily.

Many myths about the Vietcong still persist, but I hope I can dispel some of them here and now.
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What we have is not a civil war. It is a massive campaign to external aggression from Communist North Vietnam.

The political cells have created an enemy patriotism and mentality. The local population of villages and hamlets. The guerrillas wage constantly, mostly at night, the cruellest kind of war—terror—civilians are shot, bombed and mutilated as examples to those who might resist or defect, or simply become disheartened.

A typical example of Vietcong terror took place shortly before I left Vietnam. During the early morning hours of April 16th, the Vietcong attacked a hamlet called Saigon. Among the victims were five revolutionary development team members. The Vietcong were able to scatter the locals and shoot through the heads.

During the last nine years, 85,000 Vietnamese—a large share of them teachers, policemen, and elected or natural leaders—have been killed or kidnapped. Translated to the United States, that would be more than 600,000 people, with emphasis on mayors, councilmen, policemen, teachers, government officials and even journalists who work for our friends in Saigon.

At the other end of the war spectrum, we have fought, in the south, during the past year, a series of major engagements against Vietnamese regular army divisions. We have captured thousands of weapons and large stores of ammunition and equipment that have been transported from North Vietnam.

In summary: The Vietcong is not a legitimate nationalist movement. It is a movement organized, controlled and supported by the Communist government of North Vietnam. What support it gets from the people of South Vietnam is largely the result of terror, for the Vietcong is the murderer of those individuals who oppose it.

Two years ago South Vietnam was on the verge of an invasion. The enemy's main force units were attacking with increased intensity from hidden bases and sanctuaries. The government of Vietnam had arrived at a crossroad. It was a question of honoring a long-standing commitment by the Government of the United States to a young nation fighting for its freedom, or defaulting to the aggressor. Our President reaffirmed our commitment and made the courageous decision to stay the course. This meant using whatever military and economic power was necessary.

Once we had major forces ashore we began to lose, but we have regained this and have quite a few of the enemy's main force units. We have taken a major victory against a major enemy.

During the last year and a half we have sought out the enemy, caught him off guard, fought him before he was ready. For a time, the enemy's morale was low. It is now improving, but not to my satisfaction.

Working closely with the Vietnamese forces we have moved into many of the populated areas of South Vietnam, and have taken over the countryside. The enemy is fighting a guerrilla war and has learned to understand and admire them. As we have increased our forces, we have expanded our air support and artillery fire on a moving column of enemy forces.

We are fighting a war in South Vietnam, and we are winning. It is a war of attrition, of attrition, of attrition. In the last three years, I have seen them literally hold the country together. Despite their military strength, they have taken on the enemy guerrillas and main forces alone. At any given time, they have been fighting the enemy, not just the enemy, but their own people as well.

The Vietnamese forces have been fighting in South Vietnam, and they have earned the confidence of these staunch allies.

The Vietnamese armed forces and the Vietnamese people are aware of and appreciate our support. They know we have assisted them for 12 years in the development of their military organization.

With the Vietnamese, I think, is the fact that our American servicemen are eager to help them build schools, dispensatories and other upbuilding projects to their communities. These civic action projects, voluntarily undertaken by our troops and those of our allies, is inspiring to both.

A young corporal of the 82nd Airborne, the division that I command, wrote a letter to his friends in Saigon. He expresses the feeling of the troops, who are doing a job in a joint operation with the Vietnamese.

I would like to tell you more about the men who are fighting for their country. They are highly educated, they are highly trained, and they are highly motivated. They have a deep sense of pride and duty, and they are prepared to do their best.

These men are the heroes of our nation. They are the American fighting men who are fighting for the freedom of South Vietnam.

We have turned the enemy's back on the south. We have brought to its knees the enemy's main force units. We have destroyed the enemy's infrastructure, we have destroyed the enemy's supply lines, we have destroyed the enemy's economic base. We have the enemy on the run.

And they will continue to strive for one more victory. They will continue to fight. They will continue to win. They will continue to fight until they have done what they have been fighting for years, and that is to stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia and to give the people of South Vietnam a freedom of choice. They have given it to the people of South Vietnam.

They have given it to the people of South Vietnam because they have had the courage to fight. They have had the courage to fight for their freedom, and they have had the courage to fight for their country.

We have given them the courage to fight for their freedom. We have given them the courage to fight for their country. We have given them the courage to fight for the United States of America.

And so it is, that we have turned the enemy's back on the south. We have brought to its knees the enemy's main force units. We have destroyed the enemy's infrastructure, we have destroyed the enemy's supply lines, we have destroyed the enemy's economic base. We have the enemy on the run.

And they will continue to strive for one more victory. They will continue to fight. They will continue to win. They will continue to fight until they have done what they have been fighting for years, and that is to stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia and to give the people of South Vietnam a freedom of choice. They have given it to the people of South Vietnam.

They have given it to the people of South Vietnam because they have had the courage to fight. They have had the courage to fight for their freedom, and they have had the courage to fight for their country.

We have given them the courage to fight for their freedom. We have given them the courage to fight for their country. We have given them the courage to fight for the United States of America.

And so it is, that we have turned the enemy's back on the south. We have brought to its knees the enemy's main force units. We have destroyed the enemy's infrastructure, we have destroyed the enemy's supply lines, we have destroyed the enemy's economic base. We have the enemy on the run.
as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he regards as a major political achievement, he continues to believe that we are making progress in Vietnam. He is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, in fact, is the administration's new Vietnam strategy, one that includes the Vietnamese and those of our brave allies.

I foresee, in the months ahead, some of the bitterest fighting of the war. But I have confidence that the American armed forces in Vietnam, it is needless to say I am not talking about artillery or military forces in Vietnam, it is needless to say I am talking about artillery or military forces in Vietnam. And I am confident that the support we and our allies will continue to receive from our President and from the Congress.

The magnificent men and women I command in Vietnam have earned the unified support of the American people.

Senator Hart. Gen. Westmoreland, have you asked the Pentagon for more troops and how many?

Gen. Westmoreland. As commander of our American armed forces in Vietnam, it is needless to say I am constantly studying our troop requirements. If Congress and the Pentagon agree, I must plan to take advantage of any situation that may arise, and I must always be ready to receive as many troops as I need to achieve our objectives.

Q. As commander of our American armed forces in Vietnam, it is needless to say I am constantly analyzing the situation. I submit my requests from time to time, my requests are always considered at our senior levels, and I am confident of the support we and our allies will continue to receive from our President and from the Congress.

A. I was delighted to learn that the Mig pilots would be reduced. They are creating deepwater posts where they would become more and more a role in the air war in the so-called expanded battle area.

SINO-SOVET INTERVENTION

Q. What is the possibility of escalation of the war bringing in Red China and Soviet troops? How effective or decisive would they be if they did come in?

A. This is a very difficult question to speculate on. To a military point of view, I think we should be prepared for any contingency. Of course, the USSR is providing equipment to North Vietnam primarily in the electronic warfare system, but The Communist Chinese are providing support-in the form of transportation units and some antiaircraft weapons but primarily infantry-type weapons to support the North Vietnamese army and Vietcong main force units. I think this boils down to whether the USSR and Red China feel that the threat to their formal government and their territory is of such consequence that they would be willing to take the risk that would necessarily be involved.

VIETCONG FIGHTING SPIRIT

Q. The Vietcong are reportedly generally, to have fought well enough for quite some time. To what do you attribute their spirit?

A. The Vietcong, organized, directed and commanded as they are, provide a good place emphasis on political indoctrination. As a matter of interest, their training program for some units devotes more time to political indoctrination than it does to military training. This indoctrination is well done. Of course, it is backed up by a ruthless cadre that uses any methods that are required to keep their troops in line.

Now, this so-called cadre, or leadership, are extremely well trained and indoctrinated and they are committed. However, we have noted a number of recent defections and we are picking up more prisoners, more defectors coming in, and the rate seems to be increasing in a very encouraging way. We learn that many of our prisoners would like to defect, and very much to defect, to come in under the government of Vietcong's amnesty program, if any. They have been very well indoctrinated. But the cadre control them so tightly that they cannot get away. We also know that there is anti-Catholic feeling both with Vietnamese and Vietnamese leadership and the South Vietnamese, the Vietcong. North Vietnamese leaders are being served, I think, in the South. The leadership in Hanoi is by their action putting in their own leadership, apparently because they do not trust some of the South Vietnamese leadership, and there is definite friction between these two regional groups.

The number of defectors that we have received has been multiplying by a factor of two for the last couple of months, and, hopefully, this trend will continue.

The number of senior defectors that are coming in is encouraging. Whereas a year ago we were putting quite a number of lower ranks, now we are getting some of the senior officers. I talked to one the other day, and I think it is encouraging that many members of the large headquarters that he served before defecting would like very much to defect, but they have not been able to do so. The other part of this is that if North Vietnamese leaders was of such consequence that they could not make the break.

SOUTH CAROLINA SALUTES U.S. NAVY SEABEES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the year of 1967 marks a dual anniversary: The 25th for the U.S. Navy Seabees who received the Navy and the 100th for the Navy Civil Engineer Corps.

Led by the Corps officers, the Seabees today are adding a new dimension to the Navy's ability to fight the war in Vietnam. With the slogan that they are "can do" construction battalions of the U.S. Navy.

Today in Vietnam, Seabee battalions are supporting our armed forces and the Vietcong enemy. They face the same problems, the same dangers, the same fate.

As I listen on, they are providing support, in the form of transportation units and some antiaircraft weapons but primarily infantry-type weapons to support the North Vietnamese army and Vietcong main force units. I think this boils down to whether the USSR and Red China feel that the threat to their formal government and their territory is of such consequence that they would be willing to take the risk that would necessarily be involved.
THE NEED FOR A GREATER FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION FOR CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for extending and expanding the Federal welfare services program, as it is proposed in title II, part 3 of the administration's social security bill.

This proposal provides that the Federal Government pay up to 75 percent of additional expenditures for personnel and for the costs of training personnel for child welfare services.

In 1966, total expenditures for child welfare services amounted to about $142 million. Only $39 million were Federal funds, leaving $103 million coming from State and local sources.

I think a statement before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives by Secretary John W. Gardner of HEW puts the need for more funds in perspective. He said as follows:

The present law requires states to make child welfare services available in all counties by 1975. To the extent feasible, the services are to be provided by trained child welfare staff. But the funding authorization presently in the law precludes the Federal government from paying a large part of the additional cost of these requirements.

One-third of the Nation's counties do not have the services of a full-time child welfare worker, and only one-sixth of all child welfare caseworkers have social work degrees.

The number of workers has increased from about 8,700 in 1965 to about 14,000 in 1967. States are trying to improve the quality of their staff through both in-service training programs and educational leave. But 16,000 more child welfare workers will be needed by 1975 in order to meet the requirement of the law.

In my own State of Connecticut, approximately 8,000 children are committed to the State. For every child, there is a need for more funds in the State child welfare commission as neglected or uncared for. Approximately 1,500 of these children are under protective services, and 6,500 children are in placement in foster homes and institutions.

From State funds alone, for this group of children, Connecticut spends over $8 million for their care, and over $1 million for personnel.

The Federal government gives a Bureau grant to Connecticut for child welfare services, however, for the year 1967-68 is a mere $600,000.

A more equitable sharing of the cost of care for this disadvantaged group of children would make it possible for my State to develop and support a much more adequate range of services.

Today more than ever before, the need for the expansion of Federal support for child welfare services is critical.

The deprived and disadvantaged child today, often without adequate parental care, often untreated, needs our help.

Mr. President, I believe that the series is worthy of the attention of the Senate. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Mar. 28, 1967]

PRISON CONCEPT CHANGES VASTLY—HIGH GRAY WALLS MISSING AT MARION, ILL., FACILITY

(First of a series)

BY BILL BILLOTE

MARION, ILL.—How did the new top maximum-security prison of the Federal system 10 miles from this southern Illinois city compare with Alcatraz, which for 26 years was the nucleus of the biggest egos in the criminal world?

They are completely different.

When apparent, this plane swooped out of a fog over the slant piles at a strip mine on the edge of the small airport until our group left two days later.

In the plane to the lawn where Franklin Roosevelt was shot, a ranking Republican member of the Senate subcommittee on Federal prisons; Myrl E. Anderson, director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and this reporter.

SOLID ROCK

The rest of the trip to the prison was made in a car in a drizzle.

This reporter journeyed to "The Rock," as Alcatraz was called. At that time the trip was completed in a prison bus that carried a load of 12 acres was 1/4 mile out in San Francisco Bay.

It rose from mist in the shadow of the Golden Gate Bridge like an ominous cloud against the state-gray sky.

This was the same trip Al Capone and 52 other criminals made August 22, 1934, when it became known that Capone's influence had reached into the prison at Atlanta, Ga.

Big Al swaggered into his cell boasting that he could take everything Alcatraz could dish out.

RUSTIC SCENE

He shuffled out four years later, never to be a threat to law and order again. He couldn't take the anonymity of being just another number.

As our car arrived at the Marion prison, 16 deer could be seen grazing peacefully in sight of the buildings, which are in the center of 1,500 acres of rustic land deeded to the Bureau of Prisons from the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge.

"Sometimes you can see 45 to 50 of them grazing out there," Prison Director Anderson said.

The next surprise was the absence of the gray walls that enshroud nearly all state and Federal prisons.

Instead there are double 30-foot-high chain fences. They have crossbars of barbed wire which extend inward so they would be directly overhead of any one trying to scramble to the top.

NIMROD NATION

Between the two fences, 12 feet apart, are several inches of white crushed limestone. The limestone reflects the floodlights at night. The fences are anchored in concrete four feet deep.

When nervous natives sought to have walls erected they were reassured by the precautions taken at the prison.

"If any one is able to dig underneath," a prison official said at the time, "he would almost deserve his freedom." He also pointed out that a wall would have added $1,250,000 to the 12-million-dollar cost. The fences were erected for 200 thousand dollars.

The first stop was the administration building. Here beautiful green plants grew from containers. In the corner of the lobby there was a display of pictures painted by inmates, leather work and other items that would have sold at a good price in a good department store.
Waiting in an office was a short, stocky man with a tanned face and the eyes of a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison. His name is Robert Gary, a slim man with gray beginning to turn white hair and the eyes of a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison. He is Warden J. A. Mayden, and he is Prison Director of the Federal Penitentiary at Marion, Illinois.

Standing near by was Associate Warden Robert Gary, a slim man with gray beginning to turn white hair and the eyes of a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison. He looked at the investigators, of whom one was a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison, and his associate started down the hall back towards the lobby.

After signing at a desk, they passed through a steel grill that opened automatically and they walked several steps. Another visitor to this prison was a visitor to this prison, and his associate started down the hall back towards the lobby.

**PRISON'S PUSHBUTTON SECURITY**

Visitor to this prison, of whom one was a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison, and his associate started down the hall back towards the lobby.

**WAITING IN AN OFFICE**

To the west of the lobby is the main building, which contains the control center. From the control center, the visitors can see nine of the 12 steel gates that control all sections of the prison in the area. This control center is used during the daylight hours, and it is right, throw shadow reminders to the inmates that they are serving time.

**WE'RE SECURITY?**

Where are the horizontal steel bars on the outside of the steel door just outside the maximum security administration building? The new director of prisons is confident that increasing effort will be placed on the reclamation of younger criminals and in correcting the conditions that may have contributed to their decisions to live outside the law.

**WHERE'S SECURITY?**

But at Marion, as the inspecting party comprised of Warden J. A. Mayden, Senator Hruska, and Mr. Alexander, they were careful as they entered the maximum security section by name, and the Investigators of the future?

**NOT STRANGERS**

Waiting in an office was a short, stocky man with a tanned face and the eyes of a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison. His name is Robert Gary, a slim man with gray beginning to turn white hair and the eyes of a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison. He is Warden J. A. Mayden, and he is Prison Director of the Federal Penitentiary at Marion, Illinois.

Standing near by was Associate Warden Robert Gary, a slim man with gray beginning to turn white hair and the eyes of a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison. He looked at the investigators, of whom one was a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison, and his associate started down the hall back towards the lobby.

After signing at a desk, they passed through a steel grill that opened automatically and they walked several steps. Another visitor to this prison was a visitor to this prison, and his associate started down the hall back towards the lobby.

**NEW PRISON'S PUSHBUTTON SECURITY**

Visitor to this prison, of whom one was a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison, and his associate started down the hall back towards the lobby.

**FAIR BUT LOOS**

This is far from the physical restraints visible from the moment a visitor or new inmate stepped onto the dock at Alcatraz before it was closed in July, 1963.

When Alcatraz was closed, it was moored with heavy chains. An officer would signal another in a tall tower and he would send a key sliding down a cable. The key would be used to secure the lock on the chain. Then it would be pulled back up to the tower.

The prisoners were counted every 25 minutes, day and night. There were no trustys. Tear gas bulbs set in the ceiling of the administration building. The control rooms were grim cubicles with ammunition boxes on the walls. The lights on the panel flashes on. The control center is used during the daylight hours, and it is right, throw shadow reminders to the inmates that they are serving time.

**HELP GETS**

To get into that center, it is necessary to ascend a winding steel staircase behind a steel door just outside the maximum security administration building.

The steep staircase ends at a steel door which in turn leads to another steel door which may be opened electronically by the officer on duty inside.

**SLOTS GATE**

Here again is the complicated panel, electronically operated. But there is a difference. If an inmate attempting to escape grabs hold of the barbed wire at the top of the fence with an instrument or his hand, one of the lights on the panel flashes on.

The light will inform the officers the exact section of the fence that is being tampered with. In addition an officer, walking in the 12-foot corridor in the double fences, checks them carefully once on each eighthour shift to find if they have been worked on by a convict.

**SIX TOWERS**

There are six red telephones in the prison—one each for Warden Mayden, Mr. Gary, the correctional officer captain, the message center, the correctional officers at a fire house. A call over any of them can close the prison like a steel trap.

**BOEING IT**

"I was a kid of 21 years desperately trying to get a job during the depression." Mr. Alexander recalled. "I had studied social work and was interested in working in the parole field.

"I motioned me to follow him and he led me to a cell and opened the door." Mr. Alexander said. "There, blinking in the light that suddenly flooded in on him, was an inmate. He was handcuffed to a bar in his cell that was so high his toes barely touched the ground. The deputy warden then asked me who I was. I didn't go home and forget about taking a prison job." Mr. Alexander said that although he did not intend to stay permanently in prison work, he did not like being pushed out of a job which he had taken a Civil Service test to get.

On August 28, 1964, Mr. Alexander replaced J. V. Bennett, who retired after 28 years as director of the Bureau of Prisons. Mr. Alexander previously had served as his assistant.

**RECLAIMING**

The new director of prisons is confident that the Federal Penitentiary at Marion is the pioneer of corrective institutions in the future.

Mr. Alexander said the deputy warden, a dandy with a swagger stick, minced no words in letting him know he was about to welcome a new guard in the system who had training in social work.

Mr. Alexander recalled. "I had studied social work and was interested in working in the parole field.

"I motioned me to follow him and he led me to a cell and opened the door." Mr. Alexander said. "There, blinking in the light that suddenly flooded in on him, was an inmate. He was handcuffed to a bar in his cell that was so high his toes barely touched the ground. The deputy warden then asked me who I was. I didn't go home and forget about taking a prison job." Mr. Alexander said that although he did not intend to stay permanently in prison work, he did not like being pushed out of a job which he had taken a Civil Service test to get.

On August 28, 1964, Mr. Alexander replaced J. V. Bennett, who retired after 28 years as director of the Bureau of Prisons. Mr. Alexander previously had served as his assistant.

**ENOUGH**

There is no trusty system at Marion, but inmates can work their way up to the rank of a guard and can get as far in education as their efforts will take them.

Mr. Alexander said he has always believed that depriving a convicted man of his freedom is punishment enough; that once a man is serving time all efforts should be devoted to getting him to earn successfully to the outside world and convincing him that it is the only intelligent road to take.
He approves of designing prison buildings to avoid grimness. Between the buildings are long glass walls. Also different from other prisons are the high, vaulted roofs of the library, chapel, gymnasium and dining rooms.

The entrance to the new Marion prison is the lobby of a top-flight New York hotel. Its chef is Food Service Administrator Mike Love, who said: "You can't get trouble in any prison if the food is bad."

Mr. Alexander warns the staff at the prison that 'The best criminals in the world are on this institution and it is the staff's responsibility to see that the experiment does not fall.

The gymnasium and dining rooms. The chapel is a marvel of acoustics.

MODERN PRISON SPAWNED CRIME STUDIES

For two of colored glass. The kitchen could be the envy of a hundred-year-old school that started out as a truck through a gate and without an escape from inside the maximum security section.

A few of the outside maintenance inmates, however, have sometimes done the job. Two prisoners tried to ram a truck through a gate and failed.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Mar. 31, 1967]

THE CHAPEL IS A MARVEL OF ACOUSTICS. BUILT ON CLEARLY, IT HAS LONG, THIN COLUMNS OF COLORED GLASS.

A crime center there seems destined to become as important to correctional institutions as the Federal Bureau of Investigation has to those engaged in law enforcement.

When Myrl E. Alexander, director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, was seeking a site for the ultra-modern prison that was to be the humane answer to Alcatraz, he decided on the spot that "I am going to create a center to work in the field of corrections in 48 hours."

Tough institution for the first time during the Twenties, killed several kingpin of the underworld.

"He decided on the spot that 'I am going to create a center to work in the field of crime prevention and correction if the prison project goes through,"

This was done, and Southern Illinois, a hundred-year-old school that started out as a penal institution, is now a place where getting visitors interested in crime prevention and correction from all over the world.

ARMED

Charles C. Petrich, of President Morris's staff, and Robert J. Brooks, of the center staff, explained the center's aims to Nebraska Senator Roman Hruska and other visitors.

In a near-by room 17 correctional officers were taking a nine-week course. They came from Nebraska, Oklahoma, Missouri, Tennessee, South Carolina, Louisiana, Minnesota, the Dakotas and other states.

From the Nebraska Penal Complex was Lieut. Robert Parratt who will head the training section of the new center.

"All of our personnel will take a refresher course under Lieutenant Parratt," Warden Maurtce Sigler, who will head the training section of the new center.

But the trend has been, particularly in the last dozen years, seeking out reasons for crime and instituting reforms in reformatory and prisons.

penologists declared that they felt they could make a case in the new center that should have the opportunity to learn a trade, procure an education up to and including the college level and be given any psychiatric help they needed.

In explaining the concept of the new Marion prison it was stated:

"The new Marion institution has a three-fold mission—the safe custody of Federal prisoners and their rehabilitation, research into the causes and cure of delinquency begun.

"These considerations and the requirement for strict economy of construction and operation are inherited from Alcatraz.

"Adequate provision has been made for a well-balanced treatment program encompassing diagnosis, social casework, educational and vocational training, industrial employment, individual and group counseling, medical and psychiatric services and religion.

TROUBLE OVER CRIME STUDIES

When Alcatraz closed it was decided not to send any of the Rock's alumni to Marion. The official story was that the old institution was getting old, their trouble-making days were behind them and there would be no need to accommodate them.

This is true, but as inAtlanta, Leavenworth and McNeill.

They said that one time Public Enemy No. 1 Alvin Karpis was then "a mellow old man." He was sent to McNeil Island.

At the Marion prison, Senator Roman Hruska and Federal Prison Director Myrl Alexander sat down at the prison reclassification board which meets twice a week.

"The man under consideration was 28 years old and had been in Alcatraz for seven years. Originally sentenced for armed robbery he had gotten into a fight at Leavenworth that resulted in the death of another inmate.

This earned him a ticket to Marion with the hopes that he could some day earn his way out again.

Since arriving at Marion he had completed work in 22 college subjects, had changed from a defiant prisoner to one who was now getting along well with prison officials and others in the prison population.

EARNED RIGHT

One by one the members of the board gave their reactions to the inmate's request. Corrections Commissioner, the medical doctor, prison officials all joined the discussion.

"A final decision was finally decided the inmate had earned the right to take another step up the ladder—a slight relaxation in security and a few more privileges.

When the inspection of the prison had ended, Senator Hruska at a gathering of the top echelon of the prison officials complimented them on what he had seen.

He said that improvements in the prisons of the future were inevitable and that, no doubt, the activities at Marion would be one day recognized for the pioneering effort that it is.

Then he touched upon some of the handicaps to the efforts of inmates are locked under an attempt to slow the national crime rate. He mentioned the Escobedo and Miranda decisions.

"You have to get them here before you can help them," he said.

DESERECRAT IN THE FLAG

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the vast majority of the American people have been shocked, saddened, and disgusted by recent desecrations of the American flag.
Unfortunately, there is no existing Federal legislation to protect our flag. That situation should be remedied promptly.

Ours is a nation which prides itself on free speech and free assembly. But a small minority recently has tried to expand these freedoms into license of the most extreme nihilism and unbridled anarchy. Desecration of the American flag is a national disgrace, and the American people are outraged.

It is a genuine tragedy that we must focus attention on legislation to protect the flag, but recent events illustrate that action is needed.

The national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Leslie M. Fry, of Idaho, Nev., spoke out on this issue yesterday saying:

Last weekend an American Flag was burned during a so-called peace march in New York City. This revolting scene to the great majority of Americans was seen on television and in their Sunday newspapers. More recently a professor at an Indiana University burned the flag before his students and was demanded that they dismiss the professor. These occurrences must not be allowed to continue. Most of the states have legislation, but it has not been punished for flag desecration. With some five hundred thousand American men serving in Vietnam—giving their lives daily for the symbol we must have legislation to protect our flag.... The American people and the press will be watching Congress on that score. The time has come for the body that thinks about legislation to protect our flag. But, unfortunately, not all people in the nation have the love and respect for the flag that the vast majority of Americans have. Now is the time for legislation to protect our flag. This is the will of the American people.

Mr. President, it is indeed the will of our fellow Americans that this source of national embarrassment and outrage be ended. There are many ways in which protest can be manifested, but flag desecration goes far beyond decency, communism, and even institutional safeguard. Legislation is needed now, and I hope that Congress will respond quickly.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT RESTORATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the first amendment added to the investment tax credit restoration bill—H.R. 6950—was for the purpose of repealing the political campaign fund law. The Senate voted 48-42 for repeal. But the administration and its spokesmen on the Senate floor have stubbornly refused to acknowledge the will of the people by amending the bill. They have tried to load this bill down with many other amendments with the hope of having it sent back to committee, or of having it rejected when the House reconvenes the Senate version. Such tactics are not conducive to good legislation. The public and the press have not been fooled by these time-wasting maneuvers.


Cut Out the Comedy

In a regrettable display of irresponsibility some members of the Senate have withdrawn an important piece of tax legislation so heavily with political sugar plums that the core measure itself seems likely to collapse. The intent of this legislation is to encourage millions of "riders" one designed to restore tax incentives to business investments which have been curtailed by the current administration. The measure would completely or at least strip it of all amendments and amendments to the campaign fund repealer plus another legislative move designed, according to Senator Scott, to void the campaign fund measure just temporarily.

What makes all of this even more regrettable is that some of the amendments may well be worthwhile. One provides a liberalization of Social Security benefits for veterans, who grants credit to those supporting college students. The Senate's action brings undue rejoicing from many who urged such legislation, unaware of the background maneuvering.

"It is time, as one member demanded on the floor, for the U.S. Senate to "cut out the comedy." It represents, as Senator Hugh Scott (R-Pa) noted, a cruel deception of the public as well as "a scandalous waste of time."

The tax incentive restoration is worthy. So is the repeal of the campaign financing law. Both are matters of public concern. The other proposals, however worthy, should not be used in a callous political maneuver. They should be considered separately, on their merits.

THE SWORD UNSHEATHED AGAINST EVII IS A GOOD SWORD

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, our colleague and beloved Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, recently wrote an excellent column pub- lished by the Washington Star. He stands as an irrefutable answer to those who contend that the U.S. involvement in Vietnam and our military efforts there amounted to aggression which goes against the teachings of Jesus. Dr. Harris eloquently pointed out:

That sword unsheathed against evil was a good sword.

Dr. Harris's newspaper column was reprinted in the April 24 edition of U.S. News and World Report. I bring it to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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

"The Blade of a Righteous Sword" (The Reverend Martin Luther King has been saying that the United States is "wasting maneuvers" and "dying for the wrong reasons today.") Some other clergymen echo that view as they condemn the war in Vietnam. What is the religious justification of the right of a nation to wage war? Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, who opens the Senate's sessions with prayer, wrote recently in his column in the Washington Star, "The Blade of a Righteous Sword." Below is the text of the article—David Lawrence, Editor."

(Left by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris—Chaplain, United States Senate)

There is nothing inherently good or bad about a sword. The quality of sharpened steel may depend on whether it is in the hands of a surgeon or a bandit. Earth's greatest Teacher admonished, "Put up your sword; for that which it shall perish by it." That sword was for war and vengeance. It was a bad sword. But Jesus also said, "I am not come to bring peace, but a sword." Against that evil was a good sword. All depends upon the purpose for which the blade is to be used. Without sworls, once fierce men are com­ pelled to cry peace, when death and peace are the same. And to surrender the most heavenly things to the most hellish forces. There is a sword which we hold in the hands only of those who cannot be trusted with them, then the only peace possible between the lion and the lamb, which, it is prophesied, shall some day lie down together, is for the lamb to lie down inside the lion. There are present-day appeasers of evil who flail at the flag. But a peace dictated by unethical force is the peace of slaves. A nation must be strong to make its word for peace effective. A peace gained by constant retreat because of the threatening blackmail of superior force is not peace, but war. It will be a day of mourning for all the free world if ever our nation, whose potential force is the greatest, refuses to back the sword of the democracies and use its power.

There always is enough bad in the world to make that any kind of peace, unless that ill will has a restraining fear of the power of organized good will. To weaken the national striking power is to vote to make it inevitable that the democracies shall be forced to do the bidding of oral parvenus who have been allowed to fashion a dependence of sword. Of course, force never is the last word. At best, it clears but the clear way for the con­ struction of peace and its maintenance. As the face men who have put the state on the throne, instead of God, you cannot conquer them by kindly example or a friendly smile. No gentle charms can stay the fangs of the demons when it is ready to strike. To allow callous deviltry—whenever it is powerful enough—to trample righteous­ ness is to invite a new world war. The fear of good stand impotently, is a tragic travesty of justice and judgment.

In England, before World War II, a group of pacifists, led by the late Lord German's rearmament, led a movement utterly to renounce the sword of defense.

"I am happy to be allowed to risk all on meeting Hitler's threat with understanding and good will, they secured hundreds of thousands of signed pledges of a virtual refusal to take up arms. That futile policy,
sincerely followed, helped to bomb the churches of which these preachers were the ministers and to fill the land with lamentations for the mangled and the dead. That condition was almost intolerable, and many in it felt the siege lacked the compassion of a siege. The man preparedness when the foe struck. Time tragically proved it was no hour to exchange a single word.

In America, a man stood up in a free pulpit to preach. He quoted detached sentences from the Bible whose hand held the lectern when His Father's House was made a den of thieves, and whose eyes were often as a flame of fire. The preacher declared that evil, no matter how political, was never to be resisted with any physical weapons. Rhetorically, he asked, "What has a sword ever accomplished against the evil?"

In a pew a worshiper in whose heart was an aching void and in whose home was a Gold Star, speaking of the valor of a young crusader who marched forth with a righteous sword and came not back. At the church door, following the service, that worshiper said to the clergymen: "I can tell you one thing that the righteous sword has done."

"What?" asked the minister.

Regret be the listener, but deep feeling:

"The sword in the hands of those who have resisted militant evil has given you the right to stand here today and to proclaim your convictions, and saved that old and ailing man, I am afraid I cannot refute that."

There is no refutation in God's world and man's for the flash of the righteous sword!

WE NEED MORE NAVAL GUNFIRE IN VIETNAM

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, Saturday this week The New York Times carried further comments by a prominent military leader with respect to the need for additional naval gunfire in the waters off the coast of Vietnam.

According to the April 22 Times, in an article written by R. W. Apple, Jr., at least eight more destroyers have been requested by Adm. Roy L. Johnson, Commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Adm. Johnson said this could be delayed not one day longer than is absolutely necessary in determining that we ought to have our capital ships on line in the waters off Vietnam.

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

MORE SHIPS ASKED FOR VIETNAM WAR—PACIFIC FLEET CHIEF SAYS EIGHT DESTROYERS ARE NEEDED

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SARGENT, SOUTH VIETNAM, April 21.—Adm. Roy L. Johnson, commander of the United States Pacific Fleet, said tonight that at least eight more destroyers were needed for the war in Vietnam.

Speaking at a news conference here, Admiral Johnson disclosed that he had asked the Defense Department to send him another squadron, consisting of eight ships, as soon as possible.

Five squadrons are permanently assigned to the Pacific Fleet, and a sixth—drawn from the Atlantic Fleet—has been committed temporarily because of the war. Of the 46 to 50 "tin cans" included in these units, about 30 are assigned, on a rotating basis, to duty in waters east of Vietnam.

The destroyers perform a number of functions. Some are assigned to the bombardment of the South Vietnamese coast. Others are involved in Operation Sea Dragon shelling of North Vietnam while still others are assigned to attach anti-aircraft guns to the carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin as a defensive screen.

ATLANTIC DUTIES NOTED

Asked where the additional ships could be obtained, the admiral replied: "The logical place would be the mothball fleet—ships that have been retired from service. You can't just demobilize the Atlantic, even though they don't have a war going on at the moment. They have longevity responsibilities."

Admiral Johnson conceded that most of the destroyers now in mothballs would have to undergo modernization to serve off Vietnam. They are mostly World War II ships whose communication and gunfire control systems are considered antiquated.

Although he declared that the Navy could work here with the ships now deployed in the gulf and in the South China Sea, Admiral Johnson said this could be done only by risking excessive wear-and-tear on the ships and the possibility of deteriorating moral.

Admiral Johnson said he would prefer battleships or heavy cruisers, the admiral replied: "Both."

SOVIET SHIPS AT HAI PHONG

Admiral Johnson, who watched from the deck of the aircraft carrier Coral Sea the launching of planes for yesterday's strikes against power plants in Hailphong, said there were Soviet ships moored within two miles of the main targets.

He said that he was aware of the political repercussions that might have resulted if any ships had been hit, but added: "I have enough confidence in the professional skills of our aviators that the possibility never really worried me."

Asked whether he would prefer battleships or heavy cruisers, the admiral replied: "Both.
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ROBERT SARNOFF ASSESSES BROADCASTING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce is today continuing its hearings on the Radio and Television Broadcasting Act of 1967.

Television has hardly reached its majority as yet. It is still a relatively new and far from fully developed medium. Many of the pioneers are still among us.

One of these is the president of the Radio Corp. of America, Robert W. Sarnoff. Mr. Sarnoff was recently honored with the Gold Medal of the International Radio and Television Society. On that occasion, held in New York, he spoke about the communications industry, discussing three main forces which will require the industry to keep up with new technology, social and economic pressures, and Government regulation.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sarnoff's address be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT W. SARNOFF, PRESIDENT, RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA, GOLD MEDAL AWARD DINNER, INTERNATIONAL RADIO & TELEVISION SOCIETY, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 9, 1967

This award tonight has special meaning for me. It is an award of the ministrés, competitors and friends—with
whom I have worked, fought and argued over
and this the years in the interests of broadcasting
and another perspective. I have found that
time publishing, and nearly two decades with
household word.

And it has been very much a part of me
from the threshold

One is new technology, erasing the distinc­
tions that I faced daily on the facing pages of the RCA Bulletin.
We begin with, all of us must think in revolutionary terms if we hope to grow and prosper.

Tonight, however, as a former broadcaster
now deeply immersed in total communica­
tions, I want to share with you some thoughts on the prospects ahead. We begin with, all of us must think in revolutionary terms if we hope to grow and prosper.

In the next few years the broadcast indus­
tories will become vastly different—whether broadcasting, advertising, publishing,流水
media—and altering what we do and how we do it.

Another is familiar social and economic pressures: restructured power relations, opening new markets for information in every form.

Our third is government regulation. In the past this has been important to the growth of communications. No less is it essential as we approach the more complex problems.

The effects of these forces may at times appear obscure. Nevertheless, the opportuni­
ties opened to us by them are almost limitless.

History teaches two basic lessons about changing communications technology. First, it profoundly influences all social, political and economic institutions by providing more effective means of spreading broadly the inform­
ation necessary to the growth of the members. Second, each major communications
breakthrough is viewed with suspicion or hostility by some group or institutions of the society. This is because it fragments traditional controls over knowledge and popularizes information.

For example, the advent of movable type triggered the first great communications
breakthrough of the modern era. Yet historically the industry's first great communications breakthrough. It has been criticized and condemned in turn by the guild members and the powerful.

The increasing complexity of communica­
tions will inevitably entail greater govern­
ment regulation. This is the third and, perhaps, most important. Yet it is time to recognize that such regulation is a necessity in today's growing society. It will be an essential role in helping to play a constructive role in helping to encourage further progress in communications.

We can only guess at the course that govern­
ment regulation will take. Its initiatives will depend, to a great extent, on the views of a changing group of regulators whose individual philosophies will likely, as sharply as the future as they do now.

By our clearly distinguishing between the harmful and the helpful in government actions, we in the business of communica­
tions can make our viewpoint felt. By recog­
nizing the creative role of government in identifying the problems that lie beyond the scope of industry, we can encourage govern­
ment to create new and imaginative solutions, we can sharpen the thrust of our own efforts to advance the public interest through growth and development.

First, what should be the function of such a service? Second, how can it be financed to assure an adequate and stable source of funds?

Instructional, or truly educational television, defines itself. Non-commercial television, as defined, perhaps we can find no better definition than that in the Carnegie Commission report: "Public television...to define. Perhaps we can find no better definition than that in the Carnegie Commission report: "Public television..." that is, "non-commercial television."

"Public television" is defined as the use of electronic broadcasting to create a system of public service broadcasting for the benefit of the general public. The "public service" aspect of "public television" is defined as the provision of educational, cultural, and public information service..."public television." It is defined as the use of electronic broadcasting to create a system of public service broadcasting for the benefit of the general public.

The Information Revolution will develop rapidly in this and other advanced countries. Ultimately, it will spread to other parts of the world, and we must be ready to meet the challenge.

Growing affluent and leisure time are already generating new demand for varied enter­tainment and information services. The shift to a younger population and the lengthen­ing of the educational process are increasing the currently enormous strain on our teaching and learning facilities.
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PORT. It would focus, as the Carnegie Commission declared, on the type of programs neither appropriate nor available for advertising, consistent with the specific needs that cannot be entirely fulfilled by a commercial television system intended to serve the public.

Although non-commercial television may attract only a small fraction of the audience, its value cannot be measured in those terms alone. It cannot be judged by the same yardsticks applied, for example, to specialized theater, magazines and books of limited circulation. It should be measured by the vitality of its service to minority interests. For these are the interests which contribute the value of experimentation and achievement in the sciences, arts and humanities. The results of such efforts often find their way to the majority of the people, helping to enrich and elevate the quality of life.

We must never forget that majority and minority interests are not separate, monolithic elements in American society. They are constantly interchanging. Let me repeat, what serves the cultural interests of the minority tends ultimately to serve the majority.

True, there are some who question whether non-commercial television will provide a genuinely significant service within its own framework. The best answer to that question is that it provides one which, if use is made of it, is the opportunity it has never had to test its full promise. There are others who question whether government funds should be used to support a service that may attract only a minority of the public. But, if the true value of non-commercial television lies on what it can contribute indirectly and ultimately to all of American life, which I believe it does, then it merits the broad-based financial support.

In my judgment, the basic financial requirements of a non-commercial system can best be met through long-term government guarantees. I believe this would provide the necessary assurance of adequate and stable financial support on a permanent basis. Such financing is consistent with the valid principle of the broadest-based public support, and does not preclude the development of a vigorous debate from individuals and other private sources.

The additional objective of insulating program content from political or other pressures is achieved, as I see it, in this way. I believe it is possible to develop appropriate safeguards against such influences without diluting the basic principle of the broadest-based public support.

Recently, President Johnson, in a message to Congress, recommended important steps toward ensuring the full development of a non-commercial broadcast service. At the same time, he emphasized the need to keep its programming ground largely precluded by the economies of their medium.

At the same time, the commercial broadcaster must not think that this new service will relieve him of the obligation to program for the minority. Both need and many took part in the debate which preceded the sale.

However, the sale was highly controversial and it is often useful, I think, to restudy such an event after the passage of time has cooled the emotions of the moment and after more of the relevant facts are known.

I thought that such a review would be particularly useful in my own case because, in all frankness, I must recall that I was not able at the time of the sale to reach a hard and clear conviction as to whether it was right and proper that the wheat sale be consummated.

I have found this study to be useful and even though there is little likelihood of additional wheat sales to the Soviet Union in the near future, the events surrounding the 1963-64 sale do have a general bearing on the forthcoming hearing and I thought it might be worthwhile while to review the highlights here today.

In 1963, quite unlike the situation today, we had a large surplus of wheat on hand. This surplus had begun to build up with the termination of the Korean war despite the considerable effort by the Government to control production. This large surplus not only served to depress farm prices, but also, of course, was extremely expensive in terms of tax revenues needed to support storage and handling costs. In sharp contrast to the surplus situation in the United States, the Soviet Union was continuing to experience great difficulties in producing sufficient quantities of wheat and other agriculture products to meet domestic needs and to maintain her rather large export commitments. Thus, conditions continuing to worsen, the Soviet Union, in the fall of 1963, found it necessary to negotiate for purchase of wheat from Western nations, particularly Canada and Australia. The announcement of these purchases, totalling $700 million, aroused considerable interest in this country and a number of groups began to argue that the United States should change its trade policies with the Soviet bloc nations.

Despite speculation that Russia also wanted to buy wheat from the United States, President Kennedy's announcement in October that the Soviets intended to purchase American wheat came as a considerable surprise. And the administration's decision to issue "authorized" licenses required for such a transaction touched off a vigorous debate in Congress and across the country.

The administration set the following conditions for possible wheat sales: The sale would be concluded by private American grain traders at world prices, drawing wheat from open market channels which would then be replaced by grain drawn from the Government's own surplus. The sale would be in U.S. dollars or gold, cash on delivery or normal commercial credit; export licenses would be granted only on conditions that commodities be used only in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; at least 50 percent of the wheat sold would be carried in American ships if available; no single American firm would be permitted an excessive share of sales.

Mr. President, the principal arguments raised in favor of the sale can be summarized as follows:

First. A substantial sale would reduce existing wheat stocks, thus reducing Government storage and handling costs and, in turn, strengthening domestic wheat prices.

Second. The sale of wheat might lead to further sales to Russia in such related areas as fertilizer plants and farm machinery.

Third. The sale would help to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit and reduce the growing pressure on our gold supply.
Fourth. Such a sale would be an appropriate sequel to the ratification of the test ban treaty in the sense that it could help to build mutual confidence between the two nations.

Fifth. Since our allies in the free world were selling wheat to Russia, the withholding of our wheat would clearly affect the overall Soviet supply situation.

Sixth. It would cause an important share of the Soviet's gold or dollar exchange to be expended for food rather than for military or industry.

Seventh. It would aid America's standing as a humanitarian power, permitting no one to say that we withheld wheat we didn't need ourselves and desert the situation.

But the Attorney General ruled that the Latta amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1961 was a policy declaration that Congress intended to be considered by the administration, but not binding upon the President. As to the Johnson Act, the Attorney General ruled that deferred payment or normal commercial credit terms did not constitute loans under the act's provisions and it was, therefore, not applicable in this instance.

The debate in Congress focused on the question of whether credit should be extended to the Soviet Government, because it was generally assumed that the Soviets would not be able or willing to pay cash on delivery. It was anticipated that the Soviets would request an arrangement similar to the Canadian one, whereby one-fourth of the total price in cash on delivery, one-fourth in 6 months, one-fourth in 12 months and the final one-fourth in 18 months.

Under the Attorney General's ruling the administration argued that the extension of normal commercial credit was legal and took steps to authorize the Export-Import Bank to guarantee short-term credits should the Soviets ask for such an arrangement. An amendment was offered in the Senate on November 14 to the foreign aid authorization bill prohibiting the Export-Import Bank, as an agency of the Federal Government, from guaranteeing the payment of any obligations incurred by a Communist country in connection with the purchase.

A move to table the amendment failed by a vote of 50-48. The amendment was withdrawn and then offered as a separate bill—S. 2310—and referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. After the hearings the bill was reported unfavorably on November 26 and was tabled by a vote of 57-35.

A similar provision was successfully added to the foreign aid authorization bill in the House. This provision was then eliminated by the Senate Appropriations Committee and sustained on the Senate floor by a vote of 52-33. The difference between the House and Senate was settled by a conference committee report and, thus, the provision guaranteeing of credits extended to Communist countries should be provided only if the President determined that he considered such action in the national interest, and so notified the Senate and the House to that effect.

On February 5, 1964, President Johnson did notify Congress that he determined it was in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to support with guarantees the sale of U.S. farm products to the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania.

As finally concluded, the wheat sales to Russia were different in several respects than what had been originally anticipated. First, the actual volume of wheat sold was less than half the volume that the administration had originally predicted. The first sale by the Continental Grain Co. for 37 million bushels was concluded in January, followed by two sales by Cargill, Inc., for 28.5 million bushels. The sales totaled 65.6 million bushels for a dollar value of $140.2 million.

Second, contrary to original expectations, the Soviet administration had credits, but made full payment in American dollars upon delivery.

Third, less than 50 percent of the grain was actually shipped in American vessels. The Continental Grain Co. had asked for and was granted a waiver of the 50-percent requirement because of insufficient U.S.-flag ship capacity. However, as a result of the administration's action granting the waiver, the International Longshoremen's Association, the Seafarers International Union, and the National Maritime Union declared a boycott against further wheat shipments to the Soviet Union unless the 50-percent requirement was met. On February 25, 1964, President Johnson issued an Executive order calling for enforcement of the provision without waivers, on all future shipments.

A final result is that 38 percent of Continental's shipments and a little more than 50 percent of Cargill's shipments were carried in American-flag ships.

Mr. President, what were some of the concrete results of these two sales? First, it should be noted that because the actual sales were relatively small, the effect on the American economy or the Russian economy was not of major significance. However, the measurable economic gains to the United States were as follows:

Our balance of payments was benefited by a cash inflow of $140 million. Second, at that time it was costing the Government about 26.2 cents a bushel to store and handle surplus wheat. Thus, the removal of 65 million bushels resulted in an annual saving of $17 million. The administration estimated that CCC-owned wheat at that time was being carried for 5 years. Thus the long-term savings in storage and handling costs may have totaled as much as $85 million, and, therefore, offset the export subsidy payments which totaled $44 million. This export subsidy, it should be remembered, goes to the American farmer and not to the purchasing nation.

The U.S. shipping industry received an estimated $13 million from the transportation of wheat sold to the Soviet Union, thus strengthening profits and wages.

Fourth, the fact that domestic surplus was reduced probably had a strengthening effect on domestic prices, but because the sale was not of major significance and American prices was probably slight.

Beyond this, it is extremely difficult, of course, to determine the precise effects of the sales. However, because the Soviet Union had to send gold in London to buy dollars for the purchase, this helped indirectly to take some of the pressure...
One concrete conclusion is warranted, however; in the strictly economic terms it was a satisfactory business transaction.

THE BALTIC STATES: A CASE STUDY OF MODERN DAY COLONIALISM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, colonialism is today rejected and condemned by all those who value freedom and the right of all peoples of self-determination.

The United Nations calls for universal self-determination of all peoples. The United Nations has said that it is to be supported for all peoples. Yet, as a document recently prepared by the Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States points out:

"It is noticeable that the United Nations avoided action upon the most brutal case of colonialism, terror, and even genocide which the Soviet Union has been and is perpetrating in Europe and Asia.

The United Nations has taken steps, for example, to prevent the flow of goods of Rhodesia. It has considered that the present government of Rhodesia represents "a threat to the peace," and that steps must be taken to bring that government to what the United Nations would consider to be a proper position.

Yet, the United Nations has done nothing with the people of the Baltic States who have lived under Communist tyranny for many years.

One argument against such action presents the view that since the occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania has lasted for such a great length of time, that it is no longer valid to call for the reestablishment of self-determination for these countries.

To this argument, the document replies:

If self-determination rested on the immediacy of claims, or if the right to self-rule lessened in direct proportion to the duration of foreign rule, the question of independence for Asia or African states, where foreign colonial governments have existed for a longer time than in the Baltic States, would be a matter of concern.

We must not forget that the 89th Congress unanimously adopted a resolution denouncing the barbarous action of the Soviet Union in the Baltic States and demanding the restoration of self-determination to this region.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

"Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

"Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and educational development; and

"Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

I wish to share this important statement with Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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

The Baltic States: A Case Study of Modern Day Colonialism

"All people have the right to determine the form of their national existence."—Dean Rust, Secretary of State.

The principle of universal self-determination of peoples, espoused by many leaders of the free world, is worked into the fabric of the United Nations and forms the basis for UN action. The hope that mankind might live in lasting peace and freedom, but it is a hope impossible to fulfill if we are interested in the duress or occupation of another, regardless of the nature of this force; imperialist, colonialist, communist, or fascist. It is to our credit, therefore, that the colonial powers of Europe have followed these ideals of the United Nations and have given up their empires, so that even Russia, China, Japan, India, and Asia as the peoples there have realized their right of self-determination.

Independence, some have asserted, has wrecked the appetites of all, any remaining instances of foreign rule—within these two cases—are immediately brought to debate in the United Nations, or to certain sanctions, that in the past these, sanctions have been voted. This road to freedom must be supported for all nations, nations which have been subject to colonialism and oppression would end very soon. It is, however, noticeable that the United Nations has taken little action.
Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the population of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the democratic forces of the Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and political ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that the House of Representatives of the United States urges the President of the United States, in the exercise of his constitutional powers, to:

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the danger of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights for the peoples of the Baltic States.

(House Concurrent Resolution 416 was adopted by the House of Representatives by a record vote of 268 yeas to no nays on June 21, 1967, and was finally passed by the United States Senate on October 22, 1966.)

Even serious political thinkers, concerned with the fate of the Baltic peoples, have described if the occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania has not lasted too long to make valid any claims on the part of the Baltic peoples for self-determination. However, this case may be returned to in such terms. Only if the occupation of these countries and the obliteration of their immediate progeny were a local and isolated phenomenon that took place twenty years ago and bears no relation to other events could it be said that the occupation restored the immediacy of claims, or if the right to self-determination lessened in direct proportion to the duration of foreign rule, then there could be no question of independence for Eastern Europe. For American states, where foreign colonial governments have existed for a far longer time than in the Baltic states. Furthermore, the occupation of the Baltic states by the Soviet Union is not an isolated circumstance in history. For the last time in the chain of events caused by the rise of red absolutism in Russia and by its relentless march across the continents of Europe and Asia. Not that in 1940 the Baltic states were wholly and finally destroyed the independence of the Ukraine, then of Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkmenvsia and many other nations with valid claims to self-determination; in the process they killed millions of human beings who had but desired to be free and decide their own fates.

Rather remarkably, in this original expansion the Soviet forces could not break the determination and resistance of the Baltic states and Poland, and in 1918 Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—having had true and distinct national cultures for centuries—declared themselves independent states.

The new states showed a capacity for self-reliance, and rapidly achieved stable and equal democratic political constitutions, building from the ruins of World War I.

The Soviet Union, in peace treaties with those countries, renounced its territorial claims and recognized the right of the Baltic states to self-determination; however, the period designated as “forever” did not last long at all, and the new states that had begun preparations to make an attack upon these countries, preparations which are well-documented. The first real opportunity to show the world the “friendship” of Nazi Germany with a non-aggression pact on cooperative annexation of all possible territory.

While the Soviets, the Soviet leaders concluded a ‘non-aggression pact’ with Hitler (Molotov-Ribbentrop pact). According to a secret protocol to this pact Estonia, Latvia and part, later the whole, of Lithuania, Finland and some other areas of Eastern Europe were given over to the Soviet sphere of influence. By disarming, disorganizing the Baltic people, the Soviet Union thought it proper to collect its rewards on the Baltic States, Doc. 1173, August 23, 1960.)

Events progressed rapidly: in 1939 the Soviet Union forced the Baltic states to permit the installation of Soviet troops; in 1940, reflecting its absolute lack of territorial claims; on October 11, 1939 (!) the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Molotov, then the President of the Soviet People’s Commissars, denounced the Baltic states for their aggressive intentions and issued an ultimatum; within the terms of this ultimatum, the Soviet army had occupied the Baltic states.

In order to cover up this international crime, puppet parliaments were elected in all three Baltic states. Only one list of candidates, the one allowed, was permitted, and those listing other lists were arrested. Through courtesy of Soviet officials in London, we were published a day before the election.

As ordered by their Soviet superiors, these parliaments, without one opposing voice, re-elected the independent states of the Baltics.

Thus were the Baltic states “welcomed” into the Soviet Union as constituent units. The Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—on August 5, 1940, in London on August 5 and Estonia on August 6, 1940. These rapacious activities of the Soviet Union have been clearly and thoroughly noted from the beginning.

Summer Welles, Under-Secretary of State, declared on July 30, 1940:

“During these past few days the devious processes whereby the political independence and territorial integrity of the three Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—are to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been drawing rapidly to their conclusion. From the very first day of these Russian first gained their independence and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched with the most intense sympathy and interest the policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one State, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign power. These principles constitute the very foundation upon which the existing relationship between the twenty-six nations of the North Atlantic World rest. The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unbridgeable differences and separate interests inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law in the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.”

Winston S. Churchill

The charge of rigged elections is a very common one, and usually difficult to prove, since both the passage of time and the flurry of action in the present set up smoke screens to obscure the truth. However, in 1940, the Soviets tip their hand, it is a rare and enlightening vision of reality.
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SENATOR CARLSON CASTS LIGHT ON MAILING QUESTIONS

Mr. BOGGGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] last week delivered a highly significant statement, in commemoration of the direct mail Day to a large audience of major New York mailers.

Senator Carlson, who understands the problems of the postal service as well as any man, even in the Senate, cast a great deal of light upon several aspects of the business of direct mail which have been widely misunderstood.

In this address, Senator Carlson gave his listeners the benefit of his perspective and wisdom concerning the controversy upon postal rates. His remarks deserve the close attention of his colleagues in this body.

It is a pleasure to commend Senator Carlson for his valuable and continued efforts in behalf of an improved postal service. I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the Record as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, NEW YORK

BY FRANK CARLSON, NEW YORK HILTON HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., APRIL 19, 1967

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and friends: I put special emphasis on the word "friends," because I do consider you my friends, and I presume you think of me in the same way, or you wouldn't have invited me here today.

Seriously, I cannot see why any informed person should not feel friendly to the Direct Mail Industry—perhaps you don't consider it in the same way, but in my opinion—one of the major segments of our entire American free enterprise system.

I understand that your industry spent two and a half billion dollars last year in preparing, printing and mailing your product to the American people. I am also informed that the material you sent through the mails generated more than 40 billion dollars in total sales last year.

The United States Government, a significant slice of the Gross National Product. If we didn't already have a Direct Mail Industry, we would have to invent one to keep the economy moving.

There are 275,000 Third Class Mailing permits in the United States today. Permits are owned by such diverse groups as the Boy Scouts of America, Dr. Billy Graham, every charitable organization in the land, every corporation, every State Government, the whole spectrum of our social and political life.

The United States Government itself is the largest user of Third Class Mail. And judging from the samples I have seen, some of the largest users of Third Class Mail are those Government agencies at the Federal level.

Personally, I think of Third Class Mail as the smallest merchant's medium of advertising—the man in the small town, the independent store owner in a residential neighborhood and so on. It is a medium which he can afford. It permits him to pith-point his product at the customer's doorstep only to those most likely to respond to it.

Obviously, the small merchant cannot afford to buy space in a large metropolitan daily newspaper and advertise at a station. And if he could afford it, he would be wasting his money if he did use these methods.

Third Class mail is an advertising tool he needs and should have. If we were to take that tool away from him we would virtually be driving the small businessman out of his store and limiting the merchandising field to the huge chain stores which can afford Big League advertising.

The small independent merchant is having a tough enough time as it is. Let's not drive him more into the shadows by making meaningless and ineffective means of advertising inaccessible to him.

I also get seriously annoyed by the way some editorialists imply that third class mail advertising is irresponsible—unreliable, and somehow, crooked. After all, the Post Office Department has a corps of inspectors who are charged with the duty of keeping the mails clear of fraud—false claims and statements—obscenity and so forth.

If people want a personalized sales pitch, the law, he goes to jail. The mails are thoroughly and rigorously policed.

 Were you in favor of advertising then? If a man makes a false advertising claim on television or radio, he might get a slap on the wrist from the Federal Trade Commission—and be free to continue the offense again the next day. The penalties are nowhere near as severe—and the standards for accuracy and truthfulness are not nearly as high.

Then there is the rather foolish charge that third class mail advertising is a waste of the American free enterprise system.

Now, there is an economy moving.

There being no objection, the speech is ordered to be printed in the Record for his valuable and continued service to the country. And if he could afford it, he would most likely find that third class mail to bring their message to those most concerned. The small merchant would find this method of advertising too expensive for his limited resources; the large merchant would find it too coarse for the refinement of the American consumer; I do not believe so.

I notice that our good friend Jack Cole of the Mail Advertising Corporation of America has gone to the expense of re-printing in an attractively formatted language the Postal Code Regulations to the American consumer? I do not believe so.

Another section of the bill seeks to do away with the sampling technique by denying the minimum rate piece to certain producers of industry delivered the mail to consumers. Should we do away with this tried and tested method of introducing new products to the American consumer? I do not believe so.

The postal committees will want to give this particular section of the bill a careful study. One of the requisites is that the minimum rate on books be increased from ten cents to six cents—a hike of sixty percent.

I think it extremely unfair that a glibly-magazine should be charged only 3.4¢ a pound and the Bible 16¢ a pound. This just seems to me ridiculous.

Another section of the bill seeks to do away with the sampling technique by denying the minimum rate piece to certain products of industry delivered to the consumer. Should we do away with this tried and tested method of introducing new products to the American consumer? I do not believe so.

Another section of the bill seeks to do away with the sampling technique by denying the minimum rate piece to certain producers of industry delivered the mail to consumers. Should we do away with this tried and tested method of introducing new products to the American consumer? I do not believe so.
The Department needs more money but money alone will not cure the ills of the postal service. That service—so close to all the people—must become the center of the great communication system that the Congress of the United States must and will find ways to make it work more efficiently.

We cannot abandon our responsibility in this field. The needs of the people are best understood by their elected representatives. That is why I rise to stress something about the Department's failings that has overlooked the many, many good points about the service.

In spite of Doomsday statements by many, the service does have points that are being overlooked. Let us build on those good points. We are the only great postal service in the world. The challenge of a better postal service can be met successfully if we all set our talents to the task.

I want to interpose a personal note at this point. The users of Third Class Mail have been abused lately because they employ a lobbyist in Washington. It's true, they do—employ Harry Maginnis who is most effective and highly respected.

We sometimes don't agree with him—or with you, whom he represents—but we know he is an honest man, an informed man, and an efficient lobbyist. Our conservative friends in Congress are happy with him. I have been happy with him for years. He represents the people, and we want him to continue to represent them. How many other Chamber of Commerce lobbyists have represented the people their entire careers? None. Those who do not like Harry Maginnis need some help, and you need a better lobbyist. We are lucky to have him. We will have to cooperate to get the best for the people who employ him.

But to get back to the rate controversy. It makes me sick to see mud-slinging, and name-calling among certain users of different classes of mail have become most distasteful and, I think, self-defeating.

There is room in our nation for every class of mail and our nation's economy is dependent upon mass mail communications.

In the field of advertising the dollar is big enough to accommodate all media. No one should try to monopolize the entire dollar. Anybody who goes around saying Third Class Mail is here to stay. It is too effective an instrument to be abandoned.

If third class rates go up, then the advertisers are going to have to rearrange their budgets. That means they will have to cut down the allotment for newspaper, magazine and radio and television advertising to meet the rising costs of direct mail advertising.

Before concluding, I feel I should comment on another proposal, however. Last year Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien to abolish the Post Office Department and erect in its place a Government-owned, non-profit postal service.

I am very fond of Larry O'Brien and I think he is an excellent Postmaster General. I am a little surprised that he would want to do that. But I understand the proposal. However, the Department is the most ingenious and creative people in the world.

Actually, the proposal is not entirely new. Something like it was discussed in the first Congress, when it was a matter of debate whether or not it was proper in a Republic to have a Government-owned postal service. In 1869, a Bill to abolish the Postal Establishment entirely and to place it in the House for debate and a vote. It was rejected as being "inequitable."

But, in 1947, recommend something like the O'Brien proposal. The idea has been discussed—and on—and year.

But, it has never gotten anywhere.

Surely, I agree, the postal service needs improving. I agree also that the present system of stamps is both wasteful and inefficient. It needs some streamlining and modernizing.

The postal service should—and must—belong to the people. The Congress—with all its faults—represents the people, and we do our best to protect their interests in the Post Office. The present system of modernizing, with the help of some capable people from the Board of Governors, who would represent the average citizen in maintaining the quality of this vital service.

The social mission of the Postal Establishment is incalculable. It touches almost every citizen in our land almost every working day bringing the world to their door, giving them communications upon which our free institutions depend and, in a very real way, our freedom itself depends on it too.

Congress should—again—decide that the Postal Service is a service institution and should be run for the benefit of all the people. Congress requires that the postal policy in 1974, and then in 1984; and very strongly in 1981, in 1980, in 1998, and in 2092.

I see no reason to throw the wisdom of the ages onto the trash heap and declare the Post Office to be a computerized, bloodless, corporate enterprise, desirable but... deadly.

We have seen many useful services curtailed or eliminated in the name of sterile economy in the past that were under Congressional control.

What can we expect if Congressional control were removed entirely, and the fate of the postal service were left up to the efficiency experts and the accountants?

It is my personal opinion that the service would best be run by itself. Everyone has the hard word for the postal service—and sometimes the service deserves it. Certainly, in most respects, the service is less than it might be. But, let us look at what it was when John Wanamaker was Postmaster General from 1889 to 1893.

But, to get back to the rate controversy. It makes me sick to see mud-slinging, and name-calling among certain users of different classes of mail have become most distasteful and, I think, self-defeating.

There was, and is, a shortage of capable career people and there will always be a shortage until the Congress, and the Department, and the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission learn that they are going to get the quality of service and the quality of employee they are willing to pay for.

The postal service is the most human institution in our government. The Department can spend millions of dollars on developing and producing new machines—and losing sight of the human element. When the human element is eliminated, it is never going to replace that loyal, dedicated, under­tired postal employee who in the same agency can't blow his nose, because:

The time it takes to do what becomes 15 minutes by the 'eagle-eyed' supervisors, who haven't been in the Navy Finance Center, Munitions Building, Washington, where the methods engineers monitor the employees' work through two hours a day because a male charwoman had been hired to clean it.

What about the civilian employee of the Navy in Washington who wrote:

"You may think some of these supervisors take a tough line.

"You haven't been in the Navy Finance Center, Munitions Building, Washington, where the methods engineers monitor the employees' work through two hours a day because a male charwoman had been hired to clean it."

Then, there were the ladies—single and married—who were subjected to a survey by...
As I listened to officials justify their policies and techniques affecting employees privacy on the ground that there is no constitutional right to privacy, as I read newspaper articles and listened to public officials on this subject, I have the uneasy feeling that some people are like John Webster's scholar in The School for Scandal, where, to the delight of the houseparty, the number of knots on Hercules' club, the color of Achilles' beard, and whether Hector was not troubled with the toothache; and this he did to gain the number of knots on Hercules' club, the color of Achilles' beard, and whether Hector was not troubled with the toothache; and this he did to gain the name of scientific knowledge and skill. There is no need of legal dignets and eight-syllable words to define the issues and the condition of employment, equally reprehensible. Yet Federal officials do it. These practices affect not only the right to speak and act according to the dictates of his conscience; they invade also his right not to speak at all, not to act at all, and not to participate at all. In today's society, with the world becoming, according to Mr. McLuhan, "a global village," this may well be the most precious right enjoyed by civilized man.

The Federal Constitution specifically protects him in the enjoyment of these rights. The Fifth Amendment provides, "No person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." This Amendment, the Fifth, extends the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to government employees, and guarantees the federal government employees from unwar­anted privacy invasions.

The Fourth Amendment serves to protect the liberty of the individual from violation without probable cause. One of the greatest bulwarks of our liberty, the Fourth Amendment, as simple as those coined by Thomas Paine to rouse the colonies to independence: The question is whether citizens of today are as alert to defend their liberties.

The same concerns which prompted fifty-five Senators to cosponsor a measure to protect government employees from unwar­anted privacy invasions, and prompted the members of five state constitutional conventions to propose prohibitions on such intrusions, were present over five years ago for the Federal Constitution. They are the same concerns which caused Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, remembering the English Constitution, to give thought to the exercise of free speech, press, assembly, and petition, to wage their great battles for freedom. Today, only the most innocuous searches and seizures are at issue, and the Fourth Amendment has been found that "specific guarantees in the Bill of Rights have penumbras, formed by emanations from those guarantees that so give them life and substance." And that "various guarantees create zones of privacy."

Incompressive but discordant intellectual exercises in which the various Justices engaged in the Gruwell decision illustrated the ease with which the judicial branch may fall into a major compromise. The legal principles it reflects, which are contrary to their own basic civil nature, no matter what their apparent ends, and the limitations which are imposed on the exercise of the judicial power, under the Fifth Amendment provision against self-incrimination. The Fourth Amendment serves to protect the liberty of the individual from violation without probable cause. One of the greatest bulwarks of our liberty, the Fourth Amendment, as simple as those coined by Thomas Paine to rouse the colonies to independence: The question is whether citizens of today are as alert to defend their liberties.
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tional right to talk politics, but he has no constitutional right to be a policeman," this doctrine has until fairly recently, restrained courts and legislatures from taking action to protect the citizen-employee. But at long last, a step is being taken to curb just because he goes to work for government, an employee does not surrender the basic liberties enfranchising every citizen under our form of government.

They are beginning to realize that practices which can affect ten million citizens and their families can affect an entire society.

In this decade I believe that Congress, state legislatures, and municipal bodies have a special responsibility toward their employees. Sophisticated personnel methods, sophisticated personnel policies, and sordid information-gathering systems increasingly beckon the public and the private employer. Improperly used or unwisely applied, as we have seen, threaten the liberty and privacy of the Individual. It behooves the people of every state, therefore, to know how their elected and appointed officials are working for government.

Congress has taken the lead in this by its current hearings on complaints of violation of former Government service, including Senator Nelson, as one of the most articulate protectors of civilian employees of the executive branch and to prohibit unwarranted invasion of their privacy.

This bill would prohibit:

Indiscriminate requirements that employees and applicants for Government employment must disclose information about their religion, race, national origin; attend Government-sponsored meetings and lectures or participate in outside activities in support of political candidates; have a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerance or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive surverys of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerance or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

The authors here, like many who study these problems, have completely overlooked one of the crucial characteristics of the practices which threaten the dignity, self-respect, and privacy of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.

While that February report, citing the "requirements of society," suggests the broadest excuse I have heard yet, there are others cited by the Federal Government.

For instance, every few months, they force an employee to disclose his creditors, assets, liabilities, including how much cash he has in his safe deposit boxes, and they plead "prevention of fire drills." That is, if he refuses to answer, he is "illegally withholding information from the Government," that is, humanity and the dignity of the individual—that is, when the consent is given to requests for information made by the Government, an employer, by an extender of credit, or by a medical man who passes on conformity to certain standards, such consent cannot often be freely rendered. There is present an element of economic coercion, backed by the authority of government, which renders void a "facial" or "episodic" invasiveness. While right to be tolerant of or consent to certain practices, the Subcommittee has found, is merely the result of human spirits long since broken and unbreakable.

I am constantly amazed at the broad range of excuses and reasons for intrusive survevers of employees, both of personal data, for coercive practices, affecting the liberties of employees as citizens.
for self-knowledge and the development of those qualities of the soul which will imbue us with understanding, compassion, and love for our fellow men, our employees, technicians, scientists and all the others who will govern tomorrow's America, with the capacity to understand and to identify with the victim of any form of tyranny.

It is well to remember Ralph Waldo Emerson's words of advice to Bela Kalman, who was about to make a speech at Harvard: "... I had better never see a book than be warred by its attractions—swallowed up in the center of a paper machine and made into a satellite out of a system. The one thing in the world, of value, is the active mind."
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Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Farm Journal article from the March issue be inserted at this point in the Record.

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

Will cattlemen trade some of their independence to get better beef prices? Can free enterp­

sises make a private supply manage­

ment program work?

These are a couple of the most challenging questions to hit the beef business in years. And we're going to see some answers from the bold new marketing program ini­

tiated by the Cattlemen's Association (ANCA). Its aim: Better beef prices through voluntary actions.

The idea is that by moving together on cue from their own organization, cattlemen can number, kind and weight of cattle available—then ask and get higher prices.

"We can do it," declares Girdner Crofoot, Kansas and Texas feeder. "It will take time, of course, and determination, but we'll get our encouraging moments, but we can put the plan over."

"Communications in processing and re­

tailing are as fast as lightning. We need something just as effective on the produc­
sion side," explains Kansas cattleman Bill House, ANCA vice-president.

"Since marketing co-ops and govern­

tment controls seem unacceptable to the industry, it's up to cattlemen to work together volun­
tarily," adds Arizona feeder Joe Enz.

The two main features of the ANCA plan:

1. An expert setup at ANCA headquarters in Denver. This will determine what cattle prices should be—all costs considered.

2. Past communications to members and potential members about the market—market factors, information and advice on what to do about it to get better prices.

A market development committee of cattle­

men is in charge. But ANCA economist, William C. Helming, ANCA economist, will co-ordinate the program. Crofoot and Enz are co-chairmen.

Action at the recent ANCA convention put the plan in gear. But some groundwork had already been done.

For instance, the size of the problem and need for answers stood out like neon lights in an initial "cost of production" survey. Helming found average returns to U.S. cattlemen on ranch investment in minus 1.93%. And feeders got back on their in­

vestment on only 1.3% in the West and 3.5% in Midwest and East in '65 and '66.

Returns to owners for their own labor and management is on the minus side in every area. In other words, cattlemen have been working for virtually nothing!

In contrast, ANCA feels beefmen need 8% or 9% on their labor and management, or $6,000 a year for their own labor and management.

An important start on better communica­

tions was also made in late '66 with the weekly Beef Business Bulletin to "members only" containing late market factor infor­

mation.

In the future, members will also get ANCA research and advice on:

Cost of cattle raising and feeding by area and kind of operation.

Price ranges that are profitable.

Desirable fed cattle weights.

Economic cost of growing and liquidation needed to keep cattle numbers in line.

Are cattlemen dreaming? Isn't the cattle business too spread out for this kind of marketing plan? ANCA leaders think not. They point out that beef market power is more concentrated than you may think.

There are about 217,000 feeders in the U.S.—some 57,000 in the Plains and West and 160,000 in the Midwest, South and East. But a few of these feeders handle 60% of the cattle fed.

And while more than 2 million U.S. farms market some cattle, ANCA estimates that one-third will produce strings of several hundred feeder cattle each.

ANCA is affiliated with 42 state cattle orga­

nizations. One such marketing program, its greatest strength is in the 17 Western states, an area which has the bulk of both big producers and feeders.

Besides, the time is right for action. "Outsi­

des pressures" put beef marketing problems in sharper focus today than ever before, de­

clares ANCA President John Guthrie, Califor­

nia cattle raiser and feeder.

In '66, these pressures included "the in­

fantile attitude expressed by some congres­

sional leaders," and the President's appearance on TV when he urged con­

sumers to purchase most economical cuts of meat, and consumer boycotts.

Cattlemen have become price makers by doing a better job managing beef supplies," ANCA leaders think. And you can do it. But it takes serious moves to make them that from now on.

Troubled times have inspired group pro­

grams in livestock marketing for decades—

and now they are needed.

One of the most successful today is the National Live Stock Producers Association, born in the depression as the "dirty 30s." Producers groups have developed profes­

sional sales services for members using virtu­

ally every known marketing method there is—from stockyards selling to auctions, as­

sembly points and carcass selling.

Now a giant federation of co-ops, the group serves 400,000 members through 16 agencies, 140 markets.

But the indirect approach—the soft sell—

works too. Groups of ranchers like the Sand­

hill Cattle Producers Association (SCPA) are in the "dirty 30s," and a new marketing method there is—from stockyards selling to auctions, as­

sembly points and carcass selling.

In other words, cattlemen have

A big opening still for bold, fresh ideas.

Producers groups have developed profes­

sional sales services for members using virtu­

ously every known marketing method there is—from stockyards selling to auctions, as­

sembly points and carcass selling.
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Within another week the nation may be faced with a major strike in the rubber industry. Think of what that may do for the war in Vietnam as well as for our domestic economy.

And the “big four” of the rubber industry have continuing talks to combat the monopolistic power of the unions.

Just ahead is the threat of a shutdown of the automobile industry with a deadline of June 1, which also has serious implications for the Vietnam war.

The answer isn’t to create new federal agencies, or to create new laws to cover special situations, or to extend federal power. If the national administration had the right basic economic policies in place then we wouldn’t be in this mess in the first place.

The answer is to correct the basic monopolistic flaw in our labor laws, to restore the competitive discipline, and then to rely on competitive discipline.

We must also encourage greater management and labor teamwork for the principal benefit of customers.

Those who control the Democratic Party cannot make these changes. They are too indoctrinated to the economic giants and labor bosses whose excesses must be curbed.

Only by strengthening America’s basic economic principles, competition and cooperation can we fulfill America’s economic promise. Only then can we have sound and adequate economic growth, more jobs, and the economic muscle to play our proper role in world economic development and peace.

THE 11TH HOUR

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, we are in the 11th hour before a threatened nationwide railroad strike confronts the American people. And today, because of this dispute, will be the last opportunity before the Senate Labor Committee, I appeal to both parties in this conflict to settle the last differences between them that block a quick settlement.

In a statement on Saturday, President Johnson said that his able and experienced mediation panel had recommended a 6-percent wage settlement over 18 months plus an extra 15 cents an hour for skilled workers.

The unions are demanding 11.5 percent increase plus the differential over 2 years. And the railroads are offering a 5-percent-a-year pay boost.

In spite of the fact that these differences are relatively minor, Secretary of Labor Wirtz and Transportation Secretary Boyd said yesterday that collective bargaining had “fallen flat on its face.”

The President’s mediation panel reported that the differences are “of dollars and cents alone, and the real differences between the parties in our judgment are not great.”

In short, there is no earthly reason why the Nation must be threatened with a calamitous railroad strike. There is no reason why union and management cannot act responsibly and overcome all remaining differences in this dispute.

The fact is that the Nation cannot afford this strike.

Our fighting forces in Vietnam cannot be jeopardized by a tie-up that would impede a vital flow of supplies and strategic materials.

I would remind both parties in this dispute that Congress will not be content to watch a nationwide strike paralyze the country without taking action of some sort.

And, as the President’s mediators reported: The differences in this dispute are not so serious that they should be the occasion for further legislation by the Congress.”

I agree. But the matter now rests in the hands of those who must find agreement of outstanding differences before the bell tolls for us all.

AT FIRST GLANCE DEFENSE EXPENDITURES MAY NOT SEEM MAJOR FACTOR IN ECONOMY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on the first page of a 14-page statement made yesterday to the Joint Economic Committee by Assistant Secretary of Defense, Controller Robert N. Anthony, Mr. Anthony makes the following observation:

At first glance, Defense expenditures may not seem to constitute a major factor in our economy.

As our late colleague Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, used to say, “I thought I had seen and heard everything—and I been to the Dallas Fair twice.”

DEATH OF SIR DONALD BURNS SANGER, PRIME MINISTER OF JAMAICA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Sir Donald Burns Sanger, knight commander of the Royal Victorian Order and Prime Minister of Jamaica until his untimely death, April 11, 1967, was an outstanding Government career officer in his homeland and a man who will be long remembered by his people and his many friends in the United States.

Stricken at the height of his career at the age of 55, Sir Donald began his political career in 1933 by running successfully for the Council of St. Elizabeth’s Parish. His first venture into the national politics of Jamaica was in 1944.

But 1949, when the Jamaica Labor Party was formed, actually marked his real arrival on the Jamaican national scene. He became Minister of Social Welfare and in 1953 was Minister of Finance. When the health of Sir Alexander Bustamente, the first Prime Minister of Jamaica, began to fail a few years ago, Sir Donald became Acting Prime Minister and carried out his duties with great dispatch and tact.

As a result of the Jamaica Labor Party’s great victory at the polls in February of this year, Sir Donald became Prime Minister in name as well as in fact. It was a great shock to the people of Jamaica as well as to all who know him that in less than 2 months he was to be stricken with an illness which was to prove fatal.

A memorial service was held in his honor on Wednesday, April 19, at the Washington Cathedral. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz spoke at the services.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the memorial service and the remarks of Secretary Wirtz be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items
A thousand ages in thy sight
Are like an evening gone;
Short as the watch that ends the night
Before the rising sun.
Time, like an ever-rolling stream,
Bears all its sons away;
They fly, forgotten, as a dream
Dies at the opening day.
O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come;
Be thou our guide while life shall last,
And our eternal home.
Amen.

ISAAC WATTS, 1700; based on Psalm 90.

The Bishop goes to the High Altar and shall be said the Apostles' Creed, all the people standing.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth,

And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord:
Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost,

Born of the Virgin Mary:

Suffered under Pontius Pilate,

Was crucified, died and buried:

He descended into hell,

The third day he rose again from the dead:

He ascended into heaven,

And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty:

From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost:

The holy Catholic Church;

The Communion of Saints:

The Forgiveness of sins:

The Resurrection of the body:

And the Life everlasting.

Amen.

Then shall the Bishop say: The Lord be with you.

People. And with thy spirit.

Minister. Let us pray.

Then shall the People kneel: Lord, have mercy upon us.

People. Christ, have mercy upon us.

Minister. Lord, have mercy upon us.

People. Our help cometh even from the Lord, who made heaven and earth.

Minister. Then shall the Memorial Address be said: The Honourable Wm. Creighton, Bishop of Washington, Officiant.

Anthem.

Eternal Father bless our land,

Justice, Truth be ours forever.

Jamaica, Land we love.

Jamaica, Jamaica, Jamaica land we love.

President. Our memorial prayer is in order.

Minister. Then shall the Memorial Address be said: The Honourable Wm. Creighton, Bishop of Washington, Officiant.

The organ will play the National Anthem of the United States of America.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTH
AT A MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR THE HONORABLE SIR DONALD BURNS SANGSTER,
FIRST MINISTER OF LABOR FOR JAMAICA, JAMAICA CATHEDRAL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 19, 1967

Our first meeting was against a background of convention. I am after his deliberate, measuring glance, the crumbling of the corners of his mouth that preface either smile or warning, and then his quiet, disarming
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Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we often lament the state of the world, focusing, thinking on its troubles and difficulties, pointing to the effects of world communism to expand aggressively, thinking of the sacrifices being made to prevent such a takeover.

It is proper to do so. But frequently we overlook the points: that the world's troubles exist not in a vacuum, but in the context of an ever-improving environment. Communism has been thwarted in its attempt to take over the Government of Indonesia. In Africa, the leaders most attuned to the ideology of communism, Patrice Lumumba and Kwame Nkrumah, are now gone. In Ghana, as a recent essay says, "...It was, after all, the new military government that replaced "Down With Neocolonialism" signs with others reading, "Ghana Welcomes Foreign Investment."

Men and women throughout the world have become disillusioned with the false promises of communism. More and more the Communists are being judged not on the basis of what they say and promise, but on the basis of what they do. What they do, this essay notes, has had the effect of impressing reality upon the observer: In Asia, Mao Tse-Tung's Red Guards have destroyed the image of Red China as a seductive model for emerging countries and largely reduced the credibility of China as a military threat to those whom it ruthlessly dürst. In fact, while China has been thrashing in economic disorder, her neighbors have new and growing confidence. "...Thus our courage, partly—as Singapore's Lee Kuan Yew admitted publicly last week and other nations also indicate in private—because of the U.S.'s determined stand in South Viet Nam.

In some of these countries, the U.S. can take credit for adirs and aid. Japan, converted to democracy and free enterprise by the most remarkable military occupation in history, has built an economy that has far outpaced any other in Asia, and is now dispensing foreign aid itself. Despite perennial corruption, the Philippines has established itself as a vigorous and modern democracy, sufficiently secure to be increasingly assertive in its relations with the U.S. and to demand joint responsibility. In South Viet Nam, Man and nation begin to feel bad all over. But more detached historians could conclude that in the spring of 1967, the general state of the world is more promising than discouraging, more optimistic than gloomy. There is rapid, continuing change in the direction of hope and betterment.
donors, having bloodily saved itself from Communist takeover, now has to repair the intrinsically rich economy that Sukarno wrecked. Malaysia may yet fragment into Communist takeover, now has to repair its original pieces, but at least it has been wrecked. It is still beset by the huge burden of its own history.

In Europe, the good news has been obscured by the fact that one of its manifestations has been a marked kick in the U.S. diplomatic shins: De Gaulle summarily threw the NATO command out of France. But it is a gesture that is, among other things, an expression of Europe's new and proper self-confidence. This new independence has only become possible under the shelter of U.S.-Russian détente, and the relaxation operates on the other side as well. More and more, the satellite nations of Eastern Europe are asserting their traditional autonomy and rivalry toward their old neighbors in the West—and the U.S. is doing its best to encourage them. A key feature of this growing awareness among the satellites is that conventional Communism—particularly when applied to an overall scheme designed chiefly to work as an economic system. The break-up began with Rumania's refusal to accept Russian suggestions at the 1961 COMECON meeting. This resulted in the expulsion of some 500 Western firms to invest over $800 million in Rumania, and by the tide of Western tourists increases. West Germany's new Christian Democrat-Socialist coalition government has taken a competing lead West moves possible. While there is not yet any end in sight for Germany's geographical division, most East European governments have dropped the stifling position that nothing can be discussed unless West Germany acknowledges East Germany as equivalent to its Western equivalent. Rumania denied the Kremlin to recognize West Germany—and both Hungary and Czechoslovakia are similarly mired.

Western Europe's Common Market is celebrating its tenth anniversary in a justifiably euphoric state of self-congratulation. Trade among the six members has increased by 80 percent in the last ten years, and the last internal tariffs will disappear by mid-1968. De Gaulle, who has long been a sickeningly leavetaking figure to France, and his recent setback at the polls may reduce his room to maneuver mischievously abroad, forcing him to give low-voiced attention to social problems at home. More queasy is the state of Britain. Still, its economy has perked up a trifle, averaging its first substantial growth plus in three years in the last quarter of 1967.

In the potentially cloudy Middle East, the Arab-Israeli dispute has become one of the chief landholders once whole provinces, the Shah's "white revolution" has distributed land to three out of every four peasants, who labor under the burden of continuing self-taxations for local and provincial councils. Another promising country is Libya, which, in five years has risen from the slowly status of a backward state to the proud rank of the world's seventh largest oil producer.

In Saudi Arabia, King Faisal, in the 2½ years since he had put down Sait, has put his nation's huge income from oil ($700 million last year) to work building steel plants and chemical plants. But Faisal confronts Nasser on the barren battlefields of Yemen. Though there is no serious shooting there at the moment, their rival resist social and economic reform. But there are major trend-setting exceptions to this pattern in Peru, Chile and Venezuela, where progressive parties are increasingly powerful. In many countries, military regimes have taken over, but the new style of army officer is in many cases closer to the people than the politicians-of-privilege that they succeeded. In Brazil, for instance, army influence has meant at least the start of a tumbling of the old order, from corruption to responsibility.

Equally important is the collapse of Castro. One of his first moves was to disseminate Castro's own propaganda, and this has ended by disillusioning all but his most fervent admirers. Today, Russia has been reduced to the status of back of the army to keep Castro going. In fact, Castro's expansive dreams of empire building have produced a backlash. It speeded the launching of the Alliance for Progress, which has not exactly taken off in a big way but did stir some Latin regimes to take the first steps toward reform. And at long last, the Latin Americans are beginning to move toward regional collaboration and even a Latin American Common Market. Latin Central American Common Market, established in 1960, has proved a notable success producing a threefold increase in trade volume in just five years.

**STILL COUTS, BEETLE LEADERS**

**STILL COURTS, BEETLE LEADERS**

**STILL COURTS, BEETLE LEADERS**

Even in Africa, seemingly always in the grip of coups and tribal clashes, there is clear progress if the continent is viewed in the longer perspective. Take the case of Patrice Lumumba, Sékou Toure and Kwame Nkrumah; they are the wave of the angry nations of Eastern Europe are asserting their traditional autonomy and rivalry toward their old neighbors in the West—and the U.S. is doing its best to encourage them. A key feature of this growing awareness among the satellites is that conventional Communism—particularly when applied to an overall scheme designed chiefly to work as an economic system. The break-up began with Rumania's refusal to accept Russian suggestions at the 1961 COMECON meeting. This resulted in the expulsion of some 500 Western firms to invest over $800 million in Rumania, and by the tide of Western tourists increases. West Germany's new Christian Democrat-Socialist coalition government has taken a competing lead West moves possible. While there is not yet any end in sight for Germany's geographical division, most East European governments have dropped the stifling position that nothing can be discussed unless West Germany acknowledges East Germany as equivalent to its Western equivalent. Rumania denied the Kremlin to recognize West Germany—and both Hungary and Czechoslovakia are similarly mired.

In Europe, the good news has been obscured by the fact that one of its manifestations has been a marked kick in the U.S. diplomatic shins: De Gaulle summarily threw the NATO command out of France. But it is a gesture that is, among other things, an expression of Europe's new and proper self-confidence. This new independence has only become possible under the shelter of U.S.-Russian détente, and the relaxation operates on the other side as well. More and more, the satellite nations of Eastern Europe are asserting their traditional autonomy and rivalry toward their old neighbors in the West—and the U.S. is doing its best to encourage them. A key feature of this growing awareness among the satellites is that conventional Communism—particularly when applied to an overall scheme designed chiefly to work as an economic system. The break-up began with Rumania's refusal to accept Russian suggestions at the 1961 COMECON meeting. This resulted in the expulsion of some 500 Western firms to invest over $800 million in Rumania, and by the tide of Western tourists increases. West Germany's new Christian Democrat-Socialist coalition government has taken a competing lead West moves possible. While there is not yet any end in sight for Germany's geographical division, most East European governments have dropped the stifling position that nothing can be discussed unless West Germany acknowledges East Germany as equivalent to its Western equivalent. Rumania denied the Kremlin to recognize West Germany—and both Hungary and Czechoslovakia are similarly mired.

Western Europe's Common Market is celebrating its tenth anniversary in a justifiably euphoric state of self-congratulation. Trade among the six members has increased by 80 percent in the last ten years, and the last internal tariffs will disappear by mid-1968. De Gaulle, who has long been a sickeningly leavetaking figure to France, and his recent setback at the polls may reduce his room to maneuver mischievously abroad, forcing him to give low-voiced attention to social problems at home. More queasy is the state of Britain. Still, its economy has perked up a trifle, averaging its first substantial growth plus in three years in the last quarter of 1967.

As the 1967 season opens, I am pleased to note that the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Indiana Stream Pollution Control Board, and the Indiana State Department of Natural Resources has made progress toward ending all dumping of materials into the Calumet River—will be deposited in on-shore or diked disposal areas. More than half of the 450,000 cubic yards of material which will be moved from Indiana areas—some 263,000 cubic yards, with high and medium pollution potential rating, from the Calumet River—will be deposited in on-shore or diked disposal areas. Another 149,500 cubic yards—125,000 cubic yards from Indiana Harbor—high pollution potential rating, from the Michigan City Harbor—low rating—is to be dumped into Authorized or control areas of Lake Michigan. These areas will be studied by the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency and the Army Corps. The 46,500 cubic yards—low pollution potential rating—to be dredged from the Calumet Harbor will be moved by the Corps in September. This amount of material will be dredged from the Calumet Harbor by the Corps. The 46,500 cubic yards—low pollution potential rating—to be dredged from the Calumet Harbor will be moved by the Corps in September. This amount of material will be dredged from the Calumet Harbor by the Corps.
Stream Pollution Control Board and others are working with the corps, and hopefully they may find even more onshore or dike disposal areas for the dredge material before the dredging season closes.

DECISION FOR FREEDOM

Mr. HRUSA. Mr. President, the dramatic event this country last Friday of Mrs. Zvetlana Alliluyeva, Stalin’s daughter, is an event which, although it is the product of one individual’s struggle within herself to be free to lead a life of her own choosing, has major significance for all of us.

Here is a person who was close to the very apex of Communist power. Through the years, she was able to observe and experience the nature of communism as few persons could. Yet, she has decided that communism—in spite of the purported transformation it is now undergoing—was not for her.

Why did she leave her homeland, her children, and her friends for a new country she has never seen nor visited? Simply stated, she chose freedom.

Obviously it was a decision that was a long time in coming. It was a decision that took courage and will mean sacrifice and loneliness.

In her own words:
I have come here in order to seek the self-expression that has been denied me for so long in Russia.

And she found God. She found that “it was impossible to exist without God in one’s heart.” When this conclusion was reached, the main dogmas and teachings of communism lost their significance for her.

Also, there were compelling personal reasons culminated by the death of her husband, a Georgian, my mother was a Georgian, my father was a Georgian.

Mr. President, this dramatic event sharpens awareness that hundreds of millions of persons throughout the world seek that which Mrs. Alliluyeva has chosen and will find in our country. Our efforts must be pledged to making such a choice possible in their own lands, now captive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the moving statement Mrs. Alliluyeva made upon her arrival in New York be printed in the Record.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1967]

I Came Now Exravm to Moscow

(Statement written by Mrs. Svetlana Alliluyeva)

It is important to me to explain something of the reasons why I decided not to return to Russia but to come to the United States instead.

I’ve read some wrong explanations in newspapers and magazines and I don’t want to be misleading anyone—especially my own children and my friends in Russia.

When I left Moscow last December in order to collect the ashes of my late husband, Mr. Brijesh Singh, to his home in India, I fully expected to return to Russia within one month’s time. However, during my stay in India I decided that I could not return to Moscow.

It was my own decision, based on my own feelings and experiences, without anyone’s advice or help or instruction. The strongest struggle was going on in my heart all through this period, and no one could tell me the reason. I did not want to see them for quite a long time. I did everything to force myself to return home.

Many reasons for coming

But all was in vain. I felt it impossible to go back and went instead to the United States. I visited Delhi, hoping for some help and understanding. Now, after a happy and peaceful rest in Switzerland, a wonderful country with kind people to whom I am grateful, I am here in order to seek the self-expression that has been denied me so long in Russia.

Why did you come? Why did you decide to ask for your hospitality? There are many reasons.

Since my childhood I have been taught Communism, and I did believe in it, as we all did, in my generation. But slowly, with age and experience I began to think differently. In recent years, we in Russia have begun to think, to discuss, to argue, and we are not so much automatically devoted any more to the ideas which we were taught.

Also religion has done a lot to change me. I was brought up in a family where there never was any talk about God. But when I was a child I believed that it was impossible to exist without God in one’s heart. I came to that conclusion myself, without teachers. But that was a great change because since that moment the main dogmas of Communism lost their significance for me.

I do believe in the power of intellect in the world, no matter in which country you live. Instead of struggling and causing unnecessary problems we should work more together for the progress of humanity. This is the only thing which I can think seriously—the work of teachers, scientists, educated priests, doctors, lawyers, their work all over the world, notwithstanding states and borders, political parties and ideologies.

Only good and bad people

There are no capitalists and Communists for me. There are good people, or bad people, honest or dishonest, and in whatever country they live people are the same everywhere, and their expectations and moral ideals are the same.

My father was a Georgian, my mother was a Georgian. Although we have lived a long time in Moscow, I believe that one’s home can be anywhere that one can feel free.

My late husband, Brijesh Singh, belonged to an ancient family of India. He was a wonderful man and my children and I loved him very much. Unfortunately the Soviet authorities refused to recognize our marriage officially because he was a foreigner and I because of my name, was considered as a kind of state property.

Even the question of whether I should be allowed to marry a citizen of India was decided by the Government. Moreover, we could not travel together to see his homeland, or anywhere else outside of Russia.

Mr. Singh had suffered for many years from a chronic illness. In Moscow his health began rapidly to decline and his heart began to fail. Although the Government refused to allow me to take him to India, his homeland, before he died. After he died the Government finally allowed me to take his ashes home. For me, it was too late.

My husband’s death brought my long decision into dramatic reality. I wrote a book about my life in Russia. I am happy to say that now it will be published in English and Russian, as well as other languages. The American edition will be published by Harper & Row and other publishing arrangements are being worked out by my lawyers, Greenbaum, Wolf & Omsted, and most particularly by my friend, Edward S. Greenbaum and his partner, Alan Schwartz, who accompanied me here from Switzerland.

I hope that my book will explain more fully than I can in these brief remarks what I felt and what I wanted to, but could not say while in Russia.

SYMBOL OF THE PURPOSE

The publication of my book will symbolize for the main public of my journey here. The freedom of self-expression which I seek can, I hope, take form of additional writing, study and reading on the literary subjects in which I have been denied me.

While in Russia my interests were primarily literary and my friends were drawn largely from the ranks of writers, artists and teachers. I hope while here to be able to expand and broaden such friendships and, if possible, to make some small creative contribution to the world of arts and letters.

Despite the strong motives and deep desires which have led me to the United States, I cannot help but think of my country which does not want to be fooled by old ideas. They also want to make their own conclusions about life.

God help them. I know they will not reject me and one day we shall meet. I will wait for that.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS ENDORES TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is gratifying to learn that a record number of economists have endorsed the Council of Economic Advisers' position in support of the Truth in lending bill. One of the most impressive reports on behalf of the bill was made by Gardner Ackley, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and some of the most distinguished economists in the country.

The Council believes the bill will do much to further price competition in the credit industry, thereby lowering the cost of credit. Moreover, the Council believes the bill will help to break the monopolistic illusion by making consumers more aware of the cost of credit.

Mr. President, some economists have testified before our committee on behalf of the credit industry and have claimed the bill would not have this effect. It is, of course, difficult to get any two economists to agree on any matter of public policy. However, it is gratifying to me that the Ackley, the Ackley survey, three of the most knowledgeable economists in the United States, are supporting the bill and believe it will have a beneficial economic impact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Council’s report be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL
OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 25, 1967

JOHN SPARKMAN
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman: This is in reply to your request for a report on S. 900, the Congres, a bill “To assist in the promotion of
economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit," known as the "Truth in Lending" rule.

As a matter of equity, the consumer has the right to know the true cost of borrowing just as he has the right to know what any other cost is. A consumer needs this information to make wise decisions in his own interests. To provide this information the Senate has taken a lead.

The bill has a further economic justification in offering potential improvement of the efficiency of markets. Markets function more efficiently when buyers and sellers have full information about prices, and can make comparisons among alternative sources of supply or demand. This is as true about credit as it is about any commodity or other resource. Indeed, there is a special need for legislation in this area, since the price of credit is a relatively complicated concept, and is not well understood by many—or perhaps most—consumers. By requiring lenders to reduce the confusing, complicated terms of credit to one standard comparable price—the annual percentage rate—the proposed bill would simplify credit transactions to make possible intelligent comparisons, and would promote effective competition among lenders. The market for consumer credit would operate more efficiently, face every day, any individual or any nation that merely acts is subject to criticism from the professional censors of the world.

But a charge of U.S. violation under any of these four treaties would be so transparently fraudulent that the risk of international censure of the United States is absolutely infinitesimal.

The domestic law of the United States is already much more stringent than the minimal universal standards proposed by these conventions. We, as a people, have nothing to fear.

Ambassador Goldberg put the whole question of U.S. accountability to an international tribunal in proper perspective recently:

If we are faithful as a people and through our national forums to our own constitutional system, we need not fear answers to our charge that we have done otherwise.

The United States has nothing to fear and much to gain internationally through Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

Let the Senate vest the United States with the necessary credentials for our rightful leadership position in the continuing crusade for human dignity by ratifying all four of the human rights conventions.

LIVESTOCK MARKET DIGEST APPLAUDS HRUSKA IMPORT BILL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the current issue of the Livestock Market Digest, the trade journal of competitive livestock marketing, carries an editorial in support of the meat import legislation introduced by Senator Hruska. I quote from it.

Let the Senate vest the United States with the necessary credentials for our rightful leadership position in the continuing crusade for human dignity by ratifying all four of the human rights conventions.

The United States has nothing to fear and much to gain internationally through Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

Similar response among farmers and ranchers throughout America has come as a result of Senator Hruska's leadership in this important field. It is my intention, Mr. President, to urge that the Committee on Finance, on which I serve, schedule hearings on the Hruska bill in the near future, and that similar action be had in the House.

It is only through a full and comprehensive airing of the issues and factors involved in this matter that Congress can reach a sound and practical solution to a most serious problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial published in the April 24 issue of Livestock Market Digest.

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

Senator Reviews Import History, Needs for Aid

The history of action to reduce meat imports during the most recent previous depression in livestock prices—that beginning in 1962 and lasting until 1964—was re-traced in the United States by Senator Hruska this month. The purpose of the recitation was to point out the need for action now which will enable the possibility that imports could be as significant a domestic price factor as they were then.

It is what Senator Roman Hruska (R. Neb.) had to say: "In 1962 and 1964 a large and vital segment of America's agricultural economy stood on the brink of financial ruin as it watched prices for beef and beef products drop to disastrously low levels, driven ever downward by mountainous imports from abroad.

"The per capita increase in consumer demand was being met and overcome by a gigantic increase in imports. This increase amounted, in the period between 1959 and 1965, to an eightfold jump, from 211 million pounds of beef and veal in all forms to 1,677 million pounds.

"When we added into the calculation the effect of live cattle that were also being brought in, it developed that foreign nations were seeking an unfair advantage in the American market equal to 10.7 per cent of our total domestic production.

"The present situation, which included imports of beef and mutton of 614.2 million pounds in 1965, and of beef and mutton pounds in 1966, is the formula established by law, not on the basis of estimates, would be with the United States.

"Hruska noted that last year's forecasts by the Secretary were lower than figures actually turned out to be. The danger that 1967's estimates may prove too low was pointed out—for it could be damaging, if not disastrous, to find out too late to do anything except accept the price consequences.

"Hruska's remedy is to change the limit (now 995 million pounds) for triggering the import restrictions. "This trigger level is just too much foreign beef," he says. He feels that 10.7 per cent would be an adequate overall level which is now required before quotas can be imposed. He would impose the quotas in a manner which would account military purchases overseas against such quotas, and would restore authority to the Secretary to control the quota system to other types of livestock products.

"Such changes are sure to incure the wrath of some of America's allies—for they want meat markets to be open to their export products, but experience has been, however, that domestic agriculture pays too stiff a price for the protectionism practiced by other nations—the Common Market included.

"Sen. Hruska will obtain again, as he did in 1964, the good will of livestock men for speaking up in the Senate for their interests.

FOREST INSECT AND DISEASE RESEARCH LABORATORY AT WEST HAVEN, CONN.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, as a part of its national forestry effort, the Forest Service operates a forest insect laboratory near West Haven, Conn. I commend the work of the fine men and women who are developing sound, practical methods for controlling serious pests of the forests of Connecticut and other New England States.
Currently, the Forest Service has a staff of 34 at the laboratory; 16 members of the staff are scientists and 18 provide a variety of technical, clerical, and support services. Approximately $410,000 of Forest Service appropriations are used annually to support the laboratory staff and program.

A laboratory-office complex, authorized by the Congress, is being constructed at Hamden, Conn., for the staff and program which are now located in temporary quarters at West Haven. This scientific facility will be ready for use by July 1, 1967. It will contain modern scientific instruments; for example, an electron microscope, required for intensive forest insect and disease research.

Thus, the basic elements—a competent staff and a modern laboratory—for a comprehensive program of research are available. But to be most effective these basic elements should be strengthened. Adequate immediate strengthening of the program at Hamden would require an additional appropriation of $355,000—$250,000 for insect research and $105,000 for disease research. I would hope that such strengthening of this vital program area will be possible this year.

President Johnson's proposed budget for fiscal year 1968 provides a total of $8.5 million for nationwide forest insect and disease research programs of the Forest Service. Included in the total is an increase of $329,000. The research work at West Haven, as well as at other locations in the United States, is financed by the Congress through the Forest Service appropriation bill.

The additional funds needed for the research work at Hamden would be used to: First, staff, equip, and operate the new laboratory; and second, expand immediately research leadership leading to control of serious hardwood pests. As has been the practice in the past, this new work would be done in close cooperation with Yale University, Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, and other institutions in the region.

Much of the research at West Haven is directed to the development of non-chemical means of controlling pests and diseases, as well as to the control of insect pests. These lines of attack would be followed when the program is strengthened.

Chemicals have been effective eradicators of insect pests. But continued reliance on such direct action of insect-killing chemicals would be economically and environmentally unsound. It is often more efficient, from a logical, more advantageous economically, and safer to man and wildlife, to include fish—than the chemical methods now generally used. Because of this, controls cannot replace chemicals entirely, but the two approaches can and should be integrated into effective and sound systems.

Possible biotic control methods encompass the following: First, insect parasites and predators; second, microbial agents—viruses, bacteria, fungi, and protozoa; third, sterilization and release of male sterilized insects; fourth, identifying, selecting, and breeding strains of trees resistant to pest attack and injury.

Research has already shown tangible results with each of these approaches, and the research has already been applied to practical pest control. For example: First, parasites and predators imported from Europe have become established in the Northeast and are playing a vital role in controlling the gypsy moth through predation, and a predatory coccinellid beetle was recently imported from Europe and released in various parts of the United States to control of the balsam woolly aphid; third, specific viruses have been found, propagated, and applied for control of the European spruce sawfly, four pine sawflies, and the Great Basin tent caterpillar; and fourth, tree strains resistant to rusts, gall aphids, and other pests have been found and are being propagated. These few examples clearly illustrate that scientists, if adequately financed and equipped, can discover new, natural ways of controlling forest pests that have a minimum of ill side effects.

The Northeastern United States has about 71 million acres of hardwood forests. These forests contain large reserves of valuable hardwoods. For example, essentially all of the black cherry, 89 percent of the yellow birch, 65 percent of the sugar maple, 73 percent of the beech, and 33 percent of the ashes of the Nation are found in these forests. These forests of Connecticut and elsewhere in New England are highly prized for recreation, hunting, timber, and other economic benefits to many communities.

And along with several other hardwood species supply large volumes of raw materials for many wood-using industries located in the Northeast and other parts of the Nation. Such industries, ranging from pulpwood plants to furniture factories, provide employment opportunities, markets for timber, and other economic benefits to many communities.

So, forests make substantial contributions to the economic and social well-being of the region as well as the Nation. Moreover, these multiple benefits of our hardwood forest resources clearly indicate that demands upon them will climb steadily in the years ahead.

Insects and diseases have sharply reduced the capacity of northeastern forests to meet even the present demands upon them. Defoliating insects, trunk borers, cankers, stumps, rots, and other pests have ruined vast amounts of otherwise valuable timber. Tree pests have destroyed millions of acres of forest land and made them unsuitable for recreational uses.

We must protect our forests against these pests. The Forest Service research program at West Haven is directed toward developing sound, practical protection systems. We need to strengthen this effort—reduce the time required to develop reliable control systems—and make sure the nation utilizes the protection potential of New England's forests.

A REVOLUTION IN MANAGEMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last Wednesday, Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Special Assistant to the President, addressed the Washington chapter of Sigma Delta Chi and described how President Johnson and the administration have started a "revolution in management.

He stated that the thrust of that revolution is to mobilize the powerful new methods of processing and communicating information and to develop an administrative machinery to modern techniques. Moreover, additional machinery can and should be made available to the President to carry out innovative attacks on the Nation's social problems.

Early this year I introduced a bill which I believe would do this. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act of 1967, S. 843, would create a Council of Economic Advisers and an Assistant for Economic Opportunity, report to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, with a total overview of Federal domestic social programs. It would provide for an annual Presidential Social Report, comparable to the Economic Report. Finally, it would establish a joint congressional committee with oversight responsibility.

Not the least important, the legislation would declare social accounting a national goal, and would provide for regular reports on the status of society, based upon appropriate social indicators, just as we do now in the economic sphere.

President Johnson and the administration are to be congratulated for their imaginative and creative efforts. Congress should encourage this governmental revolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Califano's address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE POLITICS OF INNOVATION AND THE REVOLUTION IN GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

(Remarks by Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Special Assistant to the President, before the Washington Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, April 19, 1967)

Tonight I would like to talk to you about some of our major problems—the urban ghettos, rural poverty, keeping the economy in a state of non-inflation, preserving domestic tranquility. You often write of these problems more often, I must admit, than we would like.

You have also heard us speak many times of our achievements—the million college students now receiving Federal assistance; the millions of employees now developing new skills under Federal training programs; where none were receiving such help just a few years ago; the six million patients whose medical care has already been paid for under Medicare; the 72 months of unparalleled prosperity; the 8.6 per cent unemployment rate. Although we might not write about these accomplishments as often as we would like, you are certainly familiar with them.

You have also heard of another revolution—the political revolution. You are well aware that since the sixties the Democratic party has truly become the party of the future. The 1964 election was the beginning of an era. The 1966 election was a further confirmation of the new order.

Our new era has its problems: how to help out of poverty the millions of our fellow citizens; how to provide for the future of our children; how to keep American industry competitive; how to keep our economy growing; how to put the finishing touches on the Great Society and the War on Poverty; and how to keep the world safe for democracy.

There's not much to be said about the state of the economy. We've got the answer. Our programs have worked. We've got the unemployment rate down to 3.6 per cent. Mr. Johnson's recently stated that we've got to get all the people in the labor force working. We've got the best unemployment rate in the history of the country.

In education, we've got the best opportunity for all the young people in America. We've got to make certain our schools are safe and secure, but we've got to make certain that the young people have all the opportunity to go to college and to learn in the best conditions.

In the War on Poverty, we've made great progress. We've got to work hard to meet the needs of the poor. We've got to remember these people are human beings. We've got to work a great deal to assist them to be part of this great nation.

The President has asked us to take a fresh look at our Federal agencies to make certain they are able to meet the needs of the people. It is the responsibility of the new Cabinet to deal with these problems, get them to the Congress, and get the job done.

I hope tonight I have convinced you that we have a new government. It's a government in which we are working hard to see that we achieve the new majority of the American people. It's a government in which we are asking the Congress to give us the resources to do a job. The new Cabinet has been asked to come forward with a budget that will go for the job.

In the new Cabinet, we have a group of men and women who have been chosen for their competence and for their commitment to the idea that we can turn around these basic problems. This is the concept of the new Cabinet and the new government.

Today I would like to talk about some of the problems that we face. We have the problems of the urban ghettos, poverty, and I would like to point out that we have a history of the Federal Government's past failures to meet the needs of the American people. Our new government is a government that is asking the Congress to give them the resources to do a job.
The story I would like to talk about tonight is largely unwritten. It is a complex story involving a number of social and economic problems that are not always covered in the headlines. But it is as critical to the success of the President’s domestic programs as are the legislative victories in education, in medical care, and in the area of tax reform.

This story involves two elements: the policies of innovation and the revolution in government that have inspired us not only to reach out for a sense of new wealth and power more rapidly than in population, and our need to adjust constantly to a changing environment. These new management techniques that adjust to the whole urban environment are the result of the revolution in management. The revolution in management is the response of government to the policies of innovation that require us to mobilize the powerful new means of processing and communicating information and to develop modern analytical techniques to deal with problems in their entirety.

These new problem-solving techniques are leading us to abandon many old slogans and to question the whole concept of facts and the prism of a total approach. This new approach to problem solving and decision making has many names: modern analytical techniques that adjust to the whole urban environment. It is a systematic way of saying: what are all the parts of the problem, how do they interact with each other, and why? It gives us new management strategies and gives us new types of objectives, set our priorities, examine the options open to us and apply the resources available to those programs which will have the maximum impact on the solution of our problems.

For the approach to be total, problems must be defined and examined in their entirety, as a whole, rather than in bits and pieces. It is an approach ideally suited to the Presidency.

President Johnson as you gather the facts for a story, or as a lawyer gathers the facts for a trial, all of the data bearing on the problem must be assembled. Second, the basis of that data, specific objectives must be defined.

Third—alternative means of reaching that objective must be clearly identified and evaluated.

Fourth—the available alternatives must be presented in a way that helps the President select the best option. In terms of the benefits it will bring in relation to costs, social as well as economic.

We must adopt a total analysis not only to the solution of the problems, but to the institutions with which we try to solve them. It does no good, for example, only to develop a community action program to wipe out a slum if we do not also provide for speed commuters from their homes in one city to their destination in another. We must also tackle the problem of how the money is spent. Are our national, city and county agencies involved can work together to install and operate the system effectively and in a consistent way.

The new management revolution affects the machinery of government at all levels. It requires reorganization of Federal departments and agencies. It involves an entirely new set of relationships between Federal, state, and local governments. These relationships among government at all levels must be assessed in terms of their capability to define and solve problems.

These principles may seem simple and obvious to anyone in this room. While there were few converts to this new problem-solving approach—because they are so readily dismissible—planners can tell, for example, that an airplane weighing many gross tons, costing so much to produce, can fly so far and penetrate enemy defenses with so many pounds of bombs. They can compare the effectiveness and cost of that airplane with the ability of a missile to deliver accurately a warhead of a given size in a few minutes to its target.

Perhaps the most difficult part of the Defense equation is the assessment of an enemy’s capabilities and his intentions. To enhance our ability to make this assessment, it was essential to restructure the institutions, to develop the combination of separate service intelligence organizations into the Defense Intelligence Agency.

The difficulties of adapting these techniques to the domestic problems of our Nation are enormous. But their potential is certain to be very great. And the President, in revitalizing the entire Federal structure of our country, in savings to our taxpayers, in giving the Nation a more effective management mechanism than it has ever had.

President Johnson has fully grasped that potential. Tears of experience on the House and Senate Armed Services Committees have given him an appreciation of the value of a systematic and total analysis—of the difference one can make in the Defense Department before and after its application there.

The surest instinct for the effective use of Presidential leadership has led to so many legislative achievements has brought the President to seek their effective administration.

For, from the perspective of the Presidency, a total approach is essential to the solution of any problem. It is only then that we have a chance at a real problem-oriented President. Crime to the Justice Department may be federal crimes and federal judges and federal courts. To the Health, Education, and Welfare, crime may be juvenile delinquency and halfway houses. To the Labor Department, it is the prevention of job opportunity. It is despair and frustration.

We recognize that a slum is all these things, it becomes clear that health workers, transportation experts, educators, psychologists—everyone who is involved in these areas—all these and more are needed and they are needed at the right time and in the right place. From the very beginning, the Federal government must be inter-disciplinary and total.

The Federal government alone cannot wipe out a slum, nor can it be the mayor of every city. Nor can cities alone, when states are responsible for so many of the services. Nor can states alone, when private industry has most of the jobs available for the unemployed.

We recognize that the Federal government cannot do the job alone—nor can the city or the state—a means must be found to bring together Federal, Federal, state and local programs with private initiative.

To know exactly what we are attempting to do with the Model Cities program. Under this program, local communities are asked to assemble all their resources—public and private—together with all available Federal programs and submit a comprehensive plan not only to build apartments, transporta tion, schools, and other necessary facilities, but to give people in the area the opportunity for self-
development at the same time. The Federal government will pay a substantial bonus to help get things going.

To work most effectively with the local community, the Federal government must abandon its traditional vertical structure and bring together a horizontal team of experts, management officials, and bankers. The President, in his April 3 speech, presented the Congress the opportunity to be a special leader of the Federal government in the world of finance and commerce.

The article deals with the growth of Finance Factors, of which Mr. BOSCH is a member, and its affiliation with the Department of Finance Factors, of which the Senator is a part, and the Department of Finance Factors as part of the world of finance and commerce.

The difficult task is to establish the governmental responsibilities, and for the governors to get their states to recognize and assume them. It is easy to say that free enterprise requires government action. The difficult task is to establish the responsibilities, and for the governors to get their states to recognize and assume them.
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The First 15 Years of Finance Factors—This Month Hawaii's Largest Industrial Loan Company, and the Multi-Divisional Organization It Has Made, Along With It, Marks Its 15th Anniversary

Fifteen years ago, when personal loans were scarce in Hawaii, a small subdivision in Manoa, Hawaii, brought $300,000 in cash and formed an industrial loan company to specialize in the newly developing field of consumer finance. After it had overcome the initial growth problems, the company has continued to grow at a rapid pace. Making a $300,000 home loan in 1953, the company now has over $48 million dollars in assets and has had a remarkable showing, having only ten per cent of the offices, but better than 15% of the transactions of all the various firms, which were a new concept in Hawaii, a small Honolulu home loan company to be associated with Finance Factors. Although it has gone into hotel construction—its latest project being a joint venture with Inter-Island Resorts in construction of the new Naniloa Hotel in Hilo—Finance Factors has grown into a multi-divisional company with diversified yet closely related operations.

Within the various corporations are a number of specialty divisions, such as Finance Factors Insurance, a general line insurance company; Finance Factors Auto Loans, a company specializing in auto loans; and Finance Factors Mortgage, a mortgage company, and has not yet been set up as a separate corporate division. Finance Factors has a real estate sales division and a construction division. An important part of Finance Factors general operations is a property management division. Though there is still another layer of company activity, Finance Factors maintains control of companies formed within the corporate parent. Under Finance Investment, for instance, there is a separate corporation to develop tracts and another which built the Ward Avenue Building, another which built the Finance Factors office building in Hilo, and so on.

Also a separate corporation is Finance Realty, the subdividing and building of homes. With its nucleus in 1953 with a 12-acre subdivision in Manoas, the company in 1955 bought 100 acres near Waikiki for $690,000 in cash and another 5,000 acres of land on the Big Island—one of the few Big Island subdivisions to have been completely sold out.

Currently the company is involved in two major long-range projects. Makalilo City, a subdivision being built above Barber's Road, now has 500 homes on land leased from Campbell Estate. For its other major project, the company has 1,000 acres of free land at Pupukea which it is developing into a one-acre lot, and the Pupukea project is now under study and development.

Another member of the corporate family is involved in land development as well, but primarily related to real estate income rather than construction. This is Newton Development, set up initially to go into any type of investment, but today mostly involved in land development, such as converting condominium apartments to warehouses and office buildings. Most recently, Investment has gone into hotel construction—its latest project being a joint venture with Inter-Island Resorts to build the new Naniloa Hotel in Hilo.

There are three other separate corporations in the family—Finance Securities. Although it deals almost exclusively with house accounts, it illustrates quite well how the corporate entities develop within the family group. As the volume of stock transactions within the company began to grow, it became apparent that such a specialized division was needed to warrant the formation of a separate corporation. Today Securities handles the stock transactions of all the various firms, which over the years has developed into a substantial volume.

Also set up separately is the Finance Factors Securities Corporation, which is basically a stockbroker and has made an annual contribution for the past eight years. This contribution is based on a sliding scale of $100,000 if the company, now has over $125,000 in it, the earnings from which are used for various charitable causes determined by the board of directors each year.

One of the reasons for that success is that Finance Factors has taken a different approach than the others. While most firms set up small offices in a great many locations, Finance Factors takes the approach of having regional offices, much like a bank would. Each of these offices is larger and more impressive than the competition. In the cases where Finance Investment owns the building, it is known as the Finance Factors Building. Finance Factors always encourages its people to take part in community activities and become a part of the community.

Nowhere has its success formula been so vividly pointed out, however, as during the current economic hardships. With prices and supply nationwide and many companies found themselves in tight straits. Not only did Factors have reserves held for just such a development, but also by being in close contact with the market conditions, they were able to help out many local companies. In 1966, net profits after taxes were up a healthy 14 percent.

The Men Involved

The man the public most closely associated with Finance Factors is Hiram Fong, who as president guided it through its expansion, has been with Finance Factors since 1957, more and more responsibility in the hands of Clifford Yee, one of the original founders, who holds the title of executive vice president, and the coordinating officer of all the companies. Not that Fong has divorced himself from business affairs, in fact the opposite is the case. He moved back to Hawaii every couple of months, and company business gets a good deal of his attention during these visits. Fong, however, there is a relationship between owners and the management team that is unusually close. Partly this is because of the ownership structure of the company. But it is also due to the degree of freedom and responsibility that management has placed on each of the corporate officers.

While it is not widely known, ownership in Finance Factors rests in six men, each of whom has an equal share of stock in the company. Of these, four are full-time in operations—Clifford Yee, Mun On Chua, and Daniel Lau. The others are Hiram Fong, Pong Choy and Dr. L. Q. Pang. None of the six has taken any profits out of the firm, and over the years a major part of the company's earnings have been internally generated out of re-invested profits.

Major decisions, such as Grand Pacific's proposal to operate in California, are discussed and voted on by the executive corporate team to relate the specific move to over-all company operations, and a consensus is arrived at. All the day-to-day operations are left in the hands of the individual executives, with Clifford Yee serving as the coordinating officer for all the operations.

Yee was in his early thirties and head of accounting at Honolulu Trust Company when the idea of forming a consumer finance company was first discussed. Working with him at the time, and also among the original founders, were Daniel W. P. Wadsworth, finance officer at Continental, and Frank M. Hata, corporate secretary for all the companies, and Mun On Chua, who heads up Finance Factors Investment. At 80 is the elder statesman of the group, Dr. L. Q. Pang, who worked for the Bank of Hawaii and then, as a member of the group that originally put the company together was Lawrence B. C. Lau, who today is executive vice president of American Security Bank, to become the bank's president.

Finance Investment is run by Sheridan Fong, one of the five original owners who came to Finance Factors in 1957 from Hawaiian Telephone, where he had been head of business research. Eng was brought in to set up Grand Pacific Life Insurance in 1957, then went on to set up Finance Investment which he heads today.

Eng was replaced at Grand Pacific by Wadsworth Yee, who serves as executive vice president. In addition to his duties as State senator. At Finance Factor, Edward Masun-
moto handles the day-to-day operations as senior vice president; and a former Amfao insurance executive, Robert Doane, runs Finance Securities. Finance Securities is headed by Edward Wong.

A PREMIUM ON PEOPLE

Finance Factors puts a premium on people, and the fact shows throughout its operating arrangements. The premium comes from within the company, and it is a young company. Yee himself is 48 and the average age of the top line management group is 36. There are only 102 people in the entire company, only 32, half of whom have five years or more with the company. What holds the 260 people who make up the family of employees? It is a combination of a lot of things, ranging from one of the first profit-sharing plans in the State to a training program that encourages personal development.

In-house training programs are set up annually for both new trainees and to further the knowledge of other employees. Because the other times of the year are hectic, the training periods run from March to June or July for five or six weeks on week nights. Beyond the basic training program, headed by personnel director Ross Landgraf, there is an opportunity for each employee to further his knowledge at no expense. Every male employee is urged to take the Dale Carnegie Course, and the company will pay the tuition for anyone who wishes to take real estate, insurance, or other related courses. Speakers are regularly brought in to talk to groups on a wide range of subjects. The interesting thing is that speakers are often from the competition. As an example, bank credit men are invited in to speak, as are mortgage men, advertising people, and the like.

Finance Factors also encourages its people to have professional accreditation; at Grand Pacific, there are 30 CLU's, or Chartered Life Underwriters. Finance Factors has also taken the Harvard Advanced Management Program, and even the head of the management team in Providence, John Johnson of Fawcett-McDermott & Associates, is a licensed insurance man.

THE FORMULA HAS PAID OFF

How well this emphasis on people has paid off is reflected in the staggering success of the company. Together taken, the entire Finance Factors family has resources totalling about $64 million. In addition to Factors, with $48 million, Realty has resources of $41 million, Grand Pacific Life almost $3 million, and Investment $6 million. Up to now Finance Factors has been entirely based on operations in the State of Hawaii. While this may not be true in the future, since Grand Pacific is already moving into California, and the company is interested in any good proposition no matter where it is, nevertheless management feels that Hawaii is still in a decidedly strong growth position. Wherever it goes, however, the sound management team and the proven concept of what Finance Factors is likely reflect its past successes in new and exciting directions.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

EXECUTIVE D—TREATY ON PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE ACTIVITIES OF STATES IN THE EXPLORATION AND USE OF OUTER SPACE, INCLUDING THE MOON AND OTHER CELESTIAL BODIES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive D, 90th Congress, first session, a Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the 'Treaty Governing the Exploration and Use of Outer Space' is designed to establish rules preventing the use of outer space or any celestial body in it as a base for nuclear or any other weapons of mass destruction, and to provide means of enforcing these rules. Unlike the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, it is a unilateral, bilateral treaty with the Soviet Union entered into at a time when the Soviets are our virtual enemies in the Vietnam war. On the contrary, it is a multi-national treaty subscribed to by many, and perhaps eventually by all nations. For these reasons I have been desirous of supporting it, provided it did not pose a threat to the security of the United States of America.

The obstacle in the way of my voting for ratification was the question as to whether the United States would be able to detect violations of the treaty by the Soviets or any other nations by like means for our protection. Frankly, I place no reliance on the treaty promises of the Soviet Union, and I do not have complete confidence that our own Government will always be alert and realistic in guarding against possible threats to our security. My lack of confidence, however, does not extend to our military leaders.

In order to satisfy myself on this vital point, I addressed three questions to the Secretary of Defense. They were:

First. Will we be able to determine if Soviet spacecraft carry heavy weapons?

Second. If so, how? What is the payload capacity?

Third. Could our present and projected retaliatory capacity survive a sneak attack from outer space?

The testimony of General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, found on page 98 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, constitutes a partial answer, but being given in open hearing, could not be specific enough to wholly resolve my doubts.

The answers to my questions received from the Department of Defense, particularly from the Director of Research and Development, went into the matter more fully and furnished considerable assurance. However, my tentative position might not have enabled me to make the grave decision to vote for the treaty.

I then sought and obtained a personal conference with General Wheeler, speaking for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Obvi­ously, the information or the subjects of discussion with General Wheeler cannot be disclosed, other than to say that they went directly to the core of the three questions propounded from information from, and the assurance of, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, added to the data received from the Defense Department and carefully studied, enable me to vote for this treaty with complete confidence that it may promote, and certainly will not endanger, our national security.

I shall vote for the ratification of the treaty.

(At this point Mr. Hollings assumed the chair.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his interest in securing increased information about the military and security aspects of the treaty.

I should like to speak briefly on this matter, because in the committee I directed my attention and addressed my questions to this particular issue.

We know that the interest of our country in the peaceful exploration of outer space is neither new nor recent. In November 1958, President Eisenhower took the initiative, and, in an exchange of letters with the Chief of State of the Soviet Union, expressed our country's desire to seek agreements to limit the uses of outer space for peaceful purposes. This policy has been reaffirmed repeatedly by President Kennedy and President Johnson.

In its consideration of the treaty, the Committee on Foreign Relations, at its first hearing, received the testimony of Secretary of State Rusk, Ambassador Goldberg, and a statement by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Mr. Webb.

I must say that I did not feel that they dealt adequately with the military and national security aspects of the treaty.

I requested that the chairman of the committee insist that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler, and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Vance, speaking for the Secretary of Defense, appear at a public hearing on April 12, to testify concerning these problems.

I should like to comment on those provisions of the treaty which bear on our national security and military posture in light of the testimony given the committee by General Wheeler and Mr. Vance.

Paragraph (1) of article IV obligates the treaty parties "not to place in orbit any weapon of mass destruction or any other kind of weapon in outer space, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner."
Paragraph (2) of article IV prohibits "the establishment of military bases, installations and fortifications, the testing of any type of weapons and the conduct of military maneuvers on celestial bodies". The Senate has determined that the moon and other celestial bodies be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

In order to establish safeguards and to ascertain compliance by the parties with the treaty, article XII provides for inspection by granting the parties physical access to "all stations, installations, equipment and space vehicles on the moon and other celestial bodies" with advance notice.

The Senate should address itself to this important question and the public at large has a right to be informed.

At the outset of the hearing, before I had an opportunity to put questions to these witnesses, the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. CONOR) covered the subject matter thoroughly and in detail and obtained answers to many of the questions that I had for making that statement. When I had the opportunity for examining the witnesses presented itself, I noted that many of the questions I had prepared had been answered. The answers to some of these questions by Mr. Connor and Mr. Vance were addressed to General Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Honorable Cyrus Vance, speaking for the Secretary of Defense.

As the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that they would prefer to rely upon the capabilities of the military services and the agencies of the United States to maintain monitoring and surveillance systems for the detection of possible armed satellites rather than have the right to inspection.

I do not know all of the reasons he had for making that statement, but it is important and significant that the Department of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that they prefer to rely on our capabilities to detect any possible armed objects that they expressed confidence that they would be able to maintain that capability. It is upon this basis that I find myself able to support the ratification of this treaty.

My last point is that the treaty does not significantly change our present situation. Today there is no agreement. It has been the announced U.S. policy since 1964 to inhibit the Soviet Union from testing weapons in outer space. We should bear in mind that whether we enter into this treaty or not, the Soviet Union, if it so desired, could orbit armed objects, and our capability for verification would not be changed in any way. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. VANCE. That is correct.

General WHEELER. That is correct.

Senator COOPER. Has the United States now has the capability of identifying objects that are orbited in space, but can we also determine whether or not they are armed?

Mr. VANCE. Senator Cooper, as I indicated in my statement, it would be possible for the Soviet Union to launch one or two which we might be able to detect, but whether it is possible for the United States to detect armament in space, I do not know.

Mr. VANCE. That is not possible.

General WHEELER. That is right.

Senator COOPER. Have we not served on the Armed Services Committee for a long time or the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and some of these subjects are very technical. I do not have the knowledge that perhaps Senator Gore and others would have on the technical aspects. But may I ask whether the Department of Defense, if it were required to verify this treaty, it would be, in my view, impossible for the Soviet Union to launch, undetected, a militarily significant number, and I believe General Wheeler will concur with that statement.

General WHEELER. That is right.

Senator COOPER. Have we not served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and some of these subjects are very technical. I do not have the knowledge that perhaps Senator Gore and others would have on the technical aspects. But may I ask whether the Department of Defense, if it were required to verify this treaty, it would be, in my view, impossible for the Soviet Union to launch, undetected, a militarily significant number, and I believe General Wheeler will concur with that statement.

General WHEELER. That is right.

Senator COOPER. Have we not served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and some of these subjects are very technical. I do not have the knowledge that perhaps Senator Gore and others would have on the technical aspects. But may I ask whether the Department of Defense, if it were required to verify this treaty, it would be, in my view, impossible for the Soviet Union to launch, undetected, a militarily significant number, and I believe General Wheeler will concur with that statement.

General WHEELER. That is right.

Senator COOPER. Have we not served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and some of these subjects are very technical. I do not have the knowledge that perhaps Senator Gore and others would have on the technical aspects. But may I ask whether the Department of Defense, if it were required to verify this treaty, it would be, in my view, impossible for the Soviet Union to launch, undetected, a militarily significant number, and I believe General Wheeler will concur with that statement.

General WHEELER. That is right.
biting bomb or a nuclear weapon. The size would be one of the important facts that one would look to. There are other classified positions taken away, this point which when their reach their failure will be able to give us a great deal more knowledge than we have. There is any point, the point where a certain number would cause you concern.

Mr. Vance. Are you asking me how many would give us concern?

Senator Cooper. Yes.

Mr. Vance. It is a difficult question to answer. Senator, but if we would detect ten or more, I would certainly have concern.

DETECTION OF A MISSILE LAUNCHING OR AN ORBITING BOMB

Senator Cooper. Would it be more difficult to determine whether a missile attack was being launched or whether a group of orbiting bodies might constitute an attack upon the United States?

Mr. Vance. Let me say, Senator, with respect to that question, that it is much more difficult to detect an attack from space than it is to launch one from the earth. You have many problems in trying to launch an attack from space. You have the problem of propulsion, you do not have a propelled orbital body such as the earth is less than that of an ICBM. In addition the payload is less than that of an ICBM.

The whole problem of command and control is much more difficult with respect to an orbiting body. Finally, it is much more expensive in every sense.

So that from the commonsense standpoint, it simply does not make sense.

Senator Cooper. That is what I thought.

Mr. Vance. Yes.

Senator Cooper. That is the question I am going to direct my attention to in a minute. But that was not the question I asked.

Mr. Vance. I am sorry.

Senator Cooper. My question is this: Is it more difficult to detect a missile launching than it would be to detect an armed orbiting body directed against this country?

Mr. Vance. No.

Senator Cooper. Do we have systems in being right now that are capable of determining whether a missile has been launched?

Mr. Vance. No.

Senator Cooper. That is what I thought.

You make the distinction that it is easier to identify a missile attack on the United States than it might be.

Mr. Vance. Oh, yes; indeed, sir.

Senator Cooper (continuing). To identify an attack by armed bodies orbiting the earth.

FEASIBILITY OF ARMING ORBITING BODIES

You said that, in your judgment—and I think General Wheeler also made the statement—the arming of bodies orbiting the earth was not feasible for many reasons, at least in the present state of technology. Would you consider that it is possible that the United States could have a policy as whereby the arming of orbiting bodies might become feasible?

Mr. Vance. I doubt it myself, sir. But I said in my statement that it is possible that some of the disadvantages which I have mentioned to you in answer to your previous questions may be eliminated in time.

Senator Cooper. Do you agree with that, General Wheeler?

General Wheeler. Yes, sir; it can be done at the present time, but it is not attractive for a number of reasons, some of which you have touched on, Senator.

I would think that advancing technology will remove many of the disadvantages inherent in an armed orbiting body, and it is for this reason that the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider, as I brought out with Senator Lausche, that we must improve our capabilities in the detection and verification area.

Senator Cooper. Assuming that and that I believe the United States has the capability to identify orbiting bodies which might carry arms, can I ask:

General Wheeler. This is correct, sir.

CONTINUED RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Senator Cooper. Assuming, as you have stated, that the technology could be advanced to a point where that might be feasible, do you believe that some form of agreement might be considered feasible by the Soviet Union, do you now have a program to implement such a convention which could meet such a contingency?

General Wheeler. We do, Senator.

Mr. Vance. Yes, sir.

Senator Cooper. You have no doubt about that.

General Wheeler. I have no doubt about it.

Senator Cooper. The reason I asked that, General Wheeler, is because you have said in the statement you filed with the committee several weeks ago and today that:

"As technical, economic, and military factors change or alter current assessments concerning the United States, our national security will demand an increase in our military efforts in space not prohibited by the treaty."

And later:

"Of crucial significance to the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the knowledge that the United States will not permit the authority of this treaty to become meaningless by diminishing U.S. military efforts in space technology."

Do you believe it would be necessary for further assistance from the Congress to authorize programs which would enable you to develop methods for the detection and identification of orbiting armed bodies, so as to protect the security of the United States?

General Wheeler. That is correct, Senator.

Senator Cooper. I am interested in these two statements, which you quoted, is that we cannot permit the treaty itself to generate a sort of euphoria that this gives us a security situation that will hold into the future indefinitely, and, therefore, we will undoubtedly be in the same situation in the future as we are today, and that means to budgetary support for continuing R & D programs to improve our capabilities, for detection and verification.

Mr. Vance. Yes, sir.

Senator Cooper. I would point out we have sufficient funds in the current year's budget to do all that is required at this time.

Senator Cooper. There is no question in your mind, then, that you will ask for the means to meet this emergency.

General Wheeler. None at all, sir.

Senator Cooper. I have two or three other questions.

CAN THE UNITED STATES EVENTUALLY ARM ORBITING BODIES?

The U.S. policy is not to arm orbiting bodies whether or not this treaty is entered into.

General Wheeler. That is correct, Senator.

Senator Cooper. Assume we enter the treaty and the United States does not arm orbiting bodies, and suddenly you discover that the Soviet Union has done so. Would that event place the United States at an immediate military disadvantage or endanger its security?

General Wheeler. I do not believe so, Senator. We gave up nothing that was currently useful to us in the military area.

Senator Cooper. Do you agree with that, General Wheeler?

General Wheeler. Yes, sir; our orbiting bodies will not be of the sort which will enable the Soviet Union to identify or detect our orbiting bodies, and so we would not then be in a position to launch any attack against the United States. If the Soviet Union were to launch such an attack we would not have the capability to detect it. Therefore, we would not be in a position to launch any attack against the United States.
service to the Senate in the discussion of this matter. I had caused some study to be made, and I made some study of this matter in my office. I was not able to procure from these hearings nor from what I could ascertain any satisfactory answer to some of the questions that were raised. I have since received those answers from the discussion by the Senator from New Hampshire, and more particularly from the discussion by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

With respect to the reservation expressed in the resolution on the floor of the Senate, I was in the Chamber yesterday and acquiesced in the unanimous consent, after being assured we have received answers, but cleared this matter for a vote at 2:30. Therefore, I presume it is regular in that respect. Frankly, I feel, in view of the ramifications of this treaty, that it is in my judgment, which might well have taken up a little more discussion than has been taking place in the Chamber for the last 3 weeks for the benefit of all of us.

I was concerned when I learned that answers were not hereinafter originally scheduled with respect to members of the Department of Defense. As I understand it, those hearings were scheduled on the instigation of the district senator from Kentucky. I may be in error about that, but it seems to me that a treaty which may potentially have long-term effects, which this treaty does, can only have been the subject of more exhaustive discussion and a little more exhaustive investigation than apparently this treaty did.

I shall vote for the treaty with the assurance we have received answers, but I do feel that there is a tendency on the part of the Senate and perhaps even on the part of many to skim over these matters in a rather cursory fashion—and habit. As to what that alludes to, I am not too much about a nuclear weapon system in space.

It is true that we could identify even one missile—a nuclear missile—orbiting in space, and we could more readily identify satellites which we consider as constituting an offensive system, but it might also be considered in this same respect that we have to view the potentiality of the U.S.S.R. That potentiality might be to orbit 10 of these at one time, or in the course of 2 or 3 days, and then we are faced with a situation post facto about which nothing could be done.

Having a view of our developing technology and our capability, I believe within the foreseeable future it would be inadvisable and too expensive to orbit an offensive system in space, considering the potential that the U.S.S.R. has at the moment in the intercontinental ballistic field. Therefore, I do not regard this as an irrecoverable bar to voting for the treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis I made upon the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space be inserted in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This treaty was signed on January 27, 1967, on behalf of the USA, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R., and was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee, which has reported favorably thereon without reservation.

The President pro tempore estimated certain general principles for peaceful exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. The parties agree the outer space is free from national appropriation or claim of sovereignty; precludes the establishment of military installations and the conduct of military activities; provides for the right to inspect installations and space vehicles on the moon and other celestial bodies.

The language of the Treaty is based on a blend (It is to be lanse of the Antarktic Treaty of 1959 together with the substance of two United Nations General Assembly resolutions.)

The Outer Space Treaty consists of a Preamble and seven articles. The categories are added but below. The issues raised by these provisions will be discussed in a separate paragraph.

Article 1 provides that the exploration and use of outer space is to be carried on for the benefit and in the interest of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic development, and shall be for the benefit of all mankind.

Article 2 provides that outer space shall not be subject to national appropriation by any country. Article 3 provides that parties to the Treaty shall carry on their activities in the exploration and use of outer space in accordance with international law.

Article 4 provides that the parties shall not undertake to place in orbit objects carrying nuclear weapons, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner. Article 5 provides for access to install space vehicles on celestial bodies. Article 6 provides parties to the Treaty shall carry on their activities in the exploration and use of outer space in accordance with international law.
But, I am more concerned about what is going on in the minds of the people who propel that machinery. On that point, although this may seem perhaps not the place to say it, yet the conclusions I want to draw, hopefully I know that the hearts of all Americans go out to the family, and to the Russian people, in the death of Vladimir Komarov. I know that many people throughout the world must have said, in their own way, in their own language, to the Supreme Being in whom they believe, `Vladimiro, Rus'ka!'

In view of the statements recently made by Svetlana Alliluyeva Stalin in recognizing in the midst of her Soviet land the existence of the Supreme Being, we have no way of knowing how many people in Communist lands may have sent up the same prayer, lacking sufficient strength within themselves but in their own way praying for the brave Komarov, `May God rest his soul.'

Perhaps in a spiritual explanation lies some hope far more than in the simple control of machinery.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it would be difficult for me to vote for a treaty which offers great hope of peace in space. Would we could have it on earth. I agree with the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLORY) that it would have been desirable for both the U.S. and the Russians to discuss this matter before we were asked to vote, and I would like to have Mr. Komarov as aids to the war which is now going on in southeast Asia.

In the New York Times of April 13, there was published an Associated Press story to the effect that:

American bombers are being guided to targets in North Vietnam by daily photographs received from U.S. weather satellites.

According to the story, the aerial photos from the satellites are rushed, sometimes when still wet, to the U.S. air command center in Thailand, Lt. Gen. William W. Momyer, even while U.S. bombers are on their way to the north:

"By spotting breaks in the clouds, General Momyer can divert planes to areas that are unexpectedly clear. With satellite photos sometimes taken minutes before, he has a grasp of the weather situation that is impossible to obtain by conventional forecasting."

In connection with the Senate's consideration of the Treaty on Outer Space, a serious question is raised by this practice of using the weather satellites to locate attainable bombing targets in North Vietnam. The question is thus raised as to whether or not this practice would violate the objectives of the proposed treaty.

It is true that the weather satellites in and of themselves are not weapons of war and are not raising bombs on North Vietnam. It is also true that the targets are not being used as triggers physically located on the bombing planes flying over North Vietnam.

On the other hand, when a weather satellite flashes a photograph to earth and that photograph is read by United States air commander in South Vietnam so that he can and does then determine places over North Vietnam where the weather is clear and he orders those places bombed, it is obvious that the satellite itself is passing on the information, through an intermediary, to the bomber. The weather satellite itself becomes an integral part of the bombing operation as though it were physically located on the bombers themselves as a firing mechanism. The weather satellite is certainly an object in what is considered to be `outer space.'

The question may well be, `Is not the United States in violation of the spirit of the Outer Space Treaty even before ratification?'

The weather satellite is a serious, if not a violation at least of the spirit of the treaty and what we may consider closer to earth, but I feel the issue is not so clearly defined in the treaty to prevent future misinterpretation or misunderstanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the insertion which I made on April 14, which appears on page 9641 of the Congressional Record, including an article published in the New York Times concerning this matter be printed in the Record.

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

"SATellites guide U.S. pilots in war. Weather photos and data from North Vietnam."

Mr. SOWDEN, South Vietnam, April 13.—American bombers are being guided to targets in North Vietnam by daily photographs received from United States weather satellites. The United States weather satellite pictures of all Southeast Asia had become one of the most valuable guides to United States air commanders in South Vietnam, and the Russian people might be receiving them, too, using them for air defense planning.

"If satellite photos sometimes taken minutes before, he has a grasp of the weather situation that is impossible to obtain by conventional forecasting."

"Prints rushed to general."

Col. Edwin Carmell of Rantoul, Ill., who runs the Saigon weather post, says:

"Our people, who are experts, can tell from the density of the picture, by comparing whites and grays, a remarkable amount of information.

"He said they could generally get cloud ceilings, separate rain clouds from others and obtain a vast amount of detail needed by pilots."

"The two satellites usually furnish two photos daily of Southeast Asia."

"American bombers have become about 50 per cent of our product," Colonel Carmell said.

"In the general's eyes, they are maybe 100 per cent."

"The weather has been so bad up North recently, we could be 95 per cent correct by predicting bad weather all the time. That doesn't do much good. What the Air Force wants is to know about that other 5 per cent."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, when Mr. James Webb was before the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I asked him to provide the committee with a list of benefits which would accrue to the space program and the United States in general from this treaty, and also what the benefits would be which the Soviet Union would obtain.

Mr. Webb's response has just arrived in my hands within the past 5 minutes, and I think, unanimous consent to have his statement printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the state-
The security of this country rests both on a strong defense posture to make aggression unattractive to any who may consider such an undertaking, and on our scientific, nautical and space program. The programs being recommended by the President in his budget message for 1968 and the program of the Congress in the budget for 1967 both appear to me to be in line with the objectives of what we seek to do, and I believe that we have the necessary resources in the budget for 1968 to achieve the ends that we seek. The only benefit of this treaty will be to get formal Soviet accession to the Johnson program under the framework of treaty law. The merit of such an accomplishment is itself nebulous. The only thing the treaty is supposed to do is to make it a legal matter, to be adhered to as long as the advantage is on their side, and to be violated at will. Therefore, their present agreement to the terms of this treaty has, at best, only a formal significance.

Since the Soviet record indicates that they will violate this treaty as soon as it fits their strategy of world conquest, it is of the utmost importance that every treaty or test ban be made a part of the progress of their design. If the Soviets succeed in mounting nuclear weapons in an orbiting vehicle, the balance of power between the U.S.S.R. and the United States could change dramatically.

We have declared that it is our official policy not to place weapons in space. Some military spokesmen have stated that there would be no military advantage to such an orbital superbomb.

While I do not wish to go into that issue at this time, suffice it to say that technology changes rapidly, and that there could be a time when such orbital bombs may be quite different from ours. We must not forget that certain policymakers in our Government about 5 years ago declared that the Soviets would not need in their interest to install missiles in Cuba.

We should not hesitate, therefore, to use every scientific means at our disposal to check Soviet compliance.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senate's approval of this treaty be conditional upon its provisions being agreed to in the General Assembly of the United Nations beginning in 1961.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senate's attention to two further points.

I raised certain questions concerning the possibility of our entering into this treaty and suddenly discovering at a later date that one of the parties had violated article IV and was arming orbiting objects. I was concerned that such a possibility might place the United States at an immediate military disadvantage and endanger our national security.

I asked General Wheeler this question: Assume we enter the treaty and the United States does not arm orbiting bodies, and another country, such as the Soviet Union, does. Would that event place the United States at an immediate military disadvantage or endanger its security?

General Wurman. I do not believe so, Senator.

Second, I hope that this treaty will be adhered to in its own right because it could lead to a successful nonproliferation treaty.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senate from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I believe this treaty to be unnecessary. It is simply an attempt to get the Senate to ratify one of the nonproliferation policies which the administration has already agreed upon, both in the unilateral declarations of two Presidents, and in a series of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations beginning in 1961. It is an attempt by President Johnson to have Congress share in the responsibility for the outcome of this dubious course of action, and to appease his critics who demand concessions in the name of peace.
Some of these general principles, it is clear that the determined as helpful to nations and to mankind in general.

But the treaty contributes far more to world order than an outline of directives for functional cooperation in science and technology. Beyond that, it has actually taken an area in the environment of men and provided that nations accepting the treaty make a commitment not to place in earth orbit any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kind of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, it is emphasized that weapons are not to be installed on celestial bodies or stationed in outer space in any manner. What man has been unable to attain so far on the land, in the sea, and in the air, he has now foreseen enough to establish as an objective in this new space environment: an agreement which looks to the future of space as a place where many beneficial activities can be carried on without fear or orbital bombardment.

The treaty is a general document setting forth broad principles to guide the behavior of nations as they develop space activities. In the United States we know the value of defining such concepts so that they will constitute a firm base by adhering to broad principles defined by the founders of our Nation.

It is not to be expected that a treaty drawn at this time will solve every international space problem that may arise in the future. Indeed, it would hardly be wise to assume that in a rapidly developing field it would be possible to provide in advance for every possible contingency. What we do have in the treaty is a framework of ideas to guide us in ways which have been predetermined as helpful to nations and to mankind in general.

Looking back on the development of these general principles, it is clear that mankind in general has been waiting a long time. They did not spring into being suddenly. Some were basic policies established at the beginning of the space age, particularly as far as the United States is concerned. For example, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 states that—

The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to promote activities in space which shall be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

Furthermore, this first space law established the objective of "cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations in work done pursuant to the peaceful application of the results thereof."

I strongly favored those provisions.

Under this act, NASA began early to develop a significant program of international cooperation in space activities. It will be remembered that the first chairman of the Senate Space Committee—then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, was invited by President Eisenhower to address the United Nations on the peaceful uses of outer space on November 17, 1958. Senator Johnson said, a little more than a year following the orbitaling of the first spacecraft, that "penetration into outer space is just one man-made kind", that outer space where "no nation holds a concession" is "unscarred by conflict, (and) must remain this way.

We of the United States do not acknowledge that there are lawless areas of outer space which can presume to bargain with the nations of the Earth on the price of access to this new domain. We must not—and need not—corrupt this great opportunity by bringing to it the very antagonisms which we may, by accident, overcome and leave behind forever through a joint adventure into this new realm.

What man has done thus far has been the result directly of international cooperation on an informal basis by men of science through the years. The success, further, of the formal cooperation undertaken in orbiting the first American satellite, does in no way lessen the achievement of this Year foretells the high promise offered by enlargement of our goals and intensification of our support.

We know the gains of cooperation. We know the losses of failure to cooperate

On September 25, 1961, when President Kennedy addressed the United Nations General Assembly on "Let Us Call a Truce," he invited the world to general principles which were being formulated under the aegis of U.S. leadership.

As we extend the rule of law on earth, so must we extend it to man's new domain outside of space. If mankind reaches the the limits of man's exploration in the universe, reserving outer space for peaceful purposes, the prevention of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening the mysteries and benefits of space to every nation.

Thus, Mr. President, it is a matter of historical record that three Presidents of the United States have contributed to the fundamental policies which were incorporated into the treaty now before us. The record of negotiations within the United Nations reveals in many resolutions on outer space, treaties, and declarations of the General Assembly, that our officials steadily worked for principles which would insure space as a peaceful environment.

It is a matter of record, also, that the Congress has consistently supported international space activities for peaceful purposes. In the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, the declaration of policy and purpose that it passed had this significant provision:

(a) The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to establish, in conjunction and in cooperation with other countries, a practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to the public interest in the promotion of international cooperation and understanding, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries and which will contribute to world peace and understanding.

(b) The new and expanded telecommunications services are to be made available as promptly as possible and are to be extended to provide global coverage at the earliest practicable date. In effectuating this program, care and attention will be directed toward providing such services to economically less developed countries and areas as well as those more highly developed, toward efficient and economical use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum, and toward the deflection of the benefits of this new technology in both the economy and in the promotion of cultural, scientific, research, and educational programs.

The fundamental policies which were evolved are not mere theories. NASA's space program has been and continues to be guided by the standards set forth in this treaty. Under the provisions of the treaty, programs are planned and Congress authorizes and appropriates funds for space activities in specific areas, notably manned flight, space communications, the use of space vehicles for weather prediction, and navigation. Millions of people in many areas of the world are in a position to improve their crops and minimize the effects of natural disasters through use of our meteorological satellites. Our scientists and engineers work on the earth to use outer space for benefits which are reflected back to the earth in improved agriculture.

Meanwhile NASA's international space program has developed cooperative projects with some 69 nations and locations, getting maximum results with a minimum cost because nations which cooperate with the United States share their experience and their share of the expense. Our international agreements now constitute a vast network of cooperative projects, particularly those which establish the tracking stations so essential to both our manned and unmanned space ventures.

Our manned space flight program is still in its infancy. We are all conscious over the tragic accident which befell our April 11, 1967, space flight. The incident which took the life of Soviet Cosmonaut Komarov, and the possibility of future misfortunes in space which may jeopardize the lives of space astronauts. A new definition of safety. Astronauts thus become envos of mankind and are not to be regarded as unknowable intruders.
When I say that this treaty provides guidelines for the conduct of future space activities, I mean that it specifies the fundamental policies that have been tested so that we need have no doubts about the wisdom of the general trend—that outer space is to be free, not subject to claims of sovereignty, and that national instruments to cooperate so that all may benefit and none may be harmed. Every provision in the treaty is in harmony with the space policies of the United States and the fact that so many space visions were initiated by the United States is a testimonial to our leadership in this field. The treaty has already been approved by the President, and by the appropriate officials in the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I shall vote for the treaty, and at the same time, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, realize that those of us who are members of this committee have an obligation to exercise continued vigilance so that the U.S. national space program is mixed with international arrangements in ways that protect the nation and contribute in a realistic manner to world order and peace. The treaty will become international law, but as always, a law governing activities which must be administered in the public interest. The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences will continue, under the rules of the Senate, to be the legislative tracking station for future space programs of the United States.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to endorse the outer space treaty now before the Senate for ratification.

During the past 10 years, mankind has embarked upon what may prove to be the most exciting adventure in all human history—the exploration of the heavens both by man himself and by human history—the exploration of the heavens both by man himself and by

The space travel is no longer science fiction, but fact. On April 39 the latest spacecraft in the Surveyor series was soft landed on the moon and began transmitting scientific data to stations on the earth. In a few short years, a manned lunar landing will be made by the United States, the Soviet Union, or both, and other nations will surely follow thereafter.

We who have been fortunate enough to witness the advent of the space age have been given a magnificent opportunity to start with a clean slate in outer space. In no other major area of human endeavor is this possible, nor in all probability will it ever be possible again. Space is truly our last frontier. According to the military experts, a militarily significant number of orbital weapons could be deployed by an enemy without our knowing it. This does not preclude the possibility of their use, however, nor deny the fact that the application of increasingly sophisticated technology will probably enhance their strategic value.

As stated in the United Nations resolutions, we have no substantial reason at the present time to fear that a nation would choose to orbit nuclear weapons because of practical considerations involved. At the present state of the art, there is no real advantage to be gained. ICBM's afford a much more effective and far less costly means of achieving the nuclear warhead objectives for which orbital weapons would presumably be intended, and the guidance and control problems of these weapons are still formidable.

The reasons for not waiting until some nation has landed on the moon or the planets to draft a treaty are quite obvious. Political and legal questions must be considered, and the need for the kind of guarantees to be established by the United States to fall to ratify the treaty, it would substantially weaken its ability to protest any occurrence of this nature in the court of world opinion.

Mr. President, we have warned that the space environment can be used for belligerent purposes in a number of ways. They have warned that any nation which controls outer space can thereby gain control of whole continents or the entire earth itself.

With this in mind, I have paid especial attention to the reasons given by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense for their support of this treaty. We have been assured there will be no defense disadvantage to us as a result of ratification, that our MOL program can continue unhampered in any way.

Further, it is their belief that it is desirable to act now to prevent the introduction of destructive weaponry into outer space and to avoid the extension of the arms race into space. Our military experts have in fact said that the treaty enhances the national security by offering a real possibility of limiting the kinds and numbers of weapons that can be aimed at the earth itself or the moon.

Among other assurances that the treaty will not work to the detriment of national security are the following:

We have no substantial reason at the present time to fear that a nation would choose to orbit nuclear weapons because of practical considerations involved. At the present state of the art, there is no real advantage to be gained. ICBM's afford a much more effective and far less costly means of achieving the nuclear warhead objectives for which orbital weapons would presumably be intended, and the guidance and control problems of these weapons are still formidable.

There does not preclude the possibility of their use, however, nor deny the fact that the application of increasingly sophisticated technology will probably enhance their strategic value. It has been acknowledged by Secretary McNamara that, although it is possible that a very small number of orbital weapons could be deployed by an enemy without our detecting them by presently available means of detecting, the number of weapons could not escape detection. Certain characteristics and patterns would become evident. Furthermore, against the possibility of a surprise attack, the United States has a swift retaliation capability in its ICBM's.

In any case the United States intends to continue the development and improvement of its technological capabilities and to encroach on the space treaty as our national security. I believe that we can no longer afford to wait to subscribe to a space treaty. Time is running short. To attempt to impose the rule of law in space and to secure beneficent results before the conflict has arisen there, or a territorial claim has been made, may well prove to be an exercise in futility. The reasons for not waiting until some nation has landed on the moon or the planets to draft a treaty are quite obvious. By claiming sovereignty any nation might thereby claim the concomitant right of denial of access to these bodies for scientific exploration. The United States must meet the challenge and the United States must fulfill the obligation of the treaty. Its verification capabilities will be the limitations of technological development.
They will in no way arise from provisions of the treaty. In this connection the most important fact to remember is that the problem of monitoring potentially belligerent satellites is with us now. It will be virtually impossible to do without the treaty. The treaty offers us relatively more security, however, because nations whose intentions to abide by the treaty are recorded before the world have hopefully acquired a compelling incentive to keep their word. The political and psychological stakes in doing so are high.

Mr. President, I feel further assured that the treaty is not be a threat to national interest for the following reasons: No curtailment of either our military or nonmilitary space program is required. Development and refinement of our weather, navigational, communications, scientific, and mapping satellite systems will continue. In no sense do their functions violate the word or the spirit of the treaty. These systems are not directed against the treaty. They play a very important role in surveillance of the peace by checking for ominous activities in outer space. The mission of the VELA satellite, for example, was to tell us if and when there were evidences of violation of any of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty by detection of nuclear explosions at high altitudes beyond the reach of earthbound instrumentation. Military and equipment are not to be excluded from outer space. Very explicit provisions in the treaty allow for the use of any personnel and facilities in space in the pursuit and support of peaceful activities. The treaty does not imply by my foregoing remarks that the United States is bound to arise in the encounters of men and nations in outer space. That is that its directed against the United States has properly characterized it as “an interim achievement, a significant, but not final step forward.” What is important is the fact that a substantial beginning has been made in this direction by the rule of law shall prevail in space. I am satisfied that this treaty contains nothing inherently detrimental to the safety of the United States. Gen. Earle C. Wheeler, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have no military objection to the United States becoming party to the treaty. It makes no demands and places no obligations upon us which we have not already decided to accept. It requires no changes in our domestic, foreign, space, and defense policies. Whatever courses of action we planned to take in preparation for, or in the event of, harnessing of an atmosphere of fear and distrust in outer space, may encourage the United States from outer space would still be open to us. We will have lost no flexibility of action, but, in all probability, will have gained additional security.

Mr. President, I therefore believe that the United States has everything to gain and nothing to lose by participating in this great international undertaking. Similarly, I feel that considerations of enlightened self-interest furthered the advantages which any other party to the treaty might expect to gain by its violation. I shall go even further and express the hope that this treaty, by preventing the creation of an atmosphere of fear and distrust in outer space, may encourage the nations to channel their energies and ambitions into constructive and cooperative activities designed to meet its fascinating challenges as they have in the Antarctic.

Mr. President, I therefore support the outer space treaty and urge its adoption by the Senate. Ratification of the treaty would be a foresighted gesture on our part and one that should bestow great credit upon the 90th Congress and the American people, especially in the eyes of future generations for whom we shall have begun to lay the groundwork for a mutually beneficial use of the space environment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to approve ratification of the treaty before us.

Officially, the covenant is called Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.

In the interest of simplicity, I propose to use the popular appellation. It has been said that the Space Treaty represents the most important advance in arms control since the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was negotiated in 1963. I concur in this estimate. And I derive some personal satisfaction from the fact that on resolution of May 31, 1963, I helped pave the way for the Test Ban Treaty, as well as from the assumption that the ban on atmospheric testing has helped to ease the way for the agreement we have before us today.

In the age of nuclear weapons which are capable of wiping out entire cities at one blow, the quest for arms control becomes a matter of urgent concern to the peoples of the world. Despite the tremendous difficulties posed by the existence of Soviet communism, I consider it proper that we should explore every realistic possibility of achieving some control agreements.

Essentially the treaty before us obligates the signatory nations to conduct their activities in outer space in accordance with the principles of international law it stipulates.

That the exploration and use of outer space should be for the benefit of all mankind:

That all nations should be free to explore, use, and exploit outer space in accordance with the principles of international law.

That the space should be an area of international scientific cooperation.

With these principles, no reasonable person could disagree.

I wish to deal with some of the objections to the treaty, because I have received letters from many intelligent citizens expressing misgivings about the treaty and arguing that it would imperil our security if the Soviets should secretly develop an orbital missile capability, while we have none. Among other things, these arguments are based on the fact that the Kremlin publicity paraded what it described as an “orbital missile” hard on the heels of the United Nations resolution which called upon all member states to refrain from placing nuclear weapons in orbit.

I have heard conflicting opinions from scientists about the advantages of stationing nuclear weapons in orbit. It is almost certain that a majority of our scientists consider orbital missiles impractical because of the high cost of placing them in space and because of the inevitable loss of accuracy.

On the other hand, I have heard some scientists argue that the loss of accuracy could be compensated for by using warheads of 100 megaton size or larger. And they argue further that if the Russians were ever to put up an orbital missile defense system, they could at one stroke nullify any anti-ballistic defense we may establish because orbital missiles could be triggered to descend on us with virtually zero warning.

To win the experts themselves differ so
sharply, it is difficult for a layman to have a firm opinion.

However, I do agree with those who oppose the space treaty that we must remain alert to the possibility that the Soviets may someday be tempted to place nuclear missiles in orbit around the earth. The source of 561 of these objects is the United States against 102 whose source is listed as the U.S.S.R. 29 French, two Canadian, two United Nations, one United Kingdom, and three unknown. When satellites orbit the earth in 90 minutes or less, they pass so swiftly over national boundary lines that it is to every nation's benefit to be able to determine the international character of space.

Article III of the treaty requires those nations which accept the treaty to abide by international law, including the United Nations Charter. This provides the basis for nations to settle any conflicts which might arise in space by peaceful means rather than by resorting to violence. Perhaps we may be able to learn a lesson in this whole affair and make it impossible for another nation to utilize a first strike by using their own satellites.

Article IV deals with the military element in space activities. On this section, I believe, some writers have jumped to unwarranted conclusions without thoroughly studying the official text of the treaty. Some have even mixed up orbiting space vehicles with missiles and antimissiles.

Article IV has two paragraphs. In the first paragraph it states that the treaty undertakes not to place in orbit around the earth any object carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner.

This provision not to place nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction in outer space is and has been the policy of the United States and the treaty does not change it.

Furthermore, the opinion of military experts is that bombardment from orbiting spacecraft is not an effective strategic device as compared to intercontinental ballistic missiles which are based on land and sea. Whether or not we have this treaty, we are already faced with the situation that the two most powerful nations on earth have land- and sea-based ICBM's—the most accurate and destructive weapons known. Thus, we have an effective military deterrent force for keeping the peace which can be controlled with far greater precision than orbital weapons.

In addition, the United States has intelligence gathering methods which make it impossible for another nation to orbit any substantial number of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner.

This is not a perfect treaty. But it is about the best we can do now, and it deserves to be supported.

It is a good thing to have the basic principles of international cooperation and respect for international law applied to mankind's future activities on outer space and on celestial bodies. And, although we must continue to scrutinize all Soviet space objects carefully, from a security standpoint the treaty is also a definite plus because even the Soviets will hesitate before openly affronting the many signatories to the treaty.

This treaty contains principles which I believe can be a basis for the successful conclusion of the space treaty.
The second paragraph of article IV commits nations which are parties to the treaty to use the moon and other celestial bodies exclusively for peaceful purposes. Thus, it is forbidden to establish on celestial bodies military installations, and fortifications, and to test weapons and conduct military maneuvers. Nevertheless military personnel for scientific research or other peaceful purposes are not prohibited. This provision merely embodies in legal form the actual practice which nations now follow.

Mr. President, I have mentioned only a few of the articles providing for the peaceful development of space, but I believe the matters I have touched on are representative of the total positive thrust of the entire treaty. As I see it, the treaty on outer space is not only an instrument of hope, it is a practical approach toward using outer space as an environment where peaceful activities can be carried out for the benefit of all mankind.

Although I admit this treaty is not all one could hope for in a compact on outer space, it must be remembered that it is the final product of agreement between 28 nations. The agreements reached show that mankind can work together on issues of common interest. If we can carry into action the spirit of these negotiations, I believe we will have made a great step forward. This treaty does not tie our hands.

Mr. President, after giving careful study to the treaty, I believe that in good conscience I can support it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CHURCH. I remind the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] on the point he raised a moment ago that this treaty has no provision pertaining to the use of data obtained from any spacecraft such as a weather spacecraft traveling in earth orbit. The treaty refers solely and many times in these words to "outer space including the moon and other celestial bodies" but it does not affect in any way the use of data from satellites in orbit near the earth.

This treaty follows carefully the policy which we have followed with success in the Antarctic Treaty.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will ratify the treaty.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that there is a vagueness there that perhaps should be clarified, because where the limits of space are in its relation to earth may be highly controversial in the future, and a satellite is certainly a spacecraft.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if, after the vote is completed on this treaty, I could be recognized to have the floor, I ask unanimous consent—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the vote on the treaty, the Chair informs the Senator from Montana that 10 minutes have been set aside for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who has the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCOLELLAN].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who has the time?

Mr. GLOTT. Mr. President, what is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized at the conclusion of the vote on the treaty.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish the members of the Senate would, if they will, ask all Senators, if they feel inclined to do so, to be in the Chamber at that time.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the question is on the adoption of the resolution of ratification on the treaty on outer space. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is now on agreeing to the resolution of ratification on the treaty on outer space. 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 Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smarters] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 92 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Alben Gruening Montana
Allott Hansen Morton
Anderson Harris Mundt
Baker Hartke Nelson
Bartlett Hartke Pastore
Bayh Hollings Peterson
Bennett Hayden Pell
Bill Hickenlooper Percy
Boggs Hill Prentice
Brewster Holland Proxmire
Burdick Byrd, Va. Proxmire
Byrd, Va. Russell
Cannon Jackson Scott
Carlson Vidas Smith
Case Jordan, N.C. Sparkman
Church Kennedy, Mass. Spence
Cooper Kennedy, N.Y. Stennis
Davis Long, Mo. Symington
Dodd Long, La. Thurmond
Dodd Long, La. Thurmond
Dodd Magnuson Tindall
Eastland Manfull Tydings
Emerson Medary Walker, N.J.
Evans McClellan Williams, Del.
Fannin McGovern Yarborough
Fenoffio McNamara Young, Tex.
Fulbright Metcalf Young, Ohio
Gore Mondale Monroney
Griffin Monroney

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—12

Brooks Kuchel Moss
Clark McGee Murphy
Dodd Masse young, Del.
Jordan, Idaho Morse Smathers

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hollings in the chair). On this vote the yeas are 88, the nays 0. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. B. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the action taken today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just sent copies of my proposed remarks to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Lola], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], and the Senator for Delaware [Mr. Williams], and also to the administrative assistant of the distinguished minority leader for the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

Before all else, I wish to take note of
the magnanimous statement of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the majority whip, the assistant majority leader [Mr. Long]. Over the weekend he gave it the benefit of his personal reservations and differences and to vote for the motion which is now pending.

I think I know how strongly the Senator from Louisiana feels about the act for the public financing of elections. He believes with all his heart that it is essential for the maintenance of access to the Presidency for all Americans, rich or poor, to change that instrument of corruption into an instrument of length of time. I did so, rather, in the hope of resolving this matter and that premise which the Senator from Louisiana did so much to es­ tablish, for the first time, in law. I did so and never have indulged in person­ alities. The Senator from Louisiana made it clear over the weekend that he would put aside his personal reservations and differences in accord with the pending motion. He has recognized, as have I, that there was an honest misunderstanding in our dis­ cussion of the matter and neither of us desire any further slippage.

That is more than the action of an experienced legislator, that is the action of a decent man. It is the action of a Senator in the best tradition of the Senate. I respect and admire the Senator from Louisiana for his courage, his magnanimity, and his understanding.

May I say, Mr. President, that I do not and never have indulged in personal­ ities—when considering legislation on one side or the other, I cannot afford and would not if I could.

In my judgment, the motion which is now pending is as promising—as any measure can be—of passage by the Senate. It must be that the pending motion would not only produce a Senate bill on election financing, but that it also would provide an acceptable pathway out of the present procedural dilemma on the Senate floor. I may say, further, that this motion was not offered as a compromise or a proposal to reject or rejection of any particular position on the pending matter. It was offered sim­ ply as a course which seemed to me to be fitting in view of the Impasse.

Several Members have come to me in the past few days, however, emphasizing that if, for some reason or other, the bill is not voteable, and the guidelines are sidetracked in the legislative ma­ chinery of either House, the advance represented by the Long Act of last year would be lost as of July 31. That is something which, as one Senator from Montana, I do not wish to happen. If I may be permitted to say so, as majority leader, I am inclined to think that a majority of the Senate also does not wish that to happen.

In short, if I gauge the sentiment correctly what is sought by the Senate at this time, therefore, is the preservation of the very real legislative gain which with all its deficiencies, is represented by the Long Act on campaign financing. At the same time, and with greater emphasis, the Senate is determined that this gain shall not be subject to the jeopardy of abuse, if the act stands alone, without safeguards and guidelines, might make it even more unsatisfactory than the unsatisfactory system of campaign financing which now prevails.

I pondered this matter at length over the weekend, focusing on this question: Would it be possible by some adjustment or compromise to preserve to the prin­ ciple of public participation in the financ­ ing of elections but hold its operation in abeyance until such time as tight safe­ guards over the equitable use of public funds for these purposes could be established?

Yesterday and again this morning I discussed this matter further with sev­ eral interested Senators whose views are pending. I did not seek the leadership's practice to seek to surprise the Senate or any of its Members on procedural matters, I wished to talk first with those who were most directly concerned so that they might be on notice as to my intentions.

Mr. President, I had intended, at this point, to send to the desk a modification of the pending motion. I introduced this Sen­ ate that this new language is my own; it was arrived at without consulting any other Member of the Senate. I alone am responsible for it.

In my judgment the relevant por­ tion of the pending motion would be changed to substitute for the expiration date of Long Act of July 31, 1967, a provision that would prohibit the disbursement of any public funds under the Long Act until the Congress acts again on this matter by the passage of a further law providing guidelines and safeguards.

I realize that this modification is not the answer to everyone's view of this matter any more than was the original motion. In my opinion, however, this modification would better protect what I believe to be the preponderant viewpoint of the Senate. Under it, the principle embodied by the Long Act could be preserved in no greater danger of being stricken from the statute books. At the same time, however, the Long Act would not become operative—nor 1 per cent of public funds will be made available for any purpose under the Long Act until some safeguards and guidelines on usage were adopted by the Congress and have become law.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I think it would be well at this point to mention the concern of the Senate to a matter which has caused me considerable strain, worry and, con­ cern since Thursday last.

I refer to a personal commitment which, presumably I made, but which I had not thought I made in conversation with two distinguished Members of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. The distinguished minority leader from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], who is indisposed and unavailable at this time, was also present during the conversation.

The conversation concerned the possi­ bilities of an agreement to vote at a time certain and the possibilities of a motion to recommit which I intended to make—win or lose—on the Long amendment. When questions were certainly discussed, I do not recall that reciprocal assurances were either sought or agreed to.

Nevertheless, I have been informed by
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one Senator that I did make a personal commitment; that if there were an agreement to vote at a time certain, I would offer a motion to recommit immediately thereafter. To be sure, those two events did transpire on Thursday. I thought the circumstances were such as to cause all were in agreement that it was a way for the Senate to get off dead center.

Quite frankly, I do not know, therefore, where this leaves me personally or where it leaves the Senate. For some time now, with passions rising and with days and weeks of wasted debate and recrimination over what began as a simple and straightforward attempt, I find myself—the Senate, in effect, finds itself—in the midst of what can only be described as a comedy of errors if it were not, apparently, a tragedy of misunderstandings.

The distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Louisiana, misunderstood me. I apparently misunderstood the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey, speaking at the conclusion of the Finance Committee, told me nothing of any misunderstanding, but perhaps even that is a misunderstanding of the Senator from Delaware's view of the matter. I apologize to all three of the distinguished Members of the Finance Committee for what can only be described as a most inadequate effort on my part to be helpful to all of them and to the Senate.

Where then, do we go from here? I have in my mind the modification of my own motion—the motion which I made on last Thursday and which is now pending before the Senate. As I have already told them, all of those persons who have befriended them, all presenting this modification only after a great deal of soul searching, only after extended conversations and discussions with many interested Members of the Senate, arrived at it in the hope of building a bridge between the position of the Senate from Tennessee and the Senator from Delaware on the one hand and the Senator from Louisiana on the other.

I have to believe this purpose. Yet, I do not know whether or not I am now, in honor, permitted to offer it in place of the pending motion at this time. I most certainly will not offer it if the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Tennessee tell me that I have a personal commitment to them which is binding upon me to insist, first, upon a vote on the pending motion. If they will not offer substitute language which I have already described, to the motion which is now pending, language which I believe will preserve the positions of all three of these members of the Finance Committee, and, at the same time, will more faithfully reflect what I believe to be the preponderant sentiment of the Senate with regard to the matter which is before us.

I await the answers of my two distinguished colleagues to the questions I have raised, and then I shall urge the prompt judgment of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this is a trying hour for the Senate. It is not for the Senate, but for some Members from Tennessee, to pass judgment upon anyone, or to seek to interpret for anyone events which transpired. I desire to state precisely what happened. It is important for me to do so, and if I understand exactly what happened.

This has been a very hard-fought issue.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may we have order, so that we can hear the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished and able Gentleman from Delaware refers to it as a comedy of errors. Mr. President, this began with a basic error. The 1966 act as the Senate will recall, which is now law, was attached to a bill to which it was not related. Because it affects the revenue law, the only manner in which the Senate can now work its will with respect to amendment or repeal is to do so as a part of a revenue measure which originated in the House of Representatives. This is why the amendment to repeal the Long Act was offered as an amendment to the pending bill. This is the only way by which the Senate can work its will to repeal that law.

We acted in haste, in the closing hours of adjournment last year, when it was with the greatest of difficulty that a quorum was achieved. It is now agreed by all, including the distinguished author of the bill, that the law is in basic error in many respects.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is a very good law. I would agree that it could be amended to satisfy the criticism of some. It is a very good law without any amendments. I hope the Senator will understand my position.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his kind vote. The Senator himself offered a number of far-reaching amendments, which in itself, it appeared to me, constituted an acknowledgment that the law was inadequate. I am pleased that the Senator has stated his position as he wishes it stated.

I submit that the agreement reached last Thursday and the motion which the distinguished majority leader submitted accomplishes in the best way in which he now seeks to accomplish. It provided that there be a hundred days before the act would expire, during which it was entirely subject to amendment. Indeed, the majority leader proposed to instruct the committee to report a bill within 6 weeks for the action of the Senate, which would still leave 7 weeks for action on the floor of the Senate and in the other body; but if by July 31, 1967, a time approaching the end of this session and before tax forms are printed, the act has not been amended, then by the majority leader's motion it would be repealed. I thought it was a reasonable motion.

Now, as to the gentleman's agreement we had, I wish to state as precisely, and fully, and in as detailed a way as possible what happened.

The distinguished majority leader asked me to join a conference. There were four of us involved in that conference. There were some other Senators, I think, who may have overheard the conversation, or ones who may have read four of us were participants: the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, and the senior Senator from Tennessee.

The agreement we reached had these provisions. There was to be a vote on the pending Long amendment. Let me recall to the Senate the status of the Long amendment. It was an amendment to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii; not an amendment to the pending bill; but an amendment to an amendment. The Inouye amendment of the Long amendment, is still pending. It has not been adopted. Therefore, the Long amendment is not now a part of the bill before the Senate.

The senior Senator from Delaware and I were fully appraised of the parliamentary situation. Indeed, on the previous night we had insisted that the record be made clear as to whether the Long amendment had been substituted for the Inouye amendment or as a perfecting amendment. The Record shows that clearly. The rollcall vote was ordered. This is now a matter of record.

The question of whether the amendment of the junior Senator from Louisiana be adopted had some unusual characteristics. I am going to be perfectly frank with this body. I am not exactly sure who made the statement; I do not recall—that the junior Senator from Louisiana, being the chairman of the Committee on Finance, needed to get the amendment adopted as a face-saving matter for him. I know that all of us recognize the importance and the desirability of those things. Anyway, an agreement was reached: One, that the vote come on the Long amendment. I stated in consequence of the other provisions of the agreement that as far as I was concerned he could have his own time for a vote. The Senate is well aware, as I am, that in these close, hard-fought issues, the result of a particular vote is usually determined by absentees and pairs.

I submit that the witching hour had been set for 3:30 or 4 o'clock last Thursday afternoon. There was no agreement that we vote then. We could have had a vote earlier. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] or I could have had a vote before moving to the table. However, in view of the other parts of the agreement I was not only willing to have a vote, at a time of Senator Long's choosing, but I spoke to several Senators...
on this side and told them that in view of the agreement we had reached it would be a virtually meaningless vote and they could vote as they pleased. At any rate, a vote was held.

The question is, what was the other part of the agreement? The other part of the agreement was that the majority leader would immediately, after the vote, if the agreement was not in place, then the motion to recommit with instructions Senators will recall that such a motion was made. It is in the Record.

There were to be three parts of the instructions: One, that the bill be reported forthwith, restoring the investments credit. Two, all amendments, all riders, were to be stripped from the bill except one, and that was that the Gore-Williams amendment be modified, taking from it the corrupt-practices amendment revisions which were in the original Williams amendment, and changing the date which was in my amendment to the Williams amendment for repeal as of July 1, to a motion to recommit with instructions to be instructed to report an election campaign financing bill within 6 weeks. The agreement was carried out. The vote was held, the result of which the Senate is aware.

The majority leader offered the motion he had agreed to offer. There is one step I should relate which was within the vision of most Senators and the gallery. Just before the agreement was given to vote on the Long amendment at a given time, with a time limitation, the four of us who participated in the agreement—Senators Mansfield, Dirksen, Williams, and Gore —met in front of where the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] now sits. I specifically asked, "Does this mean that you will offer the motion we agreed to?" Senator Mansfield said "Yes." This agreement was fully fulfilled.

Now, the question arises, and the majority leader seeks an answer as to whether that was a commitment. I submit to the Senate these details as accurately and as precisely as I can recall them. There was no commitment that the majority leader would instill upon a vote on his motion. On the other hand, there was no suggestion that if we entered into this agreement it would be temporary in nature, and that after the vote on the Long amendment, then the motion would be either withdrawn or altered.

I state these details as clearly as I can recall them. If I have omitted something I would like to be corrected. As far as I am concerned I hope the distinguished majority leader will listen to the recollection of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Gore], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and perhaps think about it overnight before altering his motion, which was a part of our agreement.

In addition to the agreement, the Senate is an institution which I love. It operates in mutual trust and confidence. This institution could not function well in any other manner. The most sacrosanct thing we have in this body is confidence in gentlemen's agreements.

I appreciate very much the position taken by the majority leader. If we understand this to be a commitment, he says that he will go through with it.

This is Mr. Mansfield,
This is Mr. Dirksen,
This is Mr. Williams,
This is Mr. Gore.

This is the integrity of the Senate and the integrity of its Members.

I should like the distinguished majority leader to consider my relation of these events as I have related them, and to hear likewise from others in the conference, before he reaches a decision as to whether he feels that the agreement would be fulfilled either by withdrawal or alteration. This is an honest offer and I hope that he will contemplate the move, and I will think about it further, and consult with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Delaware. Mr. President, when the Presidential Campaign Fund Act was first passed last year both the Senator from Tennessee and I, as well as other Senators, opposed its enactment because we thought it was a bad measure. We still feel that way about it.

For the past 4 weeks the Senators have been debating this issue, and finally we persuaded the Senate to repeal the act.

As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] has pointed out, we have been successful in our efforts. The Senate had adopted as a part of the pending bill one amendment which would terminate the Presidential Campaign Fund Act as of July 1. Also included in that same amendment were two very major and very important corrections and modifications of the Corrupt Practices Act, something which we have been working on for a number of years. The first would require full disclosure and reporting of all campaign expenditures, and the second extended the Corrupt Practices Act to primaries.

Now we are all familiar with the parliamentary snarl in which the Senate has been embroiled for the past 3 or 4 weeks. The Senator from Tennessee has just related the circumstances leading up to what he said he alleged an agreement which he will not review. He has related the situation as I understand it. I will say that I did think we had an agreement or an understanding, but on the other hand I think that there is always an area for an honest misunderstanding even though personally I did understand it this way.

I think, at the same time, that we should say that I appreciate the statement of the majority leader more than I can ever tell him. When he said that if the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Delaware, or the Senator from Illinois did have that understanding, all we had to do was say the word and he would proceed with his original motion—that is a statement which Senators would expect Mr. Mansfield to make.

I appreciate that attitude. Certainly, I want to win; the Senate understands that. But at the same time I think there comes a time when something more important than winning is at stake.

We cannot operate, as the Senator from Tennessee has so well said, unless we can operate on gentlemen's agreements.

At the same time, we must be realistic and recognize that there can occasionally be an honest misunderstanding or difference of opinion. Therefore, I would prefer, here tonight, not to make this decision at this particular time. I think we understand each other, but I am hoping that some agreement can be worked out. I say that as one who feels that while we may win I do not want to take advantage of his offer. I respect him too much and I want to be fair, and friendly; winning is not that important.

I am therefore going to suggest to the majority leader that rather than pursue this matter tonight we leave the question of whether the Senate should adjourn. Perhaps all of us can go home at night and think this matter over very carefully and arrive at a decision, not from a personal standpoint but a decision which Senators will feel will be in the best interests of safeguarding the integrity and perpetuating the respect which the Senate must command.

The majority leader has been more than fair.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to take less time than the Senator from Tennessee on this subject, and perhaps no more time than has the Senator from Delaware.

I have heard the statement made over and over again—and, oddly enough, at times with many Senators in the Chamber—and the response to which I have usually made to an empty Chamber, that there are no safeguards in the existing law.

Let me say that the law which I had the honor to sponsor last year provided in its text or in conjunction with already existing law at least four safeguards on the use of money paid to political parties from the presidential election campaign fund.

In the first place, the Federal criminal law which would be applicable if there were violation of last year's law provides a strict a fraud penalty as can be imagined.

Section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, provides as follows:

Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or documents knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or representation which is material or false, is punishable by...§1, or imprisonment not more than five years, or both.

Second, section 1002 of title 18, United States Code [Section 1002] provides virtually anything that might not be covered by the fraud penalty I just read.

Section 1002 specifies:

Whoever knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof, makes any false statement, or counterfeited writing or document for the purpose of enabling another to obtain from the United States, or any agency, officer, or agent thereof, any sum of money, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

Third and perhaps most important of all, however, is the Advisory Board set up by the so-called Long Act to aid and
That is why I made the suggestion that rather than debate it at this time and make a decision now, perhaps we could sleep on it tonight. As one who likes to win, now or at any other time, I still say there are more important things than winning. That is why I say we should sleep on it tonight and see if we can come up with a calmer decision tomorrow. I do not say that apropos of what.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hardly know what to say. I believe I have received, indirectly, an answer to the question which I have raised. I believe I received answers from those who are doing their best to alleviate the position in which they think I find myself and in which the Senate finds itself.

I do not know whether it would be a good idea to think over this proposal overnight, because I have an idea that if that were the case, and the suggestion were offered in good faith and with good heart, we might find ourselves in a position to do what seems to be in the best interests of the Senate.

In view of the fact that I did not get a clear-cut answer; in view of the fact, therefore, that I must make my own interpretation, and in view of the fact that I do not want to do anything that is inconsistent with the facts as they exist, I am about to do, I ask for a vote on the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana to recommit the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What are we voting on?

Mr. HOLLAND and several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the majority leader did write me a letter. I assume that what he described in that letter was what he was referring to when he offered the motion to recommit. I do not quarrel about it. Whether the motion is adopted or not...
information of the Senator from Nebras-

ka, the clerk will state the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read
Mr. MANSFIELD's motion, as follows:
I move that H.R. 6950 be recommitted to the Committee on Finance with the follow-
ing instructions:
(1) To report back forthwith provisions
which relate to restoring the investment tax
credit and a provision providing for an expi-
dation date of July 31, 1967 on the Presi-
dential Campaign Fund law of 1966.
(2) To report back within six weeks provi-
sions with respect to the Presidential Cam-
paign Fund law of 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-
tion is on the motion of the Senator
from Montana. The yeas and nays have
been ordered, and the clerk will call the
roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called
the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce
that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr.
Byrd], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr.
Clark], and the Senator from Oregon
[Mr. Morse] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from
Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from
Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine
[Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Florida
[Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from
Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily
absent.

I further announce that, if present and
voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania
[Mr. Clark] and the Senator from Florida
[Mr. Smathers] would each vote
"yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West
Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator
from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If present and
voting, the Senator from West Virginia
would vote "nay," and the Senator from
Oregon would vote "yea."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I announce
that the Senator from Massachusetts
[Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Illinois
[Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Cali-
ifornia [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from
Iowa [Mr. Miller] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan]
is necessarily absent to attend the fu-
eral of a friend.

The Senator from California [Mr.
Murphy] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from
Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator
from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from
Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senators from
California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy],
and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]
would each vote
"yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64,
nays 22, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEA8—64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd, Va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coakley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Amato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Amato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dineen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklenooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkle</td>
</tr>
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</table>
| Hinkel
vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morse) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. Kennedy), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Mc Gee), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Maine (Mr. Muskie), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Smathers), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Yarbrough) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California (Mr. Clark) and the Senator from New York (Mr. Kennedy) would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morris) is paired with the Senator from Florida (Mr. Smathers). If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen), the Senator from California (Mr. Kuchel), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Miller) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. Jordan) is necessarily absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from California (Mr. Murphy) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York (Mr. Jarrard) is detailed on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Jordan), the Senators from California (Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Miller) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 43, as follows:

---

NOT VOTING—16

Brooke Kuchel Murphy
Clark Mansfield Muskie
Dirksen Pell Morris
Javits Miller Yarbrough
Jordan, Idaho Yarbrough Kentucky, N.Y. Moss

So the motion of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. Long of Louisiana, was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. President.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will ask the question.

Mr. METCALF. Is H.R. 6950 at the present time open for amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. It is open for amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 137, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that a motion to strike is pending. But the amendment that is proposed to be stricken may be amended before the motion to strike is voted on.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I explain to the Senate that what I would hope we would do would be to limit this bill to one strictly dealing with the investment tax credit; and if my motion prevails—and the Senate has declined to table my motion—this will be what I originally had hoped the majority leader was going to move, and what I, as the manager of the bill, had prayed be would move: that is, that we would be asked to recommit and report a clean bill, which would be nothing more than a bill to give business the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation as of the date recommended by the President.

May I say, Mr. President, that if my motion carries, we will be in a position to do that; but it does not carry, then we are going to be right back doing what we have done for the last month—taking extraneous amendments, which amendments will lead, in my judgment, to more and more controversy, until eventually we will have another motion to recommit, and once again we will go through the whole thing.

Let me say this, as one who is vehemently opposed to the Gore amendment to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966. I am not going to take something I am against, which cannot command a majority vote in the Senate, and then tell other Senators that they cannot offer their amendments which can command a three-quarters vote or a two-thirds vote in this body. Why should we take something that can only be agreed to when you have an advantage on absences, when there are good amendments that Senators would like to offer which can command a three-quarters majority?

I hope that we will be permitted to vote on a motion to strike out the one thing that the majority finds objectionable, and if we can I am willing to go ahead and pass an investment credit bill only. I hope that is what we are going to be asked to do.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall not yield to the Senator at this moment, but I shall yield to him shortly.

If Senator wants to give business the benefit of the investment credit they can do that. I have spoken for the committee and I have taken those orders from the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will yield. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Louisiana may proceed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senate has instructed the Committee on Finance to conduct hearings and report back a bill on election campaign financing after considering all aspects. We have been ordered by the Senate to do that. I wish to point out to Senators that we have been ordered by the Senate to conduct hearings and report back.

If it be objectionable that part of the bill which the committee was instructed to report back which repeals the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1967, particularly since the Senate has voted with me on that matter as recently as last Thursday. I do not think that any other Senators that have their amendments considered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator seeking recognition?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am seeking recognition to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my amendment is an amendment which I have tried to write as an amendment to the investment tax credit bill. If I may, I would like to offer this amendment and have the clerk state it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that the only amendment now in order, since there is a pending motion to strike the Senator from Louisiana, is one that would amend the paragraph which the Senator from Louisiana seeks to strike.

Mr. METCALF. Then, I yield the floor with the understanding that after that proposal is voted upon I will have an opportunity to offer my amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as the able Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long) has stated, this will probably be a very close vote.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.
Mr. GORE. Mr. President, representatives of two Senators who are absent have asked me to request that this vote not be held until tomorrow so that they may vote. The Vice President will the pending amendment subject to a substitute amendment. After opportunity has been afforded for offering and consideration of such amendments, I would be glad to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at some time certain, so that all Senators can be here and vote. If it turns out that the Vice President must decide, that is constitutionally stipulated, and the decision will be made. However, I would not wish at this time to offer any suggestion as to the time for voting. Someone may have a substitute to offer. Let the Senate realize that there is before the Senate now a bill reported from the committee upon instructions by the Senate with a termination date of July 31, 1967, for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. There is a motion pending to strike that section of the bill which the committee has reported upon instruction by the Senate.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I do not desire to delay the Senate. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would permit me, by unanimous consent, to withdraw my amendment. I do not request a yea and nay vote. The matter will only take 15 minutes or less and, then, the Senator from Tennessee can proceed and have us to that other time tomorrow or at some other time.

Mr. GORE. I shall not interpose an objection. I am not sure an amendment can be offered in the second degree, even by consent, but at least I would not object to the Senator offering whatever amendment he wishes to offer. I would like to proceed with my statement briefly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be willing to agree to arrange two pairs for the two Senators the Senator wishes to protect.

Mr. GORE. We are not going to vote on the Long amendment today.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to address two questions to the Senator from Louisiana to find out his position.

Is it the position of the Senator from Louisiana that if his amendment carries the substitute, he will not oppose consideration of other amendments that may be offered to load this bill down again as it was loaded before we voted today?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I prevail in my motion, I hope to limit this bill, to the extent I am able, to what it started out to be: a bill to restore the investment tax credit, and accelerated depreciation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the position of the Senator be if his motion is defeated?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then, I feel that everybody else also should have their irrelevant, extraneous amendments considered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have studied the substitute amendment. After opportunity has been afforded for offering and consideration of such amendments, I would be glad to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at some time certain, so that all Senators can be here and vote. If it turns out that the Vice President must decide, that is constitutionally stipulated, and the decision will be made. However, I would not wish at this time to offer any suggestion as to the time for voting. Someone may have a substitute to offer. Let the Senate realize that there is before the Senate now a bill reported from the committee upon instructions by the Senate with a termination date of July 31, 1967, for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. There is a motion pending to strike that section of the bill which the committee has reported upon instruction by the Senate.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I do not desire to delay the Senate. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would permit me, by unanimous consent, to withdraw my amendment. I do not request a yea and nay vote. The matter will only take 15 minutes or less and, then, the Senator from Tennessee can proceed and have us to that other time tomorrow or at some other time.

Mr. GORE. I shall not interpose an objection. I am not sure an amendment can be offered in the second degree, even by consent, but at least I would not object to the Senator offering whatever amendment he wishes to offer. I would like to proceed with my statement briefly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be willing to agree to arrange two pairs for the two Senators the Senator wishes to protect.

Mr. GORE. We are not going to vote on the Long amendment today.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to address two questions to the Senator from Louisiana to find out his position.

Is it the position of the Senator from Louisiana that if his amendment carries the substitute, he will not oppose consideration of other amendments that may be offered to load this bill down again as it was loaded before we voted today?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I prevail in my motion, I hope to limit this bill, to the extent I am able, to what it started out to be: a bill to restore the investment tax credit, and accelerated depreciation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the position of the Senator be if his motion is defeated?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then, I feel that everybody else also should have their irrelevant, extraneous amendments considered.
SEC. 4. Section 203(e)(1) of the Revenue Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-272) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection: "(e) In the case of public utility property (as defined in section 266(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), more than 3-per centum of the tax credits are given, unless the company consents—any public utility commission or regulatory agency cannot require a passthrough of such tax credits by any other method."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana so that I may ask him some questions about the bill.

As I understand the bill—and I ask the Senator from Louisiana to respond—if tax credits are given, if the 3-percent credits for utility companies are given, does the bill prohibit any State from passing through to the consumer? Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Present law states that the credit shall be passed through over a period shorter than the life of the property only with the consent of the company involved.

Mr. METCALF. Yes. The company involved, whether it be Consolidated Edison, Montana Power, whatever it is—unless the company consents—any public service commission or regulatory commission may require that interpretation of the bill, be applied in the case of public utility property (as defined in section 266(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), more than 3-per centum of the tax credits are given, unless the company consents—any public service commission or regulatory commission shall not apply in the case of public utility property (as defined in section 266(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), more than 3-per centum of the tax credits are given, unless the company consents.

Mr. METCALF. I am not in error. I am merely asking a question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Present law applies to State regulatory agencies; it does not apply to a State agency. Present law provides that a Federal agency cannot require a passthrough of the investment credit to the user in the case of those covered by section 203(e) of the Revenue Act of 1964 unless the company agrees to it. That does not bind a State regulatory agency. One of these could follow this policy if it wanted to. They could require an immediate and complete passthrough so far as they are concerned without the consent of the company.

Mr. METCALF. I am delighted to have that interpretation of the bill, because I am trying to understand what wording in the bill that a State regulatory commission could not order a passthrough whether it benefitted the 3-percent credit under the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I recall it, we do not require that. My understanding is that simply to instruct the Federal regulatory agencies. Frankly, I say to the Senator, I have considerable doubt that a State regulatory commission would ever try to instruct State regulatory agencies.

Mr. METCALF. I have, too. That is why my amendment was submitted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would be more appropriate that a State agency would decide for itself on this policy question. We would propose to decide it with regard to our own agencies, but we do not propose to decide that with regard to a State agency. That fails in the case of State regulatory agencies having jurisdiction with respect to which the credit was allowed. They are the only ones which have the complete right to do the opposite if they so choose.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, with that explanation, and that interpretation of the Senator in charge of the bill, I am perfectly willing to withdraw my amendment. My only hope in this amendment was to provide that if State regulatory agencies held hearings and decided that these benefits should be passed through to the consumer, they should be permitted to do so. If the Senator from Louisiana will so interpret the bill so it can do so, I will ask unanimous consent, understanding, to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand the committee amendment is subject to a perfecting amendment or motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is of course, correct. Only amendments which amend the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to strike would be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what I understood.

Mr. President, the Senate has acted very wisely in my opinion in order to send the measure back to the committee to report back with a termination date for the presidential campaign fund of July 31. I understand the Senate committee is to hold hearings and will develop a workable program for the financing of campaigns and then report back to the Senate in 6 weeks. I think that was the best procedural slot which has the effect of reinstating the Presidential Campaign Act effective July 31. This would nullify the earlier vote of the Senate.

If we are going to reopen this question in the Senate then I think we should discuss various proposals and see if we can arrive at a plan that would be more effective than the present one for a $1 checkoff on each tax return.

If this is to be the procedure I shall have a proposal to offer on behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Prud'homme), and myself which proposes to enact President Johnson's 1966 recommendations, which were introduced last June when he sent his message to Congress. The President's recommendations were introduced last June when he sent his message to Congress. The President's proposal recommended the financing of political parties, both also of congressional campaigns by allowing $100 contributions to political campaigns or candidates as an additional deduction for tax purposes. In that way an individual could make a contribution up to $100 to the party or candidate of his choice. I think that is very important to give the contributors a choice as to which candidate or political party they wish to support.

The bill also carried a provision to reform the Corrupt Practices Act along the lines of what was enacted by the Senate a couple of weeks ago, when it passed the two-year amendment. This proposal extends the Corrupt Practices Act to require 100-percent reporting by all political committees. That is important. Everybody agrees to it. It would codify the President's Corrupt Practices Act to primaries. They are two points on which Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, and Eisenhower had been very firm over the years.

This proposal, which was recommended in a message by President Johnson, was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Clark), and was cosponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pello). I understand the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senators from New York (Mr. Javits and Mr. Kennedy), the Senator from California (Mr. Kunche), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the former Senator from Oregon, Mrs. Neuberger, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph), the Senator from New York (Mr. Safire), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pell).

This amendment is now printed as amendment No. 172, and is on each Senator's desk. I shall not call it up tonight.
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for a vote, but it will be called up tomorrow, at which time I shall outline the reasons why it should be adopted. This will not be offered should the Senate decide to accept no further amendments to the bill, or to leave it as just approved by the Senate.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Earlier in this statement, the Senator said he hoped the Senate would abide by the decision which it made earlier this afternoon. Will the Senator explain what he meant by that decision to which we should adhere?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The decision made earlier this afternoon was for the Senate to recommit the bill, eliminate all amendments except those relating to the restoration of the 7-per cent investment tax credit, plus the additional amendment to terminate the Presidential Campaign Financing Act effective October 1. That amendment also carried instructions to the committee to report back to the Senate its recommendations in connection with a method of financial political campaigns which makes that possible. The Finance Committee made it in 6 weeks. I think that would be the orderly procedure.

I want to make it clear as I offer the amendment that it is not being offered under the threat that the amendment is not understood. I shall be a dog in the manger and help sink the bill with a lot of other amendments. I am offering it in good faith. I want it accepted or rejected. It is a test of party line.

I object to the position of the Senator from Louisiana that he is going to have his way or he will kill the bill by loading it with amendments. I will not be a party to any such procedure.

The Presidential Campaign Financing Act was adopted in the latter part of 1966 as a rider on the Foreign Investors Tax Act. I find no fault with that procedure. The major reason the Senator from Louisiana could offer the amendment in the Senate was to offer it as an amendment to a formerly passed House bill. But, by the same token, the only way in which any Senator can propose the repeal of that act is to use the same procedure and offer an amendment as a rider on a previously passed House bill dealing with revenue. The act was enacted as a rider adopted in the Senate. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Goiis] and I proposed the amendment as a rider to repeal it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur fully in what the Senator has said. The Senate has said that we have stepped again on the merry-go-round on which we have been moving for practically 4 weeks. The Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] attempted to clarify the confusion that existed on the Senate floor for 4 weeks by separating the capital investment tax credit features of the bill from all the other amendments. We voted back and forth on amendments, with instructions to report back separately a bill on capital investment tax credit. That was done. But out of the clear sky, like a bolt, comes the initiation of the old 4-week routine—an amendment dealing with the subsidizing of presidential elections.

The moment the chairman of the Finance Committee offered that amendment, other Members of the Senate who had bills or amendments that they wanted to offer were encouraged to offer their proposals.

Mr. President, how long are we to engage in this merry-go-round movement? We are weeks away from a vote, but it will be called up for a vote, but it will be called up for a vote, but it will be called up for a vote, but it will be called up for a vote.

The Senator from Louisiana proposes the most incomprehensible proposition that I have heard of. He says that if we defeat his amendment he will accept everything else, but if we approve his amendment, he will not accept any others. How can he justify a position of that type? I cannot understand it.

I understand the position of the Senator from Delaware when he says that he hoped the Senate would abide by what was done earlier today, but since we do not abide by his decision and his amendment, he is going to offer his amendment. I understand that.

Do I misunderstand the position of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator certainly was right. He has never been more mistaken in his life than in what he is saying now.

Mr. President, I have been in these campaigns and that is--and that is very difficult to get out of; but I have found that if I twist and wriggle long enough, somehow I will get through them.

The Finance Committee originally brought before the Senate last month a bill to restore the investment tax credit, with nothing on the bill having to do with repealing the Act on presidential campaign financing. However, such an amendment was offered, so we had to struggle back and forth for a long period of time. We offered amendments to the amendment, substitutes for the amendment, and when the opposition came in--with my team out of town and Senator Gore voted that amendment down--it was my turn to seek to have more amendments voted on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I condemn that policy to the most vigorous degree that I can. I can never subscribe to it. But my question is—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Just a minute. Will the Senator permit me to make my position clear?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have not voted for a single amendment that is not, in my judgment, an amendment which has merit and which deserves the consideration of the Senate, of the House of Representatives, and of a conference committee of the two Houses. I have voted for similar amendments on other occasions. I have voted for them on their own merits. I am a Senator and I bring in an amendment I am against, and offers it as an extraneous amendment on this bill, my reaction is, "Very well, if you want to make another Christmas tree bill out of this one, so be it. Bring in your baubles."
President, I point out again that the Senate, by a vote of 2 to 1, made its decision earlier this afternoon, with the result that we have before us now a clean bill dealing only with the restoration of the sunset clause and the expiration date of the Presidential Campaign Act of 1966. I should like to keep the bill as it now stands, and I will not offer my amendment unless the Senator from Louisiana presses for the adoption of his amendment. If he does I have no choice. Rather than restore the Presidential Campaign Act after July 31, we should give consideration to amendments that were made by the Senator's own President of the United States, President Johnson.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment.

The Senator from New York (Mr. Kennedy) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) both indicated this amendment can be offered if the Senate decides to proceed with amendments. I would be perfectly willing to agree there would be no amendments and let the bill as it presently stands, I leave the decision to the Senator from Louisiana or rather to the Senate tomorrow. As I understand, we could not vote tonight anyway.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator uses a most unfortunate choice of words when he says I am seeking to restore the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. All I am seeking to do is just leave the law the way it is, until the committee can report out a bill. It has been a week since the Senate ordered the committee to report forth the committee's recommendations. I am perfectly content to hear the Williams suggestion, and consider it and vote on it in the committee. I wish to hear the Senator from Montana (Mr. Metcalf) explain his ideas. I wish to hear everybody, and study everybody's thoughts. I should like to study the recommendations of Mr. Neustadt, one of the great political scientists of America. I want to hear what he thinks about all this. I wish to get everybody's advice.

May I say to the Senator from Ohio, in my judgment he is falling into grievous error when he says I am threatening the Senate. What I am saying is this: If the Senate will hold this to an investment tax credit bill, I will hold it to an investment tax credit bill. But if Senator Kennedy amended the bill, whether, as the Senator calls it, by instructions of the Senate—referring to the amendment that is on there through a misunderstanding between two men of honor, both of whom wanted to do the right thing by the other. I voted for the Mansfield motion, even though I could not think of anything to do, and the only way under the sun that I know to keep the Senate an equal legislative body with the House of Representatives is, once in awhile, to support a Senator and give him an opportunity to offer his amendment on a revenue bill that has passed the House.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the point I am trying to make is that we are back where we were before we voted this afternoon. The majority of the Senate voted to send the bill back to the committee, ordering the committee to report on two matters. The committee was ordered to report on the investment tax credit and to put in a termination date on the Long bill as of July 31.

We are now proceeding to undo what we ordered the committee to do, and to that action I cannot subscribe. That is my position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator saw how we got in that position. I hope, because there was a misunderstanding in complete good faith between two men of honor, both of whom wanted to do the right thing by the other.

I voted for the Mansfield motion, even though I could not think of anything that would prejudice me more.

At the time I initially objected to the amendment of the majority leader, some people seemed to feel that I was challenging the majority leader's leadership or that I was not showing the respect that should be shown to the leadership when the majority leader indicated that he had an agreement from both sides. Unfortunately, our agreement was predicated on other extraneous matter. Who is responsible for this? It is the U.S. Senate who insisted on putting an extraneous rider on the bill, a provision that would repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

That being the case, if Senators are going to get involved in these amendments, let's go back where we started.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. If my amendment prevails—that amendment that is pending at this moment—this will be a clean investment tax credit bill, precisely the bill reported originally by the Senate Committee on Finance before other people insisted on making us vote on other extraneous matter.

Who is responsible for this? It is this Senate, who insists on putting an extraneous rider on the bill. I will invite other Senators to offer their amendments, because some of their amendments are very good. I voted for a number of amendments that are very good amendments.

I voted for the Bob Byrd amendment to let old people who cannot find a job draw social security.

I voted for the Abe Ribicoff amendment to help a man put his boy through college.

I voted for the George McGovern amendment to help the cattle farmers.

I voted against a lot of other amendments, amendments that had not been studied and that I felt needed more consideration. I felt that we could not afford to agree to those amendments at that time.

I voted against the Prouty amendment, although I know the Senator from Vermont is sincere in his effort to try to give assistance to old people. However, adequate consideration had not been given to the bill. If the Senator from Ohio wants to hold this measure to a strict tax credit bill, I have been willing to do that all the time, and I am willing to do so now. However, if the Senator does not wish to do so, then I think it would be just as appropriate to let other Senators offer amendments.

There are some amendments that have been agreed to before by the Senate. The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) has had his amendment agreed to by the Senate, I believe, three times now, and always by an overwhelming vote.

How in good conscience can we tell a man that he cannot offer his amendment which has been studied and supported by the Senate when another Senator is permitted to offer an amendment that would not command a majority vote of the full Senate and insist that that amendment be the only amendment to the bill?

Nothing is contained in the rules of
the Senate that gives a Senator a right to add his amendment to a bill and insist that be the only amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The remarks of the Senator sound effective, except that they have no relevancy that he now wants relevancy, while last year he indulged in irrelevancy by permitting the start of an avalanche of amendments that were neither pertinent nor relevant to the pending bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not contend that the foreign investors tax bill was relevant to all of the amendments, nor that the amendments were all relevant to it.

This Senator had told every other Senator earlier in the 89th Congress: "Please hold off your amendments. Don't offer them to this bill. We will, in due course, give you an opportunity to offer your amendments at a time when we will have no procedural objection." Finally, near the end of the 89th Congress came a bill which was the handiwork of the Foreign Tax Force. We asked the Secretary of the Treasury what he wanted.

We held the bill up to Senators and said: "Well, this looks like the last train through the station. If we don't let you offer your amendments to this bill it will be too late. Offer your amendments. If I don't fulfill my commitments now, it will be too late."

There were numerous amendments remaining to be considered. I voted for amendments that I thought were good amendments, and I voted against amendments that I thought were bad amendments.

We went to conference with the House of Representatives. Treaty Department representatives were heard in the Senate-House conference committee and were consulted.

In conference, we thought we retained the best part of the Senate action.

Mr. LONG. There was no intention to limit the foreign investors' bill to relevant amendments.

We were cleaning the decks. There is no use kidding ourselves about that. We were offering Senators a chance to offer amendments that they had held up from offering for years.

Former Senator Saltonstall from Massachusetts had an amendment to require the Government to make an annual reporting of its contingent liabilities. It took the former Senator from Massachusetts six years to get that amendment enacted into law.

I had urged him not to offer his amendment if he did not limit bill and to two or three other bills.

I had said: "I will find a bill to let you offer your amendment too, and I will have no procedural objection. I perhaps will support it.

What does the Senator think was the first amendment to go on the Christmas tree bill? It was the Saltonstall amendment, offered by the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), who finds so much truth in what I just said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator mentioned the Saltonstall amendment.

The Saltonstall amendment was the only amendment to the so-called Christmas tree bill that would provide tax relief, without any loss of revenue. Not a dime of revenue was lost through that amendment.

All that the Saltonstall amendment provided was for an annual reporting by the various officers of the Government listing both their assets and their liabilities. The amendment was agreed to unanimously.

I repeat, it represented no loss in revenue.

The first amendment agreed to that provided for a loss of revenue was offered by the Senator from Louisiana to increase the depletion allowance for oyster and clam shells. Then followed the $2 million special tax windfall for just one company.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have no apologies to offer. I have voted for tax reductions. I have had the honor of struggling through the Senate about $20 billion in tax cuts. And I am not sorry for that.

The Senator from Delaware apparently wants to tax the American people until they have no more to offer. I am happy that I voted for tax cuts. By means of those tax cuts, we provided for the giving of a minimum standard deduction to the little man and for helping people of limited means who have special expenses.

One of the Senate amendments on the very foreign investors tax bill was an amendment to let the old people have a more generous deduction for medical expenses. I have no apologies to offer for that nor for another Senate amendment on that bill which would have extended medicare to cover the costs of drugs.

THE EYES OF TEXAS ON PENSACOLA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a vice president of Lone Star Steel Co., L. D. (Red) Web, had occasion recently to tour and observe the Pensacola, Florida, Air Station, and to be welcomed aboard the U.S.S. Lexington.

His observations were reprinted in a special article in the Longview Daily News of Longview, Texas.

Realizing the worthiness of the article and the views expressed by Mr. Webster, I ask that the article be printed at this point in the Record, so that it may be shared by other Senators.

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

L. D. (Red) Web, opinion, "Color Me Christmas Tree . . . Navy Blue." (Excerpt from article.)

L. D. (Red) Webster, vice president, public relations and advertising, Lone Star Steel Company, recently observed the U.S.S. Lexington in action. He was among a party of national business and civic leaders who were guests of the Navy for a tour of Pensacola, Florida, facilities and a cruise aboard the U.S.S. Lexington.

As a former newsman, Webster brought home to Texas vivid images of modern Russian navy during a 1958 tour. His series of newspaper articles on that trip were widely reprinted and later published in book form under the title, "I Saw Russia."

(Here is his impression of our Navy.)

(By L. D. (Red) Webster)

Color me blue—Navy blue, that is! And for all of you mothers, dads, wives, sisters and little brothers who have concern about the well being of your loved one now serving in Uncle Sam's Navy, take a few minutes to read this old line that I don't worry: the boy is in the best of hands.

Until a few weeks ago, I probably would have said my leanings were toward another branch of the service. We had gone to Pensacola, the Navy's "Annappolis of the Air," I discovered the gray straws among my red locks.

I even bought a Pensacola sweat shirt and wore with pride a blue cap whose gold emblem indicated I had been to Pensacola if for no more important reason than to enjoy a civilian's tour.

Pensacola opened my eyes to a branch of our nation's service that I had never been close to. With eyes opened, they began to sparkle with respect for the kind of men who run the Navy, and the training program the Navy undertakes.

Pensacola is beautiful, but not extra­
gantly so. It is old, and in its crustiness, there is a freshness that marks itself on every man who trained there. In its newer facilities, especially those for space studies, there is a freshness that marks itself on everyone who visited there. It is a band on hand, but before we could depart, four admirals and a host of captains boarded and apologized for the rain which kept us from marching down a long line of greeters. It was a winning, warm human moment that on we, we were a part of Pensacola.

Aside from the detailed tour of the giant base where we were shown, among other things, the world's newest nuclear powered submarine, the snorkel man's environment in space, and the devices where men are put through all sorts of tests to develop equipment for the most exacting conditions, the highlight of the trip was a day long cruise on the USS Lexington.

Lady Lex is a boat. We walked toward her stern and the old gang started looking at this mammoth vessel. He opined "You'll never make me believe that much steel will float." I agreed.

Our day on Lady Lex was characterized by high and cold winds (40 degrees, in Florida, too) and a choppy sea. Without a quiver, Lady Lex glided from the pier, moved into a channel whose width was just a coat of paint wider than the big boat, and headed for the open sea. Despite wind, under­foot the boards of the flight deck were as solid as a concrete slab. No vibration, no movement, nothing could be heard, even the Lady Lex was now pushing along at about 20 m.p.h.

As we headed out to sea our group started a tour under the direction of a young engineering officer. Quickily, I realized that I didn't want a guided tour. So I conveniently took a couple of hours, prowled Lady Lex from the bow, right up to where the anchor chains slide out through the nose, to the stern, from the bottom mast deck about four stories down, to the top of the bridge six or seven stories high. It was the equivalent of a 10-story building, and three times longer than a football field.

In the depths of Lady Lex's innards, I
learned about the Navy squeezing sideways through corridors bulky men aren't comfortable with. The ensign was a big bear of a man. In this hot, sweaty forced-air compartment, I saw Navy training at its best. Here were massive boilers, the pots that generated the power that supplied the ship, all with intricate systems, on the prowl. Nowhere did I see an officer, petty or otherwise. Instead, my dream was that the kid in the next bay, kids, just plain boys, one of whom was fuzzy-jerking in your life.

RECORD, the Navy's air training program, about the extreme youth I had seen. He said, "About '19," average age of enlistees or inductees assigned we can take them as young as 17. The Navy's air training program, the free nations of Asia, and the future of the war is being fought in Vietnam. It is the Vietnamese--and we, their allies--who are fighting. The enemy has little regard for human life and property. There are no rules of war for this enemy. Terror, intimidation, and murder of those in individuals who oppose it.

The real objective of the war is the people. If the enemy could take Saigon, or the heart of South Vietnam, civilian morale would collapse. The war would be over---without negotiation or conference. He lost this chance two years ago, and I can promise you that his military tactics alone will not win him another opportunity. Yet, despite his staggering combats, he clings to the belief that he will defeat us. And through a clever combination of psychological and political warfare--both here and abroad--he has gained support which is derived from a political war that he cannot accomplish militarily.

Many myths about the Vietcong still persist--and I hope I can dispel some of them here and now.

The doctrine of conquest in South Vietnam is from the book of Mao Tse-tung. It is the enemy's tactics--the combination of subversive political cells, guerrilla units, and conventional military forces. Between 1954 and 1963, political cells, trained and directed from North Vietnam, were installed throughout South Vietnam. At the same time that the Vietcong began recruiting and organizing guerrillas, and training them in terror tactics.

By late 1964 the combination of enemy political-guerrilla warfare and governmental instability in the south resulted in a decision by Hanoi to infiltrate South Vietnam directly. Vietcong companies were formed into units and divisions, and North Vietnamese troops began to infiltrate covertly to the south.

On HANOI'S TERMS

Ne ever at any time during those 10 years of subversion, terror and attack did Hanoi relax. Relaxation is for the people of South Vietnam. The goal of this aggression was then, and still is, the conquest of the South--reunification on Hanoi's terms.

We have an opportunity to change this, if our conduct is favorable. I emphasize the fact that we have no evidence to indicate that the enemy is slowing his invasion from the north, or that he is improving his strategy, after learning from this campaign of infiltration.

INFILTRATION IS COSTLY

We have turned the enemy's ambushes against him and we have learned how to drive him into an ambush. We have sent our deep patrols to find him. He has been punished by B-52 strikes and unparalleled close support from our air and naval gunfire. And on land and sea we have made his infiltration costly.

To those who are not favorable, I emphasize the fact that we have no evidence to indicate that the enemy is slowing his invasion from the north, or that he is improving his strategy, after learning from this campaign of infiltration.
plans to try to inflict major defeat upon us. He may have real grievances and he does have logistics problems, but his leadership is good and his men are tough and tenacious. He needs a victory for political, psychological, and military purposes, and he will continue to strive for one.

So the end is not in sight. The enemy can hardly allow the Communists in Vietnam where we cannot reach him without major effort. He rests and regroups, trains and replenishes in hidden camps and streams, and prepares along the borders of neutral countries and the demilitarized zone which he overviolently violated almost a year ago. He attacks our lines of communication, and trains, for use as guides and intelligence agents for his main force units and for sabotage and terror. He must be prepared for more bitter fighting in the future.

Before leaving the military situation, I must honestly say that I am concerned about cease-fire proposals. In Vietnam, cease-fire was an acceptable condition; but, in this war, inevitably it will be a military advantage to the enemy and a detriment to our side. This is because of the clandestine character and covert methods of the enemy. Traditionally he has used covertly cease-fire proposals to the limit that their manpower and forces alone, until our arrival, and, during the last three years I have considered. During the last three years I have been told that they are not satisfied. This is in contrast to the Vietcong policy of calculated attacks on civilians.

One of the regrettable facts of warfare is that cease-fire proposals are not confined to the military forces involved. There are civilian casualties in Vietnam and these are of at least as much concern to me, my commander, and men. But, civilian casualties do not result from indiscriminate use of our firepower. They are caused by mechanical failure, human error. This is in sharp contrast to the Vietcong policy of calculated attacks on civilians.

What was the history of warfare has seen so many precautions been taken by men in combat. We cover an enemy-held area with leaflets and loudspeaker broadcasts warning of impending attack. We do not permit an air strike or artillery fire on a moving column of enemy until Vietnamese officials give approval. Every possible precaution is taken to avoid casualties among civilians. Never has a nation employed its military power with such restraint.

Now a word about the Vietnamese armed forces. I have worked with the Vietnamese military for more than three years, and I have learned a great deal about their capabilities and their performance. A look at their record in combat, as well as in political administration, reveals an excellence of purpose and vision, when all factors are considered. During the last three years I have seen them literally hold the country together. Despite their military background they have taken long strides toward developing democratic processes and institutions. They fought the enemy guerrillas and main forces alone, until our arrival, and, during that time, they were expanding their forces to meet in the limit that their manpower and economic resources allow.

The magnificent men and women I have worked with have conducted themselves with credit. As I tour the country several times each week, I am encouraged by the obvious improvements in the proficiency, efficiency, and quality of their fighting forces.

Stanch Allies

Today the Republic of Vietnam armed forces are working and flying as close as they can with their allies—the Koreans, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the Thais and the Filipinos, as well as the Americans, and they have earned the confidence of these staunch allies.

The Vietnamese armed forces and the Vietnamese people are aware of and appreciate the support and assistance given them for 12 years in the development of their military organization.

More important to the Vietnamese, I think, are the American service personnel who give them help to build schools, dispensaries, and other things of lasting value in their communities. They are engaged in all the action projects, voluntarily undertaken by our troops and those of our allies, are inspiring to the people.

A young corporal undertakes the support of a Montagnard family whose breadwinner has been assassinated. An American squad leader talks to the men about the people the material things they need and the spiritual uplift which will help them to self-sufficiency. The Vietnamese are living a better life because of the encouragement and help our troops have given to them. A true missionary zeal among our youngest ranks and the people is the unique characteristics of this war.

I am constantly impressed by the concern for the lives of others shown by the men of my command. As I travel among them, and see their courage against the enemy and their compassion toward their friends, I am impressed by the inherent compassion.

I would like to tell you more about the men of my command. Today your soldiers, officers, airmen, marines and coast guardsmen:

Are better educated than before.

Are better informed.

Have traditional American ingenuity and initiative.

Are better physical specimens.

Have better health.

And understand what the war is all about.

They know that they are helping to stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia and to give the people of South Vietnam a freedom of choice. They have been given a job, and they are doing it well, and with compassion, as I see it, and, as I know to be the case, from recent unpatriciot acts here at home.

What are these men? They are mostly young, most of them are from the small villages of the Indochinese Union—from the farms, the cities, the factories and the campuses. They are the sound product of America's democratic society.

They are the sum of our educational system, our medical science and our communications. Their excellent morale results from knowledge of their jobs, sound military training, their compassion toward their friends, I am impressed with their compassion.

They know that they are helping to stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia and to give the people of South Vietnam a freedom of choice. They have been given a job, and they are doing it well, and with compassion, as I see it, and, as I know to be the case, from recent unpatriciot acts here at home.
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They are the sum of our educational system, our medical science and our communications. Their excellent morale results from knowledge of their jobs, sound military training, their compassion toward their friends, I am impressed with their compassion.

One of the regrettable facts of warfare is that cease-fire proposals are not confined to the military forces involved. There are civilian casualties in Vietnam and these are of at least as much concern to me, my commander, and men. But, civilian casualties do not result from indiscriminate use of our firepower. They are caused by mechanical failure, human error. This is in sharp contrast to the Vietcong policy of calculated attacks on civilians.

What was the history of warfare has seen so many precautions been taken by men in combat. We cover an enemy-held area with leaflets and loudspeaker broadcasts warning of impending attack. We do not permit an air strike or artillery fire on a moving column of enemy until Vietnamese officials give approval. Every possible precaution is taken to avoid casualties among civilians. Never has a nation employed its military power with such restraint.

Now a word about the Vietnamese armed forces. I have worked with the Vietnamese military for more than three years, and I have learned a great deal about their capabilities and their performance. A look at their record in combat, as well as in political administration, reveals an excellence of purpose and vision, when all factors are considered. During the last three years I have seen them literally hold the country together. Despite their military background they have taken long strides toward developing democratic processes and institutions. They fought the enemy guerrillas and main forces alone, until our arrival, and, during that time, they were expanding their forces to meet in the limit that their manpower and economic resources allow.

The magnificent men and women I command in Vietnam have earned the unified support of the American people.

Thank you.

Gen. Westmoreland answered written questions submitted at the annual meeting of the Associated Press. Following is a partial list of the questions and answers:

Q. Gen. Westmoreland, have you asked the Pentagon for more troops and how many?

A. As commander of our American armed forces in Vietnam, it is needless to say I am constantly studying our troop requirements. I continuously analyze the situation. I submit my requests from time to time, my desires, my estimates to my senior military headquarters. I have been getting troop increases acceptable to us since the past year. They are continuing to arrive. The number of troops that will ultimately be authorized is a matter that will have to be studied in consideration of factors—our estimate of the enemy's capabilities and intentions, the economy of South Vietnam as a whole and the political factors that will have to be reviewed at our senior levels in Washington. Needless to say, the discussions that have taken place are privileged, and, as a matter of security, I cannot give you any definitive number as to my estimate of the number of troops that will be required.

Q. Would you comment please on the bombing today in North Vietnam, an airfield there. What happens if the Mig's take sanctuary in Red China?

A. I was delighted to learn that the Mig airfields have been bombarded, at least two of them today. This was a military target on which was based aircraft that had been used against our territory. It is true that Migs could take sanctuary in China, as they did during the Korean War, and, as a matter of fact, I have had discussions with the Chinese, operating from those bases compared with those in North Vietnam. The reaction time would be increased and they would therefore have a lesser chance to reach our fighters, the bomber, and the jeopardy to our very fine Air Force and Navy pilots would be reduced.

Casualty Statistics

Q. There are daily statistics of the number of Vietcong killed, but serious doubt about the body count announced of those that have been killed. What is your view please of the accuracy of these figures?

A. Over a period of over three years, I have given this matter considerable personal attention. It is my judgment that the casualty figures that we estimate or state that we have inflicted on the enemy are accurate, perhaps conservative. True enough, there could be some doubt. From time to time some exaggeration. There could be some double counting of casualties, but in my opinion this is more than offset by other enemy troops that have been killed or wounded, a matter we never know about. Also we do not claim credit, in estimating or assessing casualties in this war, for the number of wounds. So all factors considered, I feel that the figures that you receive that are announced by my headquarters in Saigon are definitely accurate and I believe that the comparative side when all factors are considered.
Q. Could you run this war without political help and could you win this war if given a free hand in military decisions?

A. Mr. President, there is a bit of an awkward question. I think it is impossible in view of the nature of the war, a war of both the political and the military elements. If political and psychological factors are of such consequence, to sort out the war between the political factors and the military factors must be considered, they must be considered in selecting targets. They must be considered in our actions involving neutral countries. They must be considered in the means that are used in pursuing the war. The reason for this is political factors are of the complexion but also because of our national policy to confine this war to that of a limited war, and this means that from time to time the means are limited. And that policy has been made loudly clear: that it is not our intention to expand the war. We want to keep it as a limited war and therefore policy factors have to be considered and the decisions involved are necessarily above my level. Since I deal in military factors, I am responsible only for fighting the ground war in South Vietnam and only that air war in the so-called expanded battle area.

Q. What is the possibility of escalation of the war bringing in Red China and Soviet Russia and how effective would they be if they come in?

A. This is a very difficult question to speculate on. To a military point of view I think we should be prepared for any contingency. For instance the USSR is providing equipment to North Vietnam primarily in terms of air defense, weapons and systems. The Communist China is providing support in the form of transportation units and some anti-aircraft weapons but primarily infantry-type weapons. The North Vietnamese army and Vietcong main force units. I think this boils down to whether the USSR and Red China feel that the threat to their formal government and their territory is of such consequence that they could hazard the risk that would necessarily be involved.

Q. The Vietcong are regarded, generally, to have neither unity, organization, or leadership at some time. To what do you attribute their spirit?

A. The Vietcong, organized, directed and commanded from Hanoi, have placed good indoctrination and political driving force to keep the Vietcong fighting spirit alive. They have used a number of political arguments that are directed at political indoctrination than it does to military training. This indoctrination is well done. Of course, it is backed up by a ruthless code that uses strong-arm methods that are required to keep their troops in line.

Q. How is their morale or leadership excellent. They have been well trained and indoctrinated and they are committed. We have noted a number of recent transfers. We are learning up more prisoners, more defectors coming in and the rate seems to be increasing in a very encouraging way. We learn that many of the rank and file of these units would like very much to defect to come in under the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong. The so-called Chieu Hoi program, the cadre control them so tightly that they cannot get away. We also know that there have been many who call on the North Vietnamese leadership and the South Vietnamese, the Vietcong. North Vietnamese leadership, people who are more concerned with the South. The leadership in Hanoi is by their action putting in their own leadership apparatus people who are into the hands of the South Vietnamese leadership and the Vietcong. North Vietnamese leadership, people who are more concerned with the South. The leadership in Hanoi is by their action putting in their own leadership apparatus people who are into the hands of the South Vietnamese leadership.

Q. What is the possibility of escalation of the war bringing in Red China and Soviet Russia and how effective would they be if they come in?

A. As a military man, this is a bit of a question to speculate on. To a military point of view I think we should be prepared for any contingency. That is why I think it is important to do a very thorough analysis. We have recently witnessed in France, it is realized to believe that we will have the support of all host countries in a future contingency. We want to be prepared for the support of all host countries. To do so is not only unrealistic, it is unrealistic to believe that we will have the support of all host countries in a future contingency. We want to be prepared for the support of all host countries.

Q. If we should be prepared for any contingency, to what do you attribute their fighting spirit?

A. This is a very difficult question to speculate on. To a military point of view I think we should be prepared for any contingency. That is why I think it is important to do a very thorough analysis. We have recently witnessed in France, it is realized to believe that we will have the support of all host countries in a future contingency. We want to be prepared for the support of all host countries.

FAST DEPLOYMENT SHIPS NEEDED

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, during the past month I have been doing more thinking than talking about the fast deployment logistical ships, their function, the method of procurement, and the effects upon the merchant marine and shipbuilders.

I have studied the testimony of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. They are in favor of the FDL program, and their arguments are persuasive.

I have analyzed the opposition to the program. I find it based largely on fears. I am convinced that these fears are groundless. I therefore believe the Senate should reverse its previous action and approve the FDL program.

Here we have a program based upon a concept of fast reaction in time of crisis—a program vigorously supported by the military leaders of all services and by the Defense and service Secretaries. The proposed ships are especially designed to carry out the requirements of the concept—characteristics which are neither feasible nor economical for incorporation in merchant ships.

These include humidity control, ability to maintain and exercise Army vehicles in place, a large cargo hold to remove exhaust fumes of running vehicles, rapid offloading either over-the-beach or at a pier, helicopter storage and accompanying fueling facilities, ventilation to maintain and exercise Army vehicles, and by the Defense and service Secretaries.

Mr. President, the proposed ships are especially designed to carry out the requirements of the concept—characteristics which are neither feasible nor economical for incorporation in merchant ships. These include humidity control, ability to maintain and exercise Army vehicles in place, a large cargo hold to remove exhaust fumes of running vehicles, rapid offloading either over-the-beach or at a pier, helicopter storage and accompanying fueling facilities, ventilation to maintain and exercise Army vehicles, and by the Defense and service Secretaries.

In Korea, our initial deployment was made possible only by the presence of troops in Japan. Without the presence of 2 months would be required to close a division, plus supporting units whose total strength exceeds that of the division itself.

Our general strategic objectives are to deter aggression and, to the extent that we cannot deter it completely, to limit it in form, locale, and duration. As long as we maintain these objectives, we are remiss if we fail to provide the most effective means of carrying them out.

Land prepositioning is relatively inflexible. In conjunction with aircraft, it enables rapid response only to a contingency near the point of prepositioning. It does not provide a fast, flexible commitment to the far country for overt action and egress. As we have recently witnessed in France, it is unrealistic to believe that we will have the support of all host countries in a future contingency. We want to be prepared for the support of all host countries.

The ability of the merchant marine to provide this rapid response has been demonstrated on several occasions. As the merchant marine is dispersed throughout the world, it would require a minimum of 30 days to gather the ships required to load a brigade for deployment. Such a recall would immediately alert the world to our impending move and defeat our deterrent effect. The FDL ships, fully loaded or partially loaded and ready, can sail within 24 hours. These ships are not only employed logistical ships, their function, the method of procurement, and the effects upon the merchant marine and shipbuilders.

The proposed ships are especially designed to carry out the requirements of the concept—characteristics which are neither feasible nor economical for incorporation in merchant ships. These include humidity control, ability to maintain and exercise Army vehicles in place, a large cargo hold to remove exhaust fumes of running vehicles, rapid offloading either over-the-beach or at a pier, helicopter storage and accompanying fueling facilities, ventilation to maintain and exercise Army vehicles and by the Defense and service Secretaries.

Mr. President, the proposed ships are especially designed to carry out the requirements of the concept—characteristics which are neither feasible nor economical for incorporation in merchant ships. These include humidity control, ability to maintain and exercise Army vehicles in place, a large cargo hold to remove exhaust fumes of running vehicles, rapid offloading either over-the-beach or at a pier, helicopter storage and accompanying fueling facilities, ventilation to maintain and exercise Army vehicles, and by the Defense and service Secretaries.

In Korea, our initial deployment was made possible only by the presence of troops in Japan. Without the presence of 2 months would be required to close a division, plus supporting units whose total strength exceeds that of the division itself.

Our general strategic objectives are to deter aggression and, to the extent that we cannot deter it completely, to limit it in form, locale, and duration. As long as we maintain these objectives, we are remiss if we fail to provide the most effective means of carrying them out.

Land prepositioning is relatively inflexible. In conjunction with aircraft, it enables rapid response only to a contingency near the point of prepositioning. It does not provide a fast, flexible commitment to the far country for overt action and egress. As we have recently witnessed in France, it is unrealistic to believe that we will have the support of all host countries in a future contingency. We want to be prepared for the support of all host countries.

The ability of the merchant marine to provide this rapid response has been demonstrated on several occasions. As the merchant marine is dispersed throughout the world, it would require a minimum of 30 days to gather the ships required to load a brigade for deployment. Such a recall would immediately alert the world to our impending move and defeat our deterrent effect. The FDL ships, fully loaded or partially loaded and ready, can sail within 24 hours. These ships are not only employed logistical ships, their function, the method of procurement, and the effects upon the merchant marine and shipbuilders.

The proposed ships are especially designed to carry out the requirements of the concept—characteristics which are neither feasible nor economical for incorporation in merchant ships. These include humidity control, ability to maintain and exercise Army vehicles in place, a large cargo hold to remove exhaust fumes of running vehicles, rapid offloading either over-the-beach or at a pier, helicopter storage and accompanying fueling facilities, ventilation to maintain and exercise Army vehicles, and by the Defense and service Secretaries. The proposed ships are especially designed to carry out the requirements of the concept—characteristics which are neither feasible nor economical for incorporation in merchant ships. These include humidity control, ability to maintain and exercise Army vehicles in place, a large cargo hold to remove exhaust fumes of running vehicles, rapid offloading either over-the-beach or at a pier, helicopter storage and accompanying fueling facilities, ventilation to maintain and exercise Army vehicles, and by the Defense and service Secretaries.

In Korea, our initial deployment was made possible only by the presence of troops in Japan. Without the presence of 2 months would be required to close a division, plus supporting units whose total strength exceeds that of the division itself.

Our general strategic objectives are to deter aggression and, to the extent that we cannot deter it completely, to limit it in form, locale, and duration. As long as we maintain these objectives, we are remiss if we fail to provide the most effective means of carrying them out.

Land prepositioning is relatively inflexible. In conjunction with aircraft, it enables rapid response only to a contingency near the point of prepositioning. It does not provide a fast, flexible commitment to the far country for overt action and egress. As we have recently witnessed in France, it is unrealistic to believe that we will have the support of all host countries in a future contingency. We want to be prepared for the support of all host countries.

The ability of the merchant marine to provide this rapid response has been demonstrated on several occasions. As the merchant marine is dispersed throughout the world, it would require a minimum of 30 days to gather the ships required to load a brigade for deployment. Such a recall would immediately alert the world to our impending move and defeat our deterrent effect. The FDL ships, fully loaded or partially loaded and ready, can sail within 24 hours. These ships are not only employed logistical ships, their function, the method of procurement, and the effects upon the merchant marine and shipbuilders.

The proposed ships are especially designed to carry out the requirements of the concept—characteristics which are neither feasible nor economical for incorporation in merchant ships. These include humidity control, ability to maintain and exercise Army vehicles in place, a large cargo hold to remove exhaust fumes of running vehicles, rapid offloading either over-the-beach or at a pier, helicopter storage and accompanying fueling facilities, ventilation to maintain and exercise Army vehicles, and by the Defense and service Secretaries. The proposed ships are especially designed to carry out the requirements of the concept—characteristics which are neither feasible nor economical for incorporation in merchant ships. These include humidity control, ability to maintain and exercise Army vehicles in place, a large cargo hold to remove exhaust fumes of running vehicles, rapid offloading either over-the-beach or at a pier, helicopter storage and accompanying fueling facilities, ventilation to maintain and exercise Army vehicles, and by the Defense and service Secretaries.
imposed by agreements and treaties which Congress and the Defense Department must support. In order for Defense to fulfill its responsibilities, Congress must provide the military with the options necessary to most effectively carry them out.

We have provided the nuclear deterrent option, an option which we hope will never be used, but one which is in the hands of our leaders and which we know will be used only when absolutely necessary. Yet, when we are requested to provide a much less costly option, one which is much less deadly but most effective, the question arises: the question of whether, in the event of a war, we are prepared to be a global policeman's squad car, its operations supported by all services and by Defense. If so, then there must be firm conviction regarding defense and merchant marine policy and weakening our resolve and ability to carry out our national objectives.

The FDL ships will not be standing military options in the differentiation of a nation threatening to land if things do not go our way. However, they may be near an area where we have commitments or ready to sail from port should the need arise. Their flexibility and readiness will permit them to move without raising alarm or notifying the world of our intentions—as would be the case should we call in our merchant marine ships. The integrated rapid deployment capability combining the FDL ships, the C-5A aircraft, and selective prepositioning provides us with a powerful option in fulfillment of our national strategy—one which is most effective and which is attainable at the least cost.

The new ship procurement practice of the Navy—buying large numbers of ships—has been so vigorously and uniformly supported by all services and by Defense as to cast the concept of a standardized ship design in any multiyear procurement.

Additionally, our shipyards have long contended that significant cost savings would be derived through an opportunity to influence the vessel's design. In this connection, it is believed that the yard can eliminate alternate less costly features which in no way impact the vessel's strength or operating capabilities.

In these two respects, the FDL project conforms with the long-held beliefs and objectives of the yard. As to the validity of the basic concept of the FDL's military mission, it would seem presumptuous to us to pass judgment either pro or con. We are not privy to the DOD's back-up data on anticipated future logistic support requirements or the analyses which determined that the FDL project has greater merit than any of the other options examined.

Within the shipyard industry, another aspect of the FDL project has developed a wide range of opinions. I refer to the probability that the successful bidder will construct an FDL ship. Within the two extremes, there are those who believe that the FDL ships can be obtained on a competitive basis, with cost savings, in existing facilities, appropriately modified. And, there are others who contend that if our merchant marine yard facility require- t i es to be commensurate with existing ship replacement needs, we as a nation would require more shipbuilding capability than is now available. The FDL project, in this last context, would be considered as only an increment of the required additional capacity.

So wrote Mr. Hood of the shipbuilding council.

The shipbuilders seem to agree with the Navy conviction that the concept of multiyear procurement of a large number of standardized ships will promote substantial cost savings. Furthermore, they agree that even existing facilities would probably require modification for this large project. I understand that although the Navy envisions a new or substantially modernized shipyard, this is in no way a requirement. The Navy has announced plans to modernize an existing shipyard for this program.

The Navy appears to be practicing what it preaches. For the past year, a very thorough study has been in process to develop a master plan for modernization of its own shipyards. Although engineered estimates are not yet developed, it is apparent that this modernization will cost a quarter of a billion over a 6- to 7-year period. I am told that this program will result in new, modern machinery, modern process lines, improved handling facilities, and new or modernized functional buildings with all work flow designed for most effective operation. I will be most anxious to hear the details of this program when it is first presented in the 1969 budget program next year.

Some unions and some segments of the shipping industry are opposed to the concept of FDL ships as direct competition with the merchant marine—both in the quest for shipbuilding funds and in eventual ocean trade. As I have already stated, it is clear to me that the use of the FDL ships in point-to-point trade would be uneconomic and would defeat their reason for being. They will always be fully or partially loaded for deployment and will therefore be available for multipurpose tasks. Furthermore, I understand that Secretary McNamara has agreed to provide assurance that these ships will not be utilized for point-to-point cargo carrying in peace.

Talk about competition for shipbuilding funds is not a realistic argument. The FDL ships are military ships, budgeted in the Defense Department, and justified on the basis of necessity. Merchant marine shipbuilding subsidy funds are budgeted by the Department of Commerce and justified accordingly. We do require a stronger merchant marine, and I have proclaimed and will support such a program; and I would not consider it to be in competition with the Navy shipbuilding program.

This program is unique in Congress. I recall very few large programs which have been so vigorously and unanimously supported by all services and by Defense. There must be firm conviction regarding defense and merchant marine policy and weakening our resolve and ability to carry out our national objectives.

The FDL program should be pursued. I ask unanimous consent that an article from Navy magazine of April concerning this FDL program, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The FDL PROGRAM: WHAT IT IS AND WHY THE PENTAGON WANTS IT

The Navy's announced desire to construct a fleet of Fast Deployment Logistics (FDL) ships has stirred up as much ire—and as many hazy visions—as the drug LSD. An APL-CIO official, for example, has called them "superjuggernauts of the sea" which "would appear to cast the United States in the role of a global policeman."

The Interstate Commerce Committee wasn't convinced that the program's worth would justify its cost. Besides, it reported, it was concerned that the program implied the United States was prepared to intervene in any kind of strife or commotion occurring in any of the nations of the world.

Senator Magnuson, who served on the Appropriations Committee, expressed apprehension that the Senate might find itself in the position of the Defense Department if it accepts the FDL program. Senator Magnuson chided the Senate for not voting for FDL funds in the FY 1968 budget. The Senate, he said, had "hit the right rapid deployment budget.

The fight isn't over yet, however, and beneath the haze a range of issues has emerged.
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A second major objection to the FDL program is that any new shipyard would cost somewhere around 80 million. What I would like to have incorporated into the contract for the builder would be an examination of the optimum combination for getting troops and supplies where they are needed fastest. The opposition has been vocal and Congress has not been enthusiastic about the project. Though the fight has been lost for the moment in the Senate, it will be carried to the House. And if it fails there, the fight will be resumed next year.

The DEATH OF FATHER OF REPRESENTATIVE DIGGS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a sad note in our Record. Within the past few minutes I have learned of the death in Michigan of the father of Representative Charles C. Diggs, Jr.

Mr. Diggs, father of Representative Diggs, achieved dramatic success in Michigan. He was one of the outstanding successes in the Detroit business community, having started literally from scratch. He was one of the earliest Negro members of the Michigan State Senate. He lived a full life, blessed, I suspect—if we could have his word on this—with the most satisfying of all incidents, the emergence of his son as a national figure and a respected one.

Mr. President, while I realize that these words are of little meaning at the moment to the family, I can assure them that all of us here and at home recognize that Charles Diggs was a dramatic example of the success that can be achieved by an American, whatever his color.

GEN WILLIAM CHILDS WESTMORELAND—AN OUTSTANDING SOUTH CAROLINIAN—OUTSTANDING AMERICAN

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the visitation of one of the most distinguished South Carolinians to ever grace our great State, the honor- able Mr. William Childs Westmoreland, of Columbia, who is presently visiting in South Carolina with his mother, whom he has not seen for the past 3 years. I was presiding in the Senate yester-
day at the time General Westmoreland made his presentation to the Associated Press in New York, but since that time I have listened to a transcript of his speech and of the question-and-answer period that followed, and I wish to congratulate him on his magnificent presentation. It indicates to me—and I believe it is significant and worth observing—the new breed of military officer that represents a new breed of a new military.

I was acquainted with General Westmoreland before his Vietnam assignment. For a year he attended The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina, at Charleston. Later he went to West Point and made an excellent record there.

I knew him as an outstanding super-intendent of the Military Academy at West Point. At that time, while I was serving as Governor, he was honored with an honorary degree from The Citadel.

In his colloquy yesterday with the press in New York, General Westmoreland pointed out that it was not the intent of the United States to follow a policy of annihilation, but rather to employ restraint simply.

He spoke of the tremendous restraint being used in this commitment of military forces in Vietnam.

I could relate, firsthand, one incident that occurred during my visit to Vietnam last November and December which graphically illustrates this point. The situation in question was a touchy one and certainly demanded more of a political and diplomatic response than an authoritarian one of a military commander.

I admired the way General Westmoreland handled the problem. I remarked then and many times since my return about his magnificent handling of this situation.

He showed this characteristic again yesterday in his response to questioning about the type of war we were employing. He answered with careful response to charges that have been made by those, less knowledgeable, on the floor of the Senate.

He addressed himself to the bombing, and specifically the bombing of MiG airfields in North Vietnam. He said he was delighted at those bombings. Talking as a father, which he is, and as a man of compassion, he said it was not that we were annihilating, but that we were saving lives with the step-up of the bombing against targets in the north, and specifically the bombing of MiG airfields.

The General's remarks were certainly different from those of the nervous Nellies who are fearful about involvement of Red China.

Certainly no one has advocated rushing headlong into a confrontation with Red China or the Soviets, but when we ask our pilots to fly down the gun barrel each day in Vietnam we should be able, as commanders back home, so to speak, to face the risk of such a confrontation. We should not minimize the easy success of MiG fighters to our pilots and planes in the north by knocking out their airfields and their airplanes whenever and wherever we can.

It has been said that these planes would then be flown from fields in Red China. As I understood the general's answer he did not advocate hot pursuit, but he did say that the incident, but even to the MiG airfields would make it a little more difficult for them to run us into flak alley to use their missiles against us, and especially would reduce the tremendous losses from antiaircraft fire.

General Westmoreland answered the charge of those who have spoken in this Chamber with respect to cease-fire and the cessation of bombing. He said a cessation in 1968 in any way would once again mean a loss of American lives and the lives of our allies in Vietnam.

He responded to the question of what portion of the battle the South Vietnamese is to show that Ho's handling of the war in Vietnam and costing us lives because it means, in the eyes of the Communists, a victory in the political-type war that is being fought. In the midst of the comments made by another good friend, Dr. Frank Barnette, who used to head our National Security Seminars in Washington, he talked about the three dimensions of the battle, which he said will not be easy to stop. The first dimension, in World War I, was one of land, sea, and air; the second dimension, in World War II, was one of nuclear, atom, and hydrogen bombs; and in the third world war, in which we are presently engaged, he said, the first was logic, political, economic, and social-cultural warfare.

It is not my intent to comment on history here and we are carrying on. He said that they rated high and were still carrying on a majority of the search-destroy missions. Then, finally, in answer to a question, he said that peace demonstration activities and the winning of the battle in Vietnam are not being hurt by peace demonstrations and the position taken by leading Senators in this body.

I have been familiar with past discussions about freedom of debate. I am for rule XXII. That was the first important vote taken in the Senate after the prevailing officer [Mr. Strox] and I were sworn in. I differ with Senator Strope; it is not as I am working with their right to speak. I will, as Voltaire said, defer to the death the right of Senators to speak.

I think it is significant that corresponding with General Westmoreland's visit we had a presentation by our distinguished Senator and friend from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] earlier today in the United States.

Now I believe—from General Westmoreland's response and observation of yesterday, and from what I have observed—that the front line has been fought on the home front and we are being hurt by peace demonstrations and the position being taken by leading Senators in this body.

I have been familiar with past discussions about freedom of debate. I am for rule XXII. That was the first important vote taken in the Senate after the prevailing officer [Mr. Stroex] and I were sworn in. I differ with Senator Strope; it is not as I am working with their right to speak. I will, as Voltaire said, defer to the death the right of Senators to speak.

The Senator from South Dakota discussed this matter. He succinctly and gets to the point. In the final part of his speech he says that the ineffective and unpopular officials of Saigon do not have the confidence of their subjects. As reported by General Westmoreland it is not as other Senators in this body know, this is not true.

One of the great stories in Vietnam is that a responsible civil government is emerging. Our military is helping to build this government. It is easy for us to sit back here and call it unpopular. I do not know how long Senators here and the administration will last. If we look at some of the popularity polls I think the administration is in trouble in 1968. However, that does not mean that we are going to substitute a government. Neither should a lack of total support mean that we should abandon the civil government in Vietnam. We should bail the free elections, the drawing up of the constitution, and the various elections now being held in the villages in the face of unbelievable terrorism. Terrorism that has resulted in the death of numerous public officials. This great desire for an elected official in the South Dakota Senate is indeed a healthy sign.

I disagree also with the second observation of the Senator from South Dakota that we have no obligation to play police-officer from the air. As I said in an earlier speech in the Senate, I stood with the present Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], who was then Governor, and several other distinguished Members of this body, at the last battle with the commission of the U.S. Navy. We still have that one under commission. It has 1,100 men aboard ship and now, as then, is 62 feet under
water at Pearl Harbor. As we harken back to that day 25 years ago, remembering Pearl Harbor, we also remember that the great United States of America stood alone as the world's policeman. Since World War II, we have stood as the police- man to the world. This has been from Korea to the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Guatemala—and now at Vietnam.

These are instances which we have not brought upon ourselves but instances which have been thrust upon us in the role of world leaders. If they want to talk about great resources for the Great Society, let us talk about the great resources we have as a free people to protect freedom the world over. Thus, I think we do have this obligation. Being a policeman is not always a pleasant job, but it is always a necessary one.

The third lesson which the Senator from South Dakota points to is:

Corrupt regimes of the kind we have been allied with in Saigon do not deserve to be saved by the blood of American boys.

Mr. President, I believe this is a political statement. We have been free, without even a civil war, for 100 years. We have been a free nation for almost 200 years and yet there is still talk of corruption here within the Halls of this Congress.

Is it not amazing that South Vietnam has a government at all, or a regime at all, after a systematic killing off of the leadership? The great lesson of Vietnam is that we as a people are willing not only to help militarily but also to help build a government, and a society.

The fourth lesson that my distinguished friend points out is that those who believe that American military power has an important role to play in the Pacific should return to the once accepted "doctrine of our best generals that we should avoid committing American soldiers to the jungles of Asia."

That is another good political statement, and it holds good whether in a war or out of war.

I agree basically with the Senator's thesis that we should heed our military leaders in time of war. But I differ in that I believe it is the leaders who are fighting the war today, directing our military efforts today, who are charged with saving the lives of our fighting men today, rather than military leaders—though we may all agree upon their competence in their time and in their day—who lived, planned, and fought a different war in a different world and under different circumstances.

General MacArthur, great as he was, never fought the kind of war that General Westmoreland is now fighting in Vietnam.

When history makes her judgment as to who were the leaders who fought this war in Vietnam, and who has done the most to bring about its end, I want to be counted firmly and irrevocably on the side of "Westy" Westmoreland.

Finally, the fifth lesson:

Our involvement in Vietnam came about through a series of moves by the Executive Branch.

And then talks about the undeclared war—I would only refer to the response of the Honorable George Ball in an internationally televised program, who, when asked what would have been the policy of President Kennedy, responded that the present policy in Vietnam under President Johnson would have been the policy of President Kennedy. In fact, President Johnson has really stepped up the commitment of our troops. We all remember, in the 1950's, the entry of the United States into Vietnam in an advisory capacity politically, economically, and militarily that it came about under President Eisenhower, in his exchange of correspondence with Winston Churchill and, later on, upon request of the Government in Vietnam.

I think that my distinguished friend with respect to saying that we are there at their request solely. I think we are necessarily fighting in Vietnam in order to keep from having to fight here in our own homeland.

I believe this war is both important and significant. Considering the recent accolade given the United States at the SEATO conference by the members of the nations most directly involved, I do not see how any other conclusion is possible. I will admit that President de Gaulle does not like our actions there. He does not want anyone to win in Vietnam. He is not a part of the SEATO alliance and the nations in the Far East immediately involved, who know what is in the balance, have condemned the stand of the United States in Vietnam.

That brings me to the final words in the presentation of my distinguished friend from South Dakota:

A conscientious man would be cautious how he dealt in blood.

Mr. President, would we not all?

That should be taken in light of the statement in his introductory remarks:

So, I do not intend to remain silent in the face of what I regard as a policy of madness.

When a distinguished Member of this body refers to policy in Vietnam as being a policy of madness, that statement should not go unchallenged, in light of General Westmoreland's presentation to the Associated Press on yesterday. He agreed with our policy there. The only thing he could not answer was: When would the war end? The reason he could not answer that question was that he could not tell when we, back here in Congress and in the administration, would finally unite in a resolve and a clear and convincing determination that we know what the real issues are and that we will continue to seek an honorable victory in Vietnam.

It is a simple axiom—an aggressor will terminate his aggression when the cost of that aggression exceeds his willingness to pay. We will never raise the price sufficiently high in Vietnam by running away from the truth.

Instead of those signs of protest, we should be painting the number of Migs downed in combat. Instead of shouting, "Peace at any cost," we should be shouting, a just peace at whatever price.

Instead of preaching treason, we should be preaching justice and freedom of the world. Our purpose in this world seems to have become obscured by a haze of oratory, a cloud of semantics, and a divergence of opinion; and we seem no longer to know where we are going. This sometime happens when you take your eye off the target.

Let us make that reassessment. Let us urge our President to look once again at exactly what needs to be done to terminate this terrible war. Let us ask him to take politics out of it and do whatever he must to win.

Let us urge this Congress to reflect once again, anew, upon the why's and where's of Vietnam. Our purpose is to achieve that unity of purpose to bring that insusceptible strength of which we are capable together again.

Let us urge our people to look once again at the reason we have become the greatest power the world has ever known—and why. Let them once again know that a desire to be free, to choose the God of our choice, and the government of our choice, is the cause that caused our forefathers to decide that neither history, nor expediency, nor the easy way, is acceptable as an alternative to freedom. We have a better time for such a reassessment—such a reflection—such a look—than now when the man who symbolizes what I feel to be the position of an over-
whelming number of our people, is here in Vietnam—trying to tell us that standing together, unified in our determination to win with honor, we can achieve a peace; and once again show the world that the United States of America has not altered those basic principles upon which she, as a nation, was founded.

I believe when my distinguished friend from South Dakota makes the statement that—Hanoi knows very well that America is not going to surrender or withdraw from this war—

When he says—Hanoi knows very well that not a single U.S. Senator has advocated either U.S. surrender or U.S. withdrawal—

He is in error, because I have only to refer to the recommendations after the first part of his presentation. In light of the war in Vietnam, the position that we now find ourselves in, the distinguished Senator recommends:

Stop the bombing, north and south, and the resulting sacrifice of life and fuel and time. That is the basic principle which we have always followed. I am convinced that the North Vietnamese Government and the North Vietnamese people are very limited in the future they can plan. Their people will not sustain the kind of sacrifice that we have been asking for the past year or more, and I believe that the people will demand a negotiated settlement.

That to me means surrender. That to General Westmoreland would mean surrender.

He says further:

We should clearly state our willingness to negotiate directly with the Vietcong in answer to questions, that the Vietcong confine our military action to holding the ground.

The distinguished Senator upon which he, as a nation, was built.

The Vietcong minds to a free society before we can take it up and see it through in their talks with the respective countries involved.

The portion I am particularly pleased with, is, of course, the GOMO amendment. I think all the amendments are good, but this one is particularly good because it tells the world that we have in certain areas of our country where we need limestone for the manufacture of Portland cement.

So again I congratulate my friend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, for having brought the matter up in this fashion and this rapidly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the conference on the disagreement of the votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 286) to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by providing for the negotiation of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I ask unanimous consent to the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

For conference report, see House proceedings for April 19, 1967.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have submitted this conference report in behalf of the junior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long), chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The House-passed bill would permit the duty on dicyandiamide to be reduced to zero immediately without regard to the 5-year staging requirements of the Trade Expansion Act. There are two Senate amendments to this bill.

The first one was added at the request of the administration. It waives the requirements of the Trade Expansion Act for certain renegotiation hearings and other administrative procedures. This waiver was added in recognition of the short time remaining to negotiate with respect to this product during the Kennedy round.

The second Senate amendment added a new provision to the bill to provide for negotiating a zero tariff on limestone used in making cement without regard to the 5-year staging requirements of the Trade Expansion Act. This amendment also waived the renegotiation hearings and other administrative procedures so that negotiations with respect to this limestone could be undertaken before the Kennedy round terminates.

The Senate amendments—except for waiving the renegotiation requirements of limestone substantially the same as those contained in the House-passed version of H.R. 1141.

The House agreed to all these Senate amendments. The bill before us, I am advised, is identical to the bill the Senate passed on March 23. I urge that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I merely wish to congratulate the Committee on Finance, particularly the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Mr. COPLEY, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, Mr. HILL, for the work they have done in getting these particular bills through. It has not been easy to do, even though there was no opposition, because we have been working against a time limit, which has been of some substantial difficulty.

Among others I knew that the time within which negotiations under the Kennedy round could continue in Geneva would end by the end of this month, so that it was extremely important that we be able to alert our own negotiators as to the actions of Congress in this field, so that they could take it up and see it through in their talks with the respective countries involved.

The portion I am particularly pleased with, is, of course, the GOMO amendment. I think all the amendments are good, but this one is particularly good because it tells the world that we have in certain areas of our country where we need limestone for the manufacture of Portland cement.

So again I congratulate my friend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, for having brought the matter up in this fashion and this rapidly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Perhaps I should say to the distinguished Senator that I am advised that the House conference had asked that the amendment on limestone be deleted, but the Senate conference would not agree to that. I am sure that pleases the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. It certainly does. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.
the Senate today, and that thereafter I would move that the Senate adjourn. So I am not prepared to enter into such an amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I was certainly not suggesting that the Senate did not make such inquiries and contact as he desired. I really rose only to indicate that we were prepared for a vote at some time certain when Senators could have adequate notice to be present.

The able junior Senator from Louisiana has given his estimate that the Senate is evenly divided on this issue, 50-50.

I think perhaps his estimate may be a little optimistic on his side. It is my view that a majority supports repeal.

But in any event, if we can fix a time certain, I would be prepared to fix a time right now—for example, 3:30 tomorrow afternoon—and take my chances and accept the results. But I can understand the able Senator not wishing to enter into such an agreement, and I certainly do not press it. I only wished to indicate that this issue will ultimately probably be determined by those present and those absent and those who arrange for pairs, as many close questions are. Sometime we must settle it; and I would be prepared to settle it at 3:30 tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. By tomorrow it may be that I will receive additional requests. As of now I have requests of Senators to postpone the vote until tomorrow. Tomorrow will be a different day, but as of now I am prepared to agree to vote. It is important that Senators have adequate notice.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish it were within my power to accommodate the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee in this matter. If for myself personally, I would have no objection to voting on the matter tomorrow afternoon at 3:30, or voting on it now. But under the circumstances, I am sure that the senior Senator from Tennessee will understand that I would have to interpose an objection if a unanimous-consent request to that effect were to be made.

Mr. GORE. I understand. I do not make such a unanimous-consent request, and would not do so in the absence of the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Finance, unless they had been advised of it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. I am sure the Senator will understand that I could not agree to it in their absence.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock, tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR NELSON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the approval of the Journal tomorrow, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be recognized for 45 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] tomorrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the period of the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow, statements therein be limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McCLELLAN TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at some time during the period for the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock, tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 26, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. T. Stewart Matthews, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Macon, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, and through whose mighty power our fathers won their liberties of old, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither from many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, and especially this House of Representatives in Congress assembled; we beseech Thee that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy church, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations; and that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness; and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail, all which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 375. To amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. Monroney and Mr. Culberson members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 67-6.

CRITICAL SITUATION IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention through private conversations that we are on the verge of a desperate power struggle going on in Saigon between Premier Ky and General Thieu, and that this power struggle has caused a serious breakdown in the will of certain
of the government forces to fight. The situation is particularly serious in the I Corps area.

The former commander of the I Corps area, Gen. Nguyen Oahn Thi, is now in Washington. At the time of the Buddhist uprising he was successful in bringing peace to the area affected by it. Although he was immensely effective and popular among the peasants, he was forced to resign shortly after the uprising.

I have invited him to the Speaker's Dining Room today at 2:45 to brief my colleagues on his situation. At that time he will give critical information about the situation in Vietnam, and especially the I Corps area.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SCORES COSTLY PACE OF SPACE RACE: URGES COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND EXPLORATION EFFORTS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, in the aftermath of the Apollo disaster, I told my colleagues in this body:

The ambition to conquer space must not be so overwhelming that it becomes a disregard for the lives of the men who make that ambition possible.

Having followed the House and Senate investigations into U.S. space mishaps, and noting with sorrow the death yesterday of a brave Soviet cosmonaut, I must again question the wisdom of racing headlong for the moon.

The Russians must now feel, as we do, the painful cost of this decade-long rush we are now engaged in for national prestige. We cannot, of course, abandon our investment in seeking new technological horizons in space, and we do not expect that the U.S.S.R. will abandon her program, although it appears that in the last 2 years her space development has been slowed considerably. At a time when problems of crime, housing, health, and urban blight and pollution face this Nation, we cannot oversharpen our focus on lunar goals.

I have no doubt that this great Nation can reach the moon by 1970 by spending huge sums of money and by making several costly sacrifices, such as the loss of life which occurred last January. A far more difficult, and more necessary, accomplishment would be to prove that when we are challenged by another nation in this expensive and complex pursuit of space, we will not lose sight of more pressing and more humane goals.

I urge the President to seek an agreement with the Soviet Union which will facilitate the use of our efforts to broaden man's horizons beyond his earthly home.

The tragedy of four needless deaths in the past 4 months will not have occurred in vain if they help us to re-evaluate the wisdom of this costly race.

TO AMEND THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 42 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 42

Resolved, That paragraph 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting the following sentence: "Two or more but not more than ten Members may introduce jointly a resolution to which this paragraph applies."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from California and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution. It is neither going to break the Treasury nor is it going to solve the national debt, but it will, I hope and I think, be conducive toward a reduction of the cost of legislating. It is an economy move.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution just simply does one thing: It provides for a change in the rules of the House to provide that as many as 10 Members of the House may join in sponsoring a resolution or a bill in the House. Nor that is done? Under the present system there may be 25, 30, 50, or even 100 Members of the House who want to introduce a similar bill. As a result of this desire to co-sponsor a bill or a resolution, each Member introduces one. Let me illustrate. When we had the so-called ethics resolutions up before the Committee on Rules, there were over 100 resolutions introduced in connection with the consideration of establishing a Committee on Ethics and Standards. Approximately half or more of those resolutions were identical. In other words, there were 50 Members of the House who introduced identical resolutions for this particular purpose. The other day the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Wd­nall] introduced a housing bill. More than 90 Members of this House introduced identical bills.

Now, let us see what it costs to intro­duce this housing bill and have it printed. I think this is significant and it is one of the main purposes of the bill. The cost of printing this bill of 35 pages for 90 separate cosponsors is $8,292. Under joint sponsorship with a total of nine prints it would have cost $2,897, and had the one bill been sponsored by 90 Members the one printing would have been $607. These figures were furnished at my request by the Clerk's office.

Mr. Speaker, in response to my re­quest, the Clerk of the House of Repre­sentatives furnished me with that the cost of printing 10 identical bills with an average of eight pages is $1,006.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if these 10 Members jointly introduce one bill, the cost is estimated to be $164. This represents a savings of approximately $850 on that one item.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House know, when a bill is intro­duced, 2,800 copies of the bill are printed. Upon each occasion on which another Member introduces an identical bill, 250 copies must be printed, with his name and number contained thereon.

Mr. Speaker, 1,900 copies of each House resolution are printed. Each time another Member introduces an identical resolution 250 copies must be printed, with the new name and number.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th day of this month 16 Members of this House introduced separate bills to provide for the recess of Congress during the month of August.

It is my understanding that over 100 bills have been introduced to regulate the importation of milk and dairy products, all providing for the hoped for identical objective.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules yield to me at this point?

Mr. COLMER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had previously promised to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], but I shall now yield to my dis­tinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. I think the distin­guished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is saying. It is my opinion that the gentleman is entirely right. However, I just wonder if the number "10" should not be raised to at least make it 20, 25, or, perhaps, 30 or something like that?

Would the gentleman from Mississippi object to that suggestion or to such an amendment?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say in response to my friend, the gen­tleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], that I have been thinking about this particular objective. And, frankly, I favored it. I further feel that the major­ity of the Committee on Rules favor it. There is nothing sacred about the figure "10." Frankly, I put the figure "10" in here because I wanted this body to get started upon this proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I would have no ob­jection to making the number 25. However, I would be opposed to just lifting the lid entirely and, for instance, permitting more than a majority of the Members of the House to introduce a bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Missis­
sippi will yield for just one further question.

Mr. COLMER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the figures "26" seems to me to represent a reasonable figure. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], if this resolution is subject to amendment?

Mr. COLMER. I shall be happy, later on, if the gentleman from Texas desires to offer such an amendment, to yield to the gentleman from Texas that purpose, or to offer such an amendment myself.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I shall offer such amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi to yield to me at this time for the purpose of making, or undertaking to make, legislative history which in my opinion will be of benefit to the House of Representatives and the officers of the Government in administering the program which the gentleman's resolution seeks to add to the rules of this House of Representatives.

And if the gentleman will yield to me for that purpose, I have several questions.

Mr. COLMER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In what order are names to be printed on the bills? Alphabetically, order of cosponsorship, or order of seniority of Members?

Mr. COLMER. Of course, in answer to the gentleman's question, I would have to give him my opinion as to that. I am not sure that I have the authority to answer it categorically, but my own idea about it is that if the gentleman from Oklahoma, for instance, desired to introduce a bill and would like to have cosponsors, just as is the custom with other Members whom he thought would be interested. His name would appear as No. 1 on the bill, regardless of the alphabetical order or seniority, or anything else, and then other names would be added before the bill was introduced, now, mind you—and I want to emphasize that—in whatever order the entire gentleman's list would fit to place them, or the Members agreed upon among themselves.

Mr. ALBERT. Second, when will the bill be referred to a committee and numbered? The day it is introduced, or the day it is sent for printing, if held for additional cosponsors?

Mr. COLMER. I believe that is a very pertinent question, and I am glad the gentleman brought it up.

The bill with the cosponsors would be introduced the same day, when it is referred to a committee and numbered, and it would be numbered and referred to the committee in the regular course, as has been the custom under the present rules.

Mr. ALBERT. In other words, if the gentleman will yield further, all the names of all the sponsors of a bill must be on the bill when it is introduced; is that correct?

Mr. COLMER. Correct, sir.

Mr. ALBERT. Third, if the bills are held for a stated period of time for additional cosponsors, how is this to be done, or is that intended?

Mr. COLMER. I do believe that question was answered in the previous answer. The bill is not introduced until all of the sponsors' names are on it.

Mr. ALBERT. In other words, you do not intend that sort of situation to arise? The gentleman has a position to answer that question than I am, I would assume that a Member could, by unanimous consent of the House, as in all other cases, remove his name from a bill. Mr. ALBERT. May I ask the gentleman further, and I hope I am not trespassing too much on the gentleman's time.

Mr. COLMER. No, indeed; I think the gentleman is serving a good purpose to clarify these things.

Mr. ALBERT. Does this prevent a Member who has been sponsored a bill from introducing a bill on the same subject matter as an individual sponsor at some future time in either session of the Congress? In other words, if the gentleman's name is on a bill, together with the titles of the cosponsors, can he at a later date introduce a bill on the same subject matter under his own individual name and as an individual sponsor?

Mr. COLMER. I can see no reason or justification for such a procedure.

Mr. ALBERT. If any changes are made in the draft of legislation by the original sponsor while it is being held for additional cosponsors, who will be responsible for notifying the cosponsors who are already on the list?

Mr. COLMER. I am not quite sure I understand the distinguished gentleman's question.

Mr. ALBERT. If any changes are made in the draft of legislation by the original sponsor while it is being held for additional cosponsors, does the gentleman have to notify the cosponsors in case there is any conflict by reason of the additional name being added to the bill?

Mr. COLMER. I am not quite sure I understand the distinguished gentleman's question.

Mr. ALBERT. How many bills are to be printed and this is my last question, and I hope I am not trespassing too much on the gentleman's time.

Mr. COLMER. The same procedure as in the case of the original sponsor while it is being held for additional cosponsors?

Mr. ALBERT. It is not being held—there is the point. I repeat the bill is not introduced until it is perfect.

Mr. ALBERT. How many bills are to be printed—and this is my last question, I will say to my colleague. What will be the distribution of bills to each of the sponsors?

Mr. COLMER. I would assume that the present rules and procedures relative to the printing of bills would be followed just as it is now.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman understands that I am not debating this bill but merely seeking information.

Mr. COLMER. I think the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma is being very helpful. In fact, I had intended to go into some of these matters myself.

Mr. ALBERT. I hope I have not trespassed too long on the gentleman's time. But obviously, if a large number of Members are cosponsoring a bill and request...
copies of a bill, we are going to wind up right where are now. Is that not true?
In other words, if 10 Members are cosponsors of a bill and each Member wants a number of bills to be printed for himself, the situation with respect to the number of bills to be printed will be the same as it is now; is that not true?

Mr. ALBERT. That is true. I would think that if a number of Members wanted the bill it would be the same as if it were separately introduced.

Mr. ALBERT. As a practical matter, I think so.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think I can answer that question so that we can understand it.

As I read this bill, this is permissive legislation. It is not requiring anybody to put their name on a bill if he wants to introduce a separate bill. It is only permissive. In other words, I have personally been trying to get this done and many times I have introduced a bill going back for several years which was not only permissive, but which would have been mandatory.

The proposed resolution will not prevent the introduction of a flood of bills, because Members who would want to get a copy of the bill would send it out and it would be distributed.

I am going to support the gentleman’s resolution. I am hopeful that I can briefly improve it a little bit so that we might save some additional money. There is a great opportunity to save money in connection with this subject. I will ask for the time to speak later.

Mr. COLMER. As a practical matter, I am sure we will save money and that there will not be many additional bills introduced. The gentleman will see that this will result in the saving of many thousands of dollars.

But Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of Members to another advantage of the proposal. The cosponsoring of a bill adds prestige and strength to proposed legislation. For there is strength in unity.

The proposal is given status by numbers.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, who has been an advocate of the proposal for a number of years.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wish to commend the gentleman for his diligent efforts in bringing the resolution before the House. I, too, favor the resolution, although I would go a little further than the gentleman and not restrict the number of Members who might be included as cosponsors.

I feel, too, that this would bring about a great saving in the membership and to the taxpayers. I was glad to hear the gentleman say, in response to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], that you would agree to amend it to 25. I wonder if the Speaker would consider taking off any limitations so that if 50 Members wanted to get together they could do so. Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. COLMER. In response to the gentleman from Florida, who has been interested in this matter for a long time, it would not be practical or advisable to take the lid off. When you get to the point, as has been done in some other bodies, where a majority of the membership, for example, cosponsor a bill, then the body is in the position of the buggy goat at the convention: They have already voted, and the bill does not get the proper consideration.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me one more comment, I shall not ask him to yield further. I am reminded of the Senate. It has also happened that even though a measure had a majority of that body as cosponsors, a number of those people changed their minds later on, and there was no provision against changing their minds. If Members would still want to do it, I should think there would be no objection. Certainly they would have the right to change their minds when the vote came up.

Mr. COLMER. I believe the comments of the gentleman as well as those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] are very good ones. In fact, I have an amendment in my pocket ready to offer which would make it 25. I think we ought to keep it within some limits.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but my question is this: If Members wanted to get together they could do so. Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. COlMER. I believe the comments of the gentleman as well as those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] are very good ones. In fact, I have an amendment in my pocket ready to offer which would make it 25. I think we ought to keep it within some limits.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but my question is this: If Members wanted to get together they could do so. Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. COlMER. I believe the comments of the gentleman as well as those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] are very good ones. In fact, I have an amendment in my pocket ready to offer which would make it 25. I think we ought to keep it within some limits.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but my question is this: If Members wanted to get together they could do so. Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. COlMER. I believe the comments of the gentleman as well as those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] are very good ones. In fact, I have an amendment in my pocket ready to offer which would make it 25. I think we ought to keep it within some limits.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but my question is this: If Members wanted to get together they could do so. Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. COlMER. I believe the comments of the gentleman as well as those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] are very good ones. In fact, I have an amendment in my pocket ready to offer which would make it 25. I think we ought to keep it within some limits.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.
Members over the years that we let more than one person join in introducing a resolution or bill. We picked the number of 10, because we figured we had to create a new bill, but we talked, and we found some interest. We did not know what number we could accept, but in any event, the Member from Mississippi and I discussed earlier some of the concerns we have had, and we have an amendment to go to 25. That number is perfectly acceptable to me.

On some of the questions asked by the majority leader, if it is my bill, and if I want to use my own name or any other, I would have no problem with legislation with me, my name would be first, and the next nine names would be either in the order I asked them to sign, or that they had signed. It would not be by seniority or by the alphabet. In other words, I might want a good friend of mine from California, if we have been working on this together for some time, to be the first name following mine. That happens to be my intent.

I do not believe the bill should be held at the desk or anywhere else for people to add their names as sponsors. The principal supporter of the bill should obtain the copy of the bill as the bill is introduced, I think that is it.

In answer to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, I would certainly think the bill would not be held any place if the sponsor so desires it, for the purpose of adding other names to it.

In answer to another question: Does it limit the Member to just the bill he cosponsors? No, I do not think it does. If 10 Members wish to introduce the same or different bills, they can. If they have 1,500 copies printed, and everybody wants the same number, of course, we will spend the same amount of money, excepting the names will be changed. I do not think that will happen. We will be able to save some money on the vast majority of the bills introduced. I do not believe names can be added subsequently to the bill. If I do not believe a name can be removed once the bill is put in, any more than a Member can remove his name from a bill he put in. It will not prevent any cosponsor from introducing bills.

I believe if the language of the bill is changed by a principal author, and he has had eight or nine Members already cosigned, I believe out of friendship and courtesy, he should tell them this is the way the language will be; do they still want to be sponsors of it? Certainly that is what I would do in the matter.

I believe that takes care of the history as far as my intent as to why this bill is being brought here.

How many bills can each sponsor introduce? I guess he can put in as many bills on a subject as he wants to. This just happens to list 10 people who may get together and who may be saving a little money, and who may show they are all interested in it.

I believe another advantage of it is that it is a number that has with one number, and other Members have bills on the same subject, but theirs have different numbers. Then the Member tells his constituents, "I introduced a bill on that subject." When the bill is passed, it may be the bill with the first number, or it may be that the committee chairman's name is on a bill with a different number. In this way, at least 10 Members can say, "We started this ball game going, we were on the court. We want such credit as they feel entitled to in their own districts on that particular measure.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I just wonder why we could not expand the number from 25 to 100, so a many which would cover the largest delegation.

As an example, California has 38 Members. There might be a specific problem affecting all of the Members, and they might like to have their names on the same bill.

New York has 42 Members. Under the restriction of 25, it would require two separate bills to accommodate the Members from one state.

Mr. SMITH of California. I believe it would be a very rare occasion when the 33 Members from the great State of California would all be in agreement on one particular subject.

We just sort of thought, "Let us start with 10—now go up to 25."

Perhaps it will look good in a few months and we can go to 50 or 100. We can consider it then. Let us not ruin the start with any making. It has been quite a number of years over which Members have asked that this measure be brought to the floor, and we are very happy to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS), and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WATER AND SEWER PROGRAM FUNDS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the distinguished Member from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, would remain in the Chamber, but since I arranged with the gentleman from California to yield this time to me the gentleman from Texas has retired. I had intended to engage the gentleman from Texas in a colloquy concerning a speech he made on the floor yesterday, in which he announced he was introducing legislation to increase authorization for water and sewer grants.

I wanted to say to the gentleman that it is apparently going to take more than legislation to expand this program, because the administration is not spending all the money appropriated by Congress for water and sewer grants.

We have just concluded the hearings on the appropriation request for 1968, and we found, to my surprise, that the Department of Housing and urban Development is not spending the money we appropriated last year for this important water and sewer program, which touches every community in the entire United States.

There was appropriated last year the sum of $100 million for this program. But the Department is not spending all of it. On the contrary, HUD expects to carry $10 million of that appropriation over into fiscal year 1968.

In addition, I am very surprised to the Members to learn that the administration requested in the fiscal year 1968 budget only $165 million for this program, when it might have requested the full amount of the authorization, which would have been $400 million.

I believe that the people of the country should be asking the administration to expand the water and sewer program, which touches every community in this Nation, to put its major emphasis on inaugurating a brandnew program which it started out calling the demonstration cities program but has changed to the more glamorous title of the model cities.

I think it ought to be of interest to the Members of this body to know that the water and sewer program is being downgraded by the administration. Frankly I see very little reason to increase the authorizations for it when the administration will not even spend the money on the water and sewer program that Congress has already appropriated.

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

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would like to commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House, because, as he knows, there have been thousands and thousands of requests made by villages and cities through this Nation for these funds which are badly needed. In my area we have had all the complications on file and we keep hearing all the time that they do not have the money to carry them through.

Now, the gentleman from North Carolina is informing the House and the Nation that the administration is not funding the program to the extent of $10 million which was already authorized and appropriated by Congress. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. JONAS. Yes, Congress appropriated $100 million last year. The administration plans to spend $80 million of it, carrying over $10 million into 1968. And instead of asking for the $200 million which Congress authorized, theornew budget asks for only $165 million. So they are not even spending the money on this program that is presently available from appropriations and are not asking to carry over funds previously voted by Congress.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I wish to thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLMER

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 1, line 4, after "than" strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-five".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, in my opinion, is about the most innocuous permissive legislation I can imagine. I cannot see how anyone, in good conscience, could vote against the passage of it. While I will support or do support the amendment, at the same time I would have preferred to see the resolution go through without any limitations at all.

Just to give you some idea of what we have been doing here in the past, on Thursday of last week a bill was introduced and 90 identical copies of the same bill, 32 pages long, with all of that printing, were made. That is 91 different copies of one bill. Of course, each bill also has to go through the same regular procedure. It has to be printed 91 times. Therefore, it is just not that the people just do not understand that many times, and I think most every time, these identical bills are set up individually in the Printing Office. They do not just change the number of the bill and reprint the same bill, but they set up the whole bill. I have to estimate what the cost of the printing of this one bill amounted to. I would estimate the cost of printing alone, if you went to the Government Printing Office, would be unusual. Sometimes we have 100 bills or more than that. One time I remember 150 bills. Some of the older Members who have been around for some time can remember when they had to be printed one bill at a time. We have been trying to do something to cut down on the expenses and the useless expenditures we make here in the House.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why should the Government Printing Office set up separate type for each of the expenditures we make here in the House.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They should not. I am not defending the Government Printing Office for doing that. But, as the gentleman will recall, they have done it on many occasions. You will often find identical bills with different numbers. You try to follow it through and you find that even the division of the words is not the same, indicating that it has been set up again. I would like to see this changed, but it is something else that we will get into with the unions and everybody else when we start trying to do that. If the gentleman will let me conclude here, because I just want to make a few comments.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1959 I introduced a bill which was not permissive but mandatory that we would have eliminated this duplication of printing. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, at that time I could not even find a forum before which to obtain a hearing, because I learned that the bills were not been set up yet. Many people were interested in saving money around this place.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I introduced at that time provided as follows:

Before printing any bill or resolution, the Clerk shall compare the copy introduced with similar bills or resolutions introduced during the same session in like fashion printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a reference to the original bill or of the Member introducing the resolution shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a reference to the original bill or resolution introduced.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, every one, under the provisions of the bill which I introduced at that time could obtain the proper credit and could say, "All right; I am supporting that bill." Under the provisions of that resolution as originally introduced we could have had as many as 100 names appearing thereon.

Mr. Speaker, across the way in the other body, upon occasion we have as many as 70 or 80 Members of that body whose names appear on a bill, which upon occasion has indicated that the bill has already passed.

Mr. Speaker, the same thing could happen here, and some people change their minds. On the other hand, some people will find anything in the world which is placed before them, or will be hunting for some way to get their names off the bill at a later date.

I do not know how Mr. Speaker, at least this represents a start in the right direction and that is the primary reason I am going to support this resolution. However, if we could only get together a few of us who are interested in economy, to give a little time and consideration-as to the savings which could be effected through the elimination of identical printing-an operation which represents nothing more than a waste of dollars being thrown down the drain; I say thousands of dollars, then we could accomplish something-such as the wasting of several thousands of dollars last Thursday when this bill which I hold in my hand was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, had we had this principle in effect at that time, perhaps 75 names could have been gotten on the bill, or three or four, and instead of printing 91 different bills, or instead of printing 32 different bills, we could have printed only one.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House can clearly see around here, we must do something to curb this type of waste. I am not going to say that the amount of money which we will save as a result of this type of operation will be great, but it will show a difference in a national budget of $315 billion. But at least we will have some economy and will indicate to the people of the country the fact that we wish to act responsibly, and economically.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am telling the Members of the House that this wasteful expenditure of money in this fashion worries me and it should be of concern to the Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I am told in our thinking that as long as it is "Uncle Sam's money" or the money of someone else, we do not have much incentive. I believe that Congress needs to create a new image, and to impress the public that we are interested in practicing economy in every way possible.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution, as amended.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMAN) said the question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUTTING THE MARITIME PROBLEM IN CLEAR PERSPECTIVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years some of those in the Government responsible for promoting the American merchant marine have claimed to appreciate the fact that our merchant shipping capability is in a state of dangerous decline.

One of the panaceas produced by these people has been to permit the building of ships for American operators in foreign shipyards on the theory that one of the root causes of our maritime decline is the high cost of building modern merchant ships in American shipyards.

This superficially simple proposal has been repeated so often that there is a tendency not to examine all of the facts in their true perspective.

Recently, Mr. Edwin M. Hood, the very able president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, presented a paper before the 15th annual Institute on Foreign Transportation and Port Operations at Tulane University in New Orleans, La., which should be read by every thoughtful person concerned with the merchant marine.

Mr. Hood carefully and objectively analyzes all aspects of our maritime problem and demonstrates how the U.S. Government can save 50 percent on maritime subsidies without resort to foreign construction.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Hood's paper, entitled "Putting the Maritime Problem in Clear Perspective," in the Record as an appendix.

PUTTING THE MARITIME PROBLEM IN CLEAR PERSPECTIVE—HOW THE U.S. GOVERNMENT CAN SAVE 50 PERCENT ON MARITIME SUBSIDIES WITHOUT RESORT TO FOREIGN CONSTRUCTION

(By Edwin M. Hood)

INTRODUCTION

There is little disagreement among those interested in national maritime affairs with respect to the present state of the U.S. merchant fleet: the ships are predominantly old and declining in number each year. Obviously, something must be done. Yet, there persists an area of substantial disagreement as to what should be done. It is to be hoped that constructive action will evolve from the continuing dialogue which began in earnest several years ago.

Much of the discussion has unfortunately been misinstructive, primarily by reason of a lack of perspective pertaining to the economic status of our maritime industry in world markets.
April 25, 1967

Congressional Record — House

10713

Certain economic factors exist which are not subject to change and a tendency to discount these factors has sometimes obscured tangible opportunities for improving the American merchant marine. Let us therefore consider the "facts of life" about U.S. flag ship operations in world markets. Several industries — aircraft, electronics, and shipbuilding — which could make our maritime industry more competitive.

Nonconstructive Accusations

Also, our merchant marine is rebuked for "high costs." All sectors of the industry have been criticized for their cost levels as compared to those of other nations. Shipyard operators have been berated because costs of building ships here are higher than in countries such as Japan. Some people contend, on spurious grounds, that costs are double here, though no modern cargo liner has been built elsewhere with the size, power and rigidity enforced quality specifications of U.S. built ships. This position is based on hypothetical construction of a ship in the lowest cost yard of the world — a shipyard specializing in building "takers" or "house" design in multiple copies to local standards. This position is presented as unbiased, but it is an argument of absence of evidence, whereas ship operators in nonsubsidized enterprises elsewhere on the globe have the ability to provide their shipbuilding industries, thus distorting any real competition.

Subsidized vessel operators have pointed out to them that U.S. seamen earn several times the wages that their foreign counterparts receive, as though those operators have a competitive advantage to the tremendous consumer purchasing power of our citizenry, such as the automotive and chemical industries. In fact, nearly the same number of automobiles are stolen each year in the United States as exist in Russia; annual production here equals the total number of automobiles in all of England.

The U.S. maritime industry enjoys neither advantage.

International Statistics Illustrate the Point

A brief examination of a few basic economic indicators illustrates the strength of our economy and the well-being of our citizens relative to other nations.

In 1964, the Gross National Product (GNP) of the United States was $629 billion. That combined GNP of the four principal nations of Free Europe — France, West Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom — was $352.5 billion. Our 192 million citizens purchased nearly 1.09 billion dollars of transportation services for the 210 million citizens of those leading countries. Governmental expenditures at all levels of the United States in 1964 were $128 billion. Our gross national expenditures were an amount nearly equal to the GNP of France and Italy combined. The growth in our GNP from 1964 to 1965 was over 64 billion — 42 billion less than the total GNP of Italy. Major U.S. Government foreign assistance programs totalled more than $102 billion between 1945 and 1965. We gave away an amount almost equal to the GNP of West Germany in 1964.

In the Far East, we find Japan with a GNP in 1964 of $36 billion, a population of 97 million, and no more than $45 billion for India with a population of 472 million.

The following chart illustrates the Domestic Product for 1963 further illustrates our fortune — our enviable economic position:

1963 Gross Domestic Product of Free World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total (Billion)</th>
<th>Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$3,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (West)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td></td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East and southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World total</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Estimated.
2. Not available.


The United States enjoyed 44% of the total free-world Gross Domestic Product. The per capita amount was over 50% above the next highest nation, Canada, and ranged from two to nearly five times greater than that in most other countries.

A comparison of amenities also demonstrates how well off our citizens are. In 1964, our 192 million population constituted 6% of the world's total of 3,230 million. Yet, we enjoyed 50% of the 2.3 billion civil aviation miles flown and 52% of the 160 million motor vehicles in use. Our citizens have flush toilets compared to 75% in West Germany and 9% in Japan.

The point of all these figures is to emphasize the competitive contest we have little chance of winning.

Economic Background — The Maritime Industry

The maritime industry, both shipbuilding and ship operations, does not benefit from barriers of distance and duties, nor from special subsidies or massive infusions of Government sponsored technological advance, nor from the powerful base of substantial domestic consumption. Our maritime industry exists because it can compete with other industries and nations of the world. Should the various maritime programs be eliminated, as some industry detractors suggest, there would be no national maritime industry since a world market confrontation solely on the basis of our wage rates versus foreign rates would invoke a competitive contest we have little chance of winning.

Recognizing how international wage structures are determined is a first step in formulating a constructive approach to revitalizing our maritime capabilities. The following chart illustrates various kinds of maritime programs we have today which accommodate this wage differential, we would have virtually no merchant fleet and no merchant marine capability. With these programs, we will.

The second step is to admit why the present dialogue is so intense. Our merchant fleet has grown small and old. Most of the ships are of World War II vintage and at that age can offer physically only a few more years of useful service and economically are already past their prime. Our National Defense Reserve Fleet (NDRF) which furnished ships for the Korean War, or 204 during the Suez Crisis and 180 for Viet Nam is in even worse condition both physically and economically.

We are caught in the strange paradox that as our foreign commerce increases and as our responsibilities for maintaining world peace increase in biological and political shores, our merchant marine capability declines. The more sea power we need, the less we have.

Those who say that the maritime industry is inefficient and archaic because it requires Federal Government support to survive are the same people who are the children of our statistics—happy society which has learned to express things in numeric terms and so lose the meaning of what they portray. For example, the cost of cargo handling in U.S. ports averages about four times that in foreign ports.
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Port charges for piloting, dockage and so forth, are double or more of those of other countries. Should we quit "subsidizing" our ports and longshoremen by carrying on our foreign commerce with nations which do not without merchant ships touching our shores? Of course not! Why spend money we could save by rolling back wages here to foreign levels. Or, as someone put it: if only we could earn 1917 wages, have 1915 prices and pay 1915 taxes, we would be a high-powered economy which lifts itself up by its own bootstraps to a level so high above the rest of the world that the entire structure of foreign competition would be collapsed.

Many other examples, equally ridiculous, are live examples of the concept: Shipowners are paid in a high-powered economy which lifts itself up by its own bootstraps to a level so high above the rest of the world that the entire structure of foreign competition would be collapsed. But this is idle dreaming. Under both approaches, unfortunately, our Government would be bankrupt with the taxes that would be collected.

In addition, we have run into a variety of alleged corrective measures of dubious logic. These include increased government subsidies per unit of cargo loaded for overseas on U.S. flag ships are military supplies. This rate will support a fleet of 375 ships. What kind of program is this for a nation which utilizes 40% to 45% in operating costs?
The Shipbuilders Council of America completed more than a year ago an extensive study of ways to reduce merchant shipbuilding costs. This study, which was conducted at the request of the Maritime Administration by experts from a group of outstanding professional specialists within the shipbuilding industry. Numerous recommendations were developed and presented, some of which have already been implemented.

The conclusion was that merchant ships could be built for 20% to 30% less than under present procurement practices. The entire savings would essentially accrue to the Federal Government, which would benefit in the construction differential subsidy.

These savings were not conjectural or whimsical. They were based on the combined experiences of men of competence and experience who build our merchant ships. They would not place themselves in the exposed position of predicting levels of savings which could not be attained if the conditions they specified were met. These conditions were straightforward detailed recommendations. Broadly, these included means for reducing red tape, elimination of over-designed features, administrative simplification, standardization of components and production of ships in multiples.

Automation of ship operations to allow crew reductions became an extremely important aspect in within proven ship design technology. An increase in vessel cost of about 10% for automation alone, allowed crew reductions of 50%. Since crew costs represent about one-third of total costs for current ships, and since operating subsidies covering these costs are paid to U.S. and foreign crew wages are more than 60% of total subsidy costs, the merit of such automation readily applies itself. The process should be accomplished in coordination with an expansion of our merchant fleet so that total shipboard employment is not reduced. This would avoid the economic harm to our seamen and would preserve the valuable national asset these skilled crew represent.

The effect of implementing both these cost reductions—production oriented ship construction and automated ship operations—could modify the operating costs of Table A as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Government Subsidy</th>
<th>Net Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crew wages</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
<td>$792</td>
<td>$223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and Interest</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>2,513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Not including port charges and cargo handling costs.
2. Construction subsidy expressed as cost per operating day.

The projections reflect a cost reduction potential for Federal Government subsidies of over 40% if the United States were to implement these programs. The United States could procure nearly twice the merchant fleet capacity it now possesses for no increase in subsidies over the long term. This would give us a fleet of new ships, a healthy supporting shipyard industry, and no net reduction in shipboard employment by the time the fleet size is doubled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Distribution of cost reduction potential for shipyards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ship costs in port</td>
<td>$2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship cost at sea</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port charges</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo handling</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These projections indicate savings may be as great as 35%. Certainly, doing everything possible to realize these savings is desirable. But, such reductions are not automatic. These ships require a tremendous volume of cargo. To make the most of their potential will require availability of cargo to move in great volume. In achieving this volume is the manner in which cargo preference cargo is handled and the extent of protection offered to a carrier over a particular trade route.

Current recommended changes to Federal Government programs appear to be exactly opposite to these two major incentives. This is difficult to rationalize in view of the magnitude of the cost reduction potential. It would be in the best interest of the United States to be in possession of maximum economic benefits at the expense of cargo owners. It is suggested that the cost of building ships for our flag abroad, or greater dependence on foreign flag shipping for our sea power requirements, is a recommendation for the Administration to make more consistent efforts to encourage American shipyards and American shipbuilding and to encourage American ownership of our merchant marine.

SUMMARY

The achievement of total equality in shipbuilding and ship operating costs between the United States and other maritime nations is a goal beyond our immediate possibility. Our society has progressed too far to make such a goal wholly attainable. Nevertheless, we must face the immediate need to maintain significant sea power. To obtain this capability the cost to the Federal Government will be considerable in terms of construction and operating payoffs. As a result, Congress is being asked to modernize the Merchant Marine and to establish new requirements for U.S. flag ships.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SUBMITS JOBS DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE ACT TO SPUR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL COUNTIES THROUGH TAX INCENTIVES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to submit a comprehensive proposal for spurring the creation of jobs in the rural areas of America.

The bill I am submitting will provide special tax incentives for businesses meeting certain requirements, which locate in counties designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as being eligible under the provisions of this bill. Among these tax incentives are:

1. An additional 7-percent credit for investment in machinery and equipment.
2. Second, accelerated tax amortization of investment in commercial and industrial facilities, including real estate, over a 7-year period.

Third, a tax credit for expenses incurred in the operation of employee training programs, parallel to the tax credit I have generally proposed in H.R. 4624, the Human Investment Act.

As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have become aware of the serious problems confronted by small town and rural economies. In fact, a small business subcommittee under the able direction of the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman John C. Kluczynski, is currently holding a series of hearings on the problems of small businesses in these areas. The proposals I am introducing today is the result of my experience as ranking minority member of this subcommittee and of my close collaboration with the chairman of the Small Business Committee, Congressman Joe L. Evins from Tennessee, Congressman Joe L. Evins from Tennessee.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, children of rural counties are forced to migrate to already crowded cities in order to find employment that will pay them a living wage. This rapid migration to urban areas creates serious problems for the cities—problems the Congress and the Federal Government are now beginning to wrestle with—but it also robs rural
counties of the skills and talents of these young people. Many of those who migrate to cities do so only through economic necessity. They are often hesitant to leave their counties, it is no longer essential for all services, it is no longer essential for all industry to be concentrated in the great urban centers. In fact, many industries today find that rural areas offer a more plentiful supply of skilled labor than some cities.

As an example, my home city of Rochester, N.Y., has a current rate of unemployment which is less than 1 percent. Nearby Wayne County, N.Y., which I also represent, had an unemployment rate of 6.8 percent in 1966. Both areas are served by good roads and railroads, but the trend toward the city and away from its countryside persists. Nearby Wayne County, N.Y., which I also represent. Located in the 13-county Appalachian area in the State had an unemployment rate of 8.1 percent in 1966. A total of five of these 13 counties have more than 15 percent of their families earning less than $1,500 per year. An additional 15 rural counties near or adjacent to the 13-county Appalachian area in the State have family income and unemployment statistics as bad or worse than the statistics of all of these 13 counties. A large percentage of workers are employed in counties outside their county of residence, usually in nearby counties. These statistics came to light in February when New York's Governor Rockefeller sought to expand the Appalachian program within our State to these additional areas.

The fact that these conditions exist in vast numbers of counties is indicative of the seriousness of this problem around the Nation.

Just as we must move quickly to bolster the great commercial and industrial cities of New York, which has many thriving cities, is indicative of the seriousness of this problem around the Nation.

As an additional encouragement to industry to locate in designated areas, my bill provides a tax credit for employee training programs, parallel to that allowed under the Human Investment Act as proposed in H.R. 4624, which I introduced earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides considerable tax advantages to a business locating in one of these undeveloped counties, but the cost to our Treasury will be far outweighed if this program is successful in spreading the economic growth of our Nation more evenly among geographic areas. I believe that this program can accomplish this goal without necessitating the creation of any new federally administered development grant programs. Under my bill, localities not yet designated as job development areas by the Department of Agriculture would be eligible to participate if they met the employment requirements of my bill. As an additional encouragement to industry to locate in designated areas, my bill provides a tax credit for employee training programs, parallel to that allowed under the Human Investment Act as proposed in H.R. 4624, which I introduced earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides considerable tax advantages to a business locating in one of these undeveloped counties, but the cost to our Treasury will be far outweighed if this program is successful in spreading the economic growth of our Nation more evenly among geographic areas. I believe that this program can accomplish this goal without necessitating the creation of any new federally administered development grant programs. Under my bill, localities not yet designated as job development areas by the Department of Agriculture would be eligible to participate if they met the employment requirements of my bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGER. Mr. Speaker, every Congressman has his share of problems and unusual experiences. While I have not yet had one colleague's experience of losing and losing my automatic type-writer, I contend my problem is equally disturbing.

I recently received over 24,000 responses to a questionnaire I circulated throughout my district. I sought to reply to those constituents who returned the questionnaire. Like many Congressmen, I sent my written responses to the Bureau of Engraving, sealing, and mailing to expedite this task.

During this bulk mailing, through someone's omission, one of my constituents received an absolutely blank sheet of letterhead in reply to his questionnaire response.

Fortunately, this constituent, Mr. George F. Smayling of St. Charles, Mo., is good natured. I would like to share with you his response to the blank paper I sent him, which follows:

ST. CHARLES, Mo., April 9, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, every Congressman recognizes his clear and present duty to prevent violence in constituencies' streets, but few Congressmen are called upon to prevent violence in their constituents' houses. However, unorthodox as my request may seem, no one can deny my right to place my problem squarely in the hands from whence it came.

The enclosed ?? ?? from your office has elicited four or five long, erudite, and zealous opinions each zealously defended by its proponent:

1. As a pragmatist and empiricist, I maintain that the constitution of America implies John Locke's tabula rasa that you are subtly affirming that your constituents' wishes are your own hands.

2. My wife is writing for your having created a "first." We have non-music music, as John Cage's compositions of twelve minutes of silence, and now non-letter letters, as John Cage's compositions of twelve minutes of silence, and now non-letter letters. Yours is the first, she says!

3. Compelling as our arguments are, our high school freshman son, studying civics as a philosophy of government, concludes that each genie in statismanship, are simply offering evidence (or non-evidence) of the ultimate in non-conversion.

4. Finally, our twelve-year-old son, a great mystery, spy novel fan, is convinced that there is a secret message on your letterhead. He has used all his "007" kit chemicals to no avail; undaunted, he is saving his allowance to buy more esoteric chemicals to reveal the invisible ink. Let's hope he tells us the message.

Your attention to our grave problem will be much appreciated. Naturally, each family member hopes he will judge correct in his interpretation; however, we have agreed to forgive and forget our differences, regardless of who is right, if you will only give us the answer.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE F. SMAYLING.
cated a realistic, well-thought-out solution to the problem of housing our foreign friends, many of whom are at a loss for adequate quarters in the District of Columbia. In those few areas where they may establish, space is simply not available.

To solve this problem, the President has proposed a larger, more desirable location in an area other than that provided in H.R. 6838. This larger area is a truly realistic and farsighted solution and would quarter a goodly number of the hundred-odd nations now having relations with the United States. In addition, this area would, I am sure, be of interest to several of the important international organizations, such as the Organization of American States. The OAS has long been anxious to acquire a decent location on which to build; but so far, without success.

This question is much more than simply a housekeeping problem; it touches on our conduct of our foreign affairs. If we are to be responsible and maturely hospitable to our foreign friends, might we not expect equal treatment abroad?

An editorial in the Washington Star of April 13, 1967, supports my view of the issue involved here, as follows:

FOOL SUBSTITUTES

The House of Representatives' proposal to make two separate tracts of land in the Kalorama area of Washington available for foreign chancellories has drawn a swift reaction. According to a State Department poll, not one of the 27 foreign governments seeking new chancery sites has the slightest interest in this area. Would that be the case, what purpose has been served by the House action?

Actually, the State poll is not surprising. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that the Kalorama area is not suitable for foreign offices under existing zoning, yet failed previously to evoke serious interest. Even if this were not so, however, the House-passed bill would hardly constitute a satisfactory alternative to the so-called International Center advocated by the National Capital Planning Commission near Washington Circle. Both the Kalorama sites are limited in size, and could provide at best only a portion of the space required to house a network of the International Center, carefully planned and tightly controlled, seeks a more lasting solution to the diplomatic quarters problem.

So the scene of battle moves now to the Senate stage, with the administration affirming its support of a slightly modified version of the House plan. However, if Senator Fulbright, in the absence of Senator Mapes, the current assistant protocol chief, suggests that the State Department will be in there pitching. State officials, however, have indicated in no uncertain terms that the State Department, which is primarily responsible for assisting foreign diplomats, will have only itself to blame.

SOVIET HYDROELECTRIC TURBINES LIKELY TO PROVE FAULTY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times reported on March 31 that the U.S.S.R. had asked the Interior Department if Moscow would be allowed to bid on the contract to supply hydroelectric turbines which will expand the generating capacity of the Grand Coulee Dam in Washington State. This contract would be worth approximately $100 million to the Soviets.

Aside from moral objections, the Senators of the United States are against the fact that we would have to such a transaction while our men are engaged in fighting against Soviet-supplied weapons in Vietnam. There is also the question of the depressing effect upon our domestic turbine industry. But to me the most important factor is the reliability of the equipment. Would the United States receive reliable equipment? The evidence that has come to my attention shows it is very likely that procurement of Soviet equipment could well delay our contemplated expansion of the generating power of the Grand Coulee Dam.

A study, published in 1964 by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, entitled "The Many Crises of the Soviet Economy," had this to say on page 9:

"The Soviet Union manufactured in 1960 about 3 million electric motors (0.5 kilowatt or more), having a total capacity of 25 million kilowatts, valued at 300 million rubles. The value (not depreciated) of all electric motors (0.5 kilowatt or more) manufactured in the U.S.S.R. is estimated to be about 1.45 billion rubles. The magnitude of repairs and maintenance caused by substandard quality and low reliability of the equipment can be seen in the fact that in 1960 about 10 million kilowatts of motor capacity underwent general repair and maintenance. The additional cost due to other repairs and maintenance, cost, in 1960, 1.2 billion rubles, required a staff of 350,000 people—of whom 10 percent were engineers and technicians—and consumed 25,000 tons of copper.

Downstream of new electric motors during their first year of life amounts to 30 to 40 percent of the total working time."

Again on page 13 of this study it states:

"Several Soviet industrial establishments are not too interested in increasing the quality, reliability, and service life of both producer and consumer equipment such as measuring and testing instruments, the use of more expensive materials, and it would necessitate an improvement of existing designs."

The deputy director of the Likhachev automobile plant in Moscow admitted that producers of passenger cars, some 4 billion pounds of milk equivalent, 25,000 tons of copper, and $100 million in new electric motors. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Dole, said that about 3 million electric motors of 0.5 kilowatt or more, having a total capacity of 25 million kilowatts, valued at 300 million rubles. The value (not depreciated) of all electric motors (0.5 kilowatt or more) manufactured in the U.S.S.R. is estimated to be about 1.45 billion rubles. The magnitude of repairs and maintenance caused by substandard quality and low reliability of the equipment can be seen in the fact that in 1960 about 10 million kilowatts of motor capacity underwent general repair and maintenance. The additional cost due to other repairs and maintenance, cost, in 1960, 1.2 billion rubles, required a staff of 350,000 people—of whom 10 percent were engineers and technicians—and consumed 25,000 tons of copper.

Downstream of new electric motors during their first year of life amounts to 30 to 40 percent of the total working time.

The damage caused by substandard quality and low reliability of the equipment can be seen in the fact that in 1960 about 10 million kilowatts of motor capacity underwent general repair and maintenance. The additional cost due to other repairs and maintenance, cost, in 1960, 1.2 billion rubles, required a staff of 350,000 people—of whom 10 percent were engineers and technicians—and consumed 25,000 tons of copper.

DOWNSTREAM OF NEW ELECTRIC MOTORS DURING THEIR FIRST YEAR OF LIFE AMOUNTS TO 30 TO 40 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL WORKING TIME.

The value (not depreciated) of all electric motors (0.5 kilowatt or more) manufactured in the U.S.S.R. is estimated to be about 1.45 billion rubles. The magnitude of repairs and maintenance caused by substandard quality and low reliability of the equipment can be seen in the fact that in 1960 about 10 million kilowatts of motor capacity underwent general repair and maintenance. The additional cost due to other repairs and maintenance, cost, in 1960, 1.2 billion rubles, required a staff of 350,000 people—of whom 10 percent were engineers and technicians—and consumed 25,000 tons of copper.

DOWNSTREAM OF NEW ELECTRIC MOTORS DURING THEIR FIRST YEAR OF LIFE AMOUNTS TO 30 TO 40 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL WORKING TIME.
Of course, we must have a strong dairy farm industry to assure American consumers of an adequate supply of milk, so this is a problem for all, farmers and consumers alike.

So here is the situation. The dairy farmers and the Secretary of Agriculture agree that something should be done to control imports. There is an emergency situation; that is why, as you are told, the Secretary met with farmers last week.

The call for setting of quotas under section 22 would be a short-term solution, if this did not take too long. These hearings by the Tariff Commission could take more than 6 months.

Under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the President can set quotas pending the report and recommendations of the Tariff Commission. In other words, the President has the authority to act immediately to limit these imports which are having a disastrous effect on our dairy farmers.

If the Secretary of Agriculture would report to the President that there is a situation which calls for emergency treatment, the President could act tomorrow to regulate the flow of dairy imports.

He could stop some of this grumbling from the farm belt which has caused him to take emergency action and send the Secretary out to see if he can throw some water on the fire out there in the Midwest.

The President can do this now, temporarily stopping the flow of dairy imports in evasion of quotas.

This action would help the dairy farmers; that permanent solution is in effect. And, the dairy farmers are united on what this situation should be. They are for passage of the Dairy Import Act of 1967, which would set quotas, while allowing importers to share in our domestic markets.

The administration can best serve the dairy farmers of this country by taking immediate action under section 22—while it is not too late—to do what is needed in stopping the flow of imports before more dairy farmers decide to leave their farms.

TRIBUTE TO DR. EARNEST BRANDENBURG

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include pertinent material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the education community suffered a great loss in the death of Dr. Earnest Brandenburg, president of Drury College in Springfield, Mo., to a few short years ago he established the great new field of human relations in Missouri. He had the highest respect of the community, the students, the faculty of the college, and the education community at large. One of the finest tributes to Dr. Brandenburg appeared in the April 14 issue of the Drury Mirror, written by Gale Montgomery. His actions truly spoke so loud that words cannot tell, but this article vividly portrays the depth of our sense of loss....

A PERSONAL TRAGEDY FOR MANY

(By Gale Montgomery)

In an early morning class, a Drury professor made the unusual request that his students bow their heads. He reverently thanked God for the "great humanitarian who had been our president for all too short a time." He prayed that Dr. Brandenburg's guidance as a Drury student, and the whole of those he knew would remain in the spirit of the college forever.

Dr. Brandenburg's death was not only a loss for the college, it was a deep personal tragedy for the many people who knew him well.

I met Dr. Brandenburg in the fall of 1964 when we both arrived on campus. After being introduced to him in a long reception line and feeling very impressed by the warmth and kindness with which seemed to radiate from this man, I learned that he was to be my counselor. I faced the first year of college with small anticipation of the experience. However, I was no cause for anxiety. It was the first of many times that Dr. Brandenburg took time during the course of a busy day to talk about my problems and ambitions. I know from this experience that he had much concern for every student in the college. The great achievements he made for the campus were the inspiration of his desire that every Drury student have every possible education advantage. To this ideal he was dedicated.

Dr. Brandenburg fought many winning battles for the college with the assistance of advisors and the administration. It was a delicate task that he alone, and this battle too, was not fought alone. Another dedicated man made every attempt known to medicine to save Dr. Brandenburg's life. As a medical doctor, he too has a deep concern for the welfare of the people that he serves. That these two great men would come together to fight the overwhelming odds of cancer was a trick of fate that influenced both of their lives with lasting impressions. Dr. Brandenburg had complete faith and confidence in his doctors, his nurses, and his patients. He knew that his death was inevitable, and his medical ethics of his profession would allow. He spoke of Dr. Brandenburg as one of the "greatest men that he had ever known." He had an intellectual mind as merely a part of the man who loved life and lived it well. Even during the last days Dr. Brandenburg spent in the hospital, he retained his infinite capacity to make, and be, a friend. The doctor referred to our former president with the word that often came to the minds of many, the word "brother." Dr. Brandenburg was loved. By the student, by the faculty, by a doctor and nurse who shared with his family the last days of his life.

I will remember Dr. Brandenburg because he was my friend. He was a gentleman who built his own memorial in the hearts of everyone he knew.

PROPOSED 48-PERCENT TAX ON NET ADVERTISING INCOME

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle man from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the duty of Congress to take a closer look from time to time at the rules and regulations issued by the Internal Revenue Service which has the duty of collecting those taxes imposed on public service organizations. I believe that a detailed examination is called for at this time, particularly since the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, Sheldon S. Cohen, is in the position of being able to control the regulations which are tantamount to a death tax on some of the finest public service organizations in the Nation.

Mr. Cohen seeks to impose a 48-percent tax on the net advertising income, across the board, on publications dedicated and using their resources to promote a better life for the youth of the Nation, for progress in science, medicine, and the arts.

I believe the Nation's tax collector is ill-advised in his zeal to crush the financial stability of such organizations as the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the National Geographic Society, the American Historical Association, the American Medical and Dental Associations, and the American Bar Association—to name a few who will be hardest hit. The Commissioner is allowed to have his way.

The facts, Mr. Speaker, are these public service groups do compete with such publications as Life, Look, Time, and Newsweek for the advertising dollar, but do not use the advertising dollar for activities which are primarily for profit. The Commissioner can see no reason, under the Internal Revenue Code, why these groups should not be allowed to use this advertising dollar to improve the quality of life in this country. The revenue totals a little over $100 million annually, and in the case of the Scouting movement it is used to train boys and girls for better citizenship—something that no other organization has done as successfully as it has by day's world. The medical journals use the revenue derived from the sale of advertising to advise and inform medical practitioners of new devices, drugs, and techniques in medicine. The National Geographic Society promotes exploration and scientific studies; the chamber of commerce, with revenue from its publications, a better business climate; new business and industry techniques, and therefore more jobs and higher tax revenues from the creation of them.

The Commissioner's edict, in addition to chipping away more revenue for the Internal Revenue Service, is placing himself in the role, not only of a censor, but of an advocate of antitrust activity among public service organizations. His apparent intention is to promote competition among those seeking the advertising dollar, but punishing those organizations who use their funds for public service.

I contend that this activity should be taken only after the judgment of Congress has been determined, or by the courts of the Nation; which have ample precedent for determining what is fair and unfair in today's business markets.
For years, Mr. Speaker, some of our leading foundations have operated in a tax-exempt status, and wrongfully in many cases, if the prevailing opinion in Congress is any standard. Many of these foundations do good work, but others, I understand, are simply tax dodging operations.

Such is not the case, insofar as I know, in relation to those public service organizations which in my opinion are seriously affected by the Internal Revenue Commissioner.

I believe it is an obligation of Congress to protect this proposed action against, not only the legal progress, legal refinements, and scientific advancement, but instead with some of the macaroni factory and use it for'such in relation to those public service organizations which in my opinion are seriously affected by the Internal Revenue Commissioner. I believe the Collector of Internal Revenue in this instance is relying on an outdated mandate from Congress. His contemplated action is based on a 17-year-old law, which was enacted for the purpose of curbing an abuse on the part of a tax-exempt university, which sought to acquire a macaroni factory and use it for profit. I believe it is a bad tradition with other producers of the same product.

We are not dealing with macaroni here, Mr. Speaker, but instead with some of the money that is being spent into the Nation to improve the general welfare.

Congress should halt this newest effort of the Internal Revenue Collector until it has had time to examine the full impact of the proposed regulations and until it has heard from those whose lifelong efforts are about to be swept down the drain of over increasing taxation.

I have reason to believe that the Commissioner does not deny that the principal expenditures made by the tax-exempt organizations in question are used for public service, community and individual betterment, and the advancement of science and medicine.

For example, the American Bar Association spends its income in improving our judicial system, encouraging the study and advancement of our legal system, promoting the professionalization of our legal profession, and encouraging the profession to serve the poor communities. The American Dental Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill., spends its income in developing and promoting improved teaching methods and higher educational prerequisites for the dental profession. The American Hospital Association, 600 South Michigan, Chicago, Ill., spends its income in improving our health care system and in community action and being responsible to the community. The American Psychological Association, 1200 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C., spends its income developing and promoting the advancement of exploration and for the advancement of science and technology. I shall include that editorial at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania has produced far more coal than any other State in the Union. Anthracite was mined as early as 1769, and within 20 years bituminous coal was being extracted from beneath the earth of western Pennsylvania. In the intervening years a total of almost 14 billion tons has been produced.

Accidents have taken a heavy toll of our miners, but all precautions are taken to provide protection against roof falls, explosions, and other dangers incident to working deep in the bowels of the earth.

Our miners are also subjected to the very real possibility of contracting silicosis, emphysema, and other bronchial and lung diseases that can come from working in atmospheres laden with dust. While it is not possible to predict those that will die because they worked in underground uranium mines. Just how many men already exposed to the radiation that will prove fatal will not be known for some time, as it often takes between 17 and 20 years from the start of mining to the start of lung cancer.

The peak of employment of uranium miners in this country came in the late 1950’s and the early 1960’s. On April 14 the matter was the subject of a Post editorial stating bluntly that a death warrant for as many as 1,150 uranium miners has in effect been signed by the Atomic Energy Commission, the sole purchaser of uranium in this country. I shall include that editorial at the conclusion of my remarks. It must be read with care by every Member of Congress for it contains many charges and implications that cannot be overlooked.

Can my colleagues fully comprehend the mental anguish that exposure to radiation in unsafe mines has created for the victims and their families in addition to the cruel physical suffering that is ahead for those sentenced to death? The tragic assumption is that the conditions might have been corrected but it seems that these conditions have developed because of a consortium of se-
crecy between certain of our Federal agencies—the Departments of Labor, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare, together with the Atomic Energy Commission—as well as, regrettably, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

If such callous treatment of an employee were chargeable to industry, these Federal agencies would utilize every means of forcing and/or penalizing the guilty parties so that conditions would be corrected and such restitution as possible would be forthcoming.

This indifference to human suffering by Federal agencies is deplorable enough, but it is all the more appalling that members of the Joint Committee could be aware of conditions and still acquiesce to the wishes of the AEC and other offices involved.

The AEC has too long been considered a "sacred cow," never to be criticized or even questioned. Typical is AEC's arrogation of granting licenses for construction and operation of reactors in communities where the citizenry opposes, not the citizenry opposes, all the while keeping as quiet as possible the fact that recovery of full damages from an atomic accident is limited and that private insurance companies that do not foresee radiation damage come from homeowners policies. Congress, of course, must bear responsibility for granting such authority. Perhaps, as the full range of the Price-Anderson law and its implications come to be better understood, Members of the House and Senate will finally recall from the AEC a power that it never should have been granted in the first place.

The longsilenced news of what is happening to uranium miners should awaken the Nation to the questionable antics of the AEC and its consorts downtown and on Capitol Hill.

The failure of our own joint congressional committee to act in the best interests of uranium miners and general public makes urgent a complete review of the AEC, its offices, and people.

The failure of our own joint congressional committee to act in the best interests of uranium miners and general public makes urgent a complete review of the AEC, its offices, and people.

The Federal editorial follows:

"From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 18, 1967"

**AEC DEATH MINES**

A death warrant for perhaps 1,150 uranium miners has been signed by the Atomic Energy Commission, the sole purchaser of uranium in this country. Only two health problems remain to be tied up. First, the miners must be told; the second, predicting their death from lung cancer, caused by radiation exposure in unsafe mines, is still a secret declassified to the Federal establishment.

Secondly, the miners must die; lung cancers is usually not detected for 10 or 20 years after exposure.

In truth, a good many more than 1,150 uranium miners may expect to die of lung cancer, since the radiation standards in effect today, although improved, remain feeble. Moreover, the standards being considered by the inter-agency Federal Radiation Council, a creature of the AEC, are widely expected to remain unchanged, as is indicated by the fact that they were to be enforced. They are "weak," one internal Government paper says, calling the AEC's new standards "would reflect badly on this (HEW) and other departments for previous failure to act."

In addition, some miners would be allowed to continue working and some miners put out of work. That the possible alternative to unemployment is death evidently has not been considered.

Not only the AEC but the Departments of Labor, Interior and HEW, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have, over the years found the flimsiest pretext of jurisdiction, cost and security to avoid their responsibilities to the miners. Existing, internationally accepted radiation standards should be adopted at once. The Federal Government must guarantee the payment of compensation claims to cancer-stricken miners, or their widows. Not one miner should be allowed to work for one more day in an Atomic Energy Commission death mine.

**BURNS DITCH**

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

The Indiana Dunes: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. Saylor, Mr. Speaker, anyone who has followed closely the current scheme to build a Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal was certain to recognize the fallacy in the recent declaration by the Army Engineers that the project is "economically justified."

This assessment of the value of the $1,036,850,000 ditch—with $568,200,000 to come from the U.S. Treasury—recalls these definitions of the word, "water," from Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary:

a: capital stock not representing assets of the issuing company and not backed by earning power
b: fictitious or exaggerated asset entries that give a stock an unrealistic book value.

These interpretations could also apply to much of the water for water projects which the Army Engineers concoct with utmost fluidity and without concern for accepted standards of liquidation. One of their more notorious calculations pertains to the benefit/cost ratio for Burns Ditch Harbor, a needless undertaking that would destroy much of the beauty and recreational value of the Indiana Dunes and surrounding lake areas.

In the Isaac Walton magazine for February 1967, Mr. Herbert P. Read recounts some of the manipulations that have taken place in the process of persuading the Engineers to arrive at their mysterious conclusions for Burns Ditch. Mr. Read also provides a measure of the Engineers' history which should be made known to all Members of Congress.

In a recent article, Congressman Mr. Read points out that, while the Indiana Dunes controversy is a typical case history of conservation battles everywhere, it has highlighted the growing conflict between industry and public interest in industrial development. The cost of antagonism included land speculators, politicians, engaged secret deals, and the Army Engineers. By helping them to preserve a harbor for Burns Ditch on the southern tip of Lake Michigan serving primarily Midwest Steel and Bethlehem Steel Companies, the Army Engineers became the instrument by which the Indiana Dunes were granted federal status. The development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore can't be said it was almost too late. By issuing a landfill permit, they may yet destroy what Congress has, thus far, found it advantageous to keep affairs as they are.

The Indiana Dunes controversy is a typical case history of conservation battles everywhere. It has highlighted the growing conflict between industry and public interest in industrial development. The cost of antagonism included land speculators, politicians, engaged secret deals, and the Army Engineers. By helping them to preserve a harbor for Burns Ditch on the southern tip of Lake Michigan serving primarily Midwest Steel and Bethlehem Steel Companies, the Army Engineers became the instrument by which the Indiana Dunes were granted federal status. The development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore can't be said it was almost too late. By issuing a landfill permit, they may yet destroy what Congress has, thus far, found it advantageous to keep affairs as they are.
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...ters. In 1916, Stephen Mather, first Director of the National Park Service, reported on the early federal acquisition of the 25-miles of dunes shoreline between the steel city of Gary, Indiana and the resort enclave of Lake Michi­
great, Michigan. Also in 1916, Indiana’s United States Senator Tom Taggart introduced the first “Save the Dunes” bill in Congress. The bill was killed at the 11th hour with the threat of a presidential veto.

By the 1920’s, local Indiana politi­
cians viewed the Dunes as a gold mine for land speculation with promoters of steel mills and a harbor. Their opposition forced conservationists to accept a 5-mile state park. Promises to enlarge the park were made; local parades were made after 1926. The depression of the 1930’s slowed both residential and industrial growth. The 11,000 acre piece of land remained on the Bethlehem property, to its heritage of natural beauty. In 1952, the Save the Dunes Council was formed, but by this time, the Burns Ditch harbor proposal was dead. The point for con­

atives was in 1956 when Bethlehem Steel Co. acquired a large portion of the best of the dunes area, after a series of secret, political and financial deals. The proposed harbor was relocated to be between Bethle­

hemit and Midwest Steel Companies in the dunes area.

The clash was then inevitable. Conser­
vationists and harbor proponents and industri­
ally-minded politicians were both in the fray. The Army Engineers recommended federal funds for the harbor based on their economic feasibility studies. The value of the Dunes to the steel-makers was stated after a few paragraphs and the dunes park proposals seemed dim.

But as the Army Engineers usually unques­tioned views were taken by other federal officials of the harbor in the form of a Benefit/Cost ratio began its move through federal channels toward ut­

limate approval. This move was to result in a little sand in the usually well-oiled gears. The Engineering Committee of the Save the Dunes Council, which I served as chairman, discovered that the Army Engineers’ Benefit/Cost ratio was based on incorrect, unrealistic projections, and erroneous assumptions. We managed to find an impartial forum with the U.S. Bureau of the Budget which had not yet approved the harbor project. The Budget Bureau, with its own views, which generally vindicated our criticisms. The Army Engineers, for the first time, beat a strategic retreat. The Bethlehem Steel Dunes bill was also stalled in Congress, due to the opposition of most of the Indiana politicians.

In 1963, President Kennedy proposed a plan which included conditional approval of the harbor, and eliminated the Bethlehem Steel Company property from the Lake­

shore boundaries. In return, the Indiana politi­
cians agreed to support a National Lake­

shore proposal of about 11,000 acres.

While this story deals primarily with the Bethlehem Steel landfill, rather than the harbor controversy, our experience offers its first clear cut view of the battle between America the Beautiful. To wit: When the Army Engineers sanctimoniously proclaim that the proposed landfill, containing Scenic Site VIII, the “only feasible alternate” and that the Benefit/Cost ratio “proving the landfill will work,” they are dismissing the Army Engineers’ back-up figures and have someone qualified analyze them.

At long last, in 1966, 50 years after that claim was discovered, after the dunes of the proposed landfill were stripped and leveled to make way for a finishing mill. This occurred while a congressional Lakeshore bill and despite pleas from conservationists, congressional leaders, and Interior Secretary Stewart Udall. And still, 11,000 acres of high dunes remained on the Bethlehem property along the lake. The landfill filling in process permits Bethlehem Steel to get rid of these high dunes which the company and Indiana politicians have for years denied the very existence of. It also will provide a dumping ground for slag and other excess process waste when the “surplus” dunes are gone, as recently admitted by a Bethlehem Steel official an authenticate, that such a permit can be extended periodically, and Bethlehem can continue to dump farther out into Lake Michigan.

Any projection into the lake at this point interrupts a littoral drift parallel to the beach to dissipate the “washes” the beach to dissipate any build-up, and which already exists in the water. A continuous erosion and replenishing of sand also occurs. The claim that the Army Engineers made that the landfill would interrupt or alter this natural process and result in beach ero­

sion. Artificial remedial measures are costly. The Indiana Port Commission supposedly bears the financial responsibility, but no funds for the purpose have been authorized or appropriated. In fact, few people in Indiana know of the situation.

The landfill is not essential to the con­
struction of the port Indiana is building on the lake between Bethlehem and Midwest Steel Companies. It is not essential to the expansion plans for the steel companies. Bethlehem Steel Co., yes—but not essential. Filling in Lake Michigan for private use is not essential. This project was granted only when in the overall public in­

terest. Title to the offshore land is held by the State of Indiana. Long ago, the steel companies have pushed hard for it. It is possible to acquire title to filled-in land after approval by state officials. But Inland Steel and Pittsburgh Steel have to use the finish­ing mill virtually automatically. This does not prevent the steel and the steel companies from playing little games in jockeying back and forth for favors or concessions. The agreement which transferred part of Bethlehem’s land to the Indiana Port Commission for the har­
bor, and their subsequent turn “independently” of the Indiana politicians that the landfill was essential to the harbor.

We knew of President Kennedy’s ultimate intent to bring about the soil and growth of this “essential” to the “public” port, or that the permit from the state was granted without public hearings and without publicity. A few days later, a Chicago newspaper uncorked the fact that a key man, in approving the landfill for Bethlehem, had alternately worked for the Army Engineers, then for Bethlehem and back again for the Army Engineers. The resultant furor forced Army Secretary Stan­ley Resor to suspend the permit and hold public hearings.

The bid was off. No longer could Bethle­

hem hope to slip through the landfill permit quietly. Interior Secretary Udall prepared his own case for the public hearings. But he did not oppose the landfill. Bethlehem called in its credit chits with the Indiana politicians.

The Army Engineers were still in the mix of television cameras and busloads of reporters a parade of politicians and port promoters claimed that the Bethlehem filling was “essential” to the “public” port, or that it was part of the 1963 port—park compromise. I prepared and submitted testi­
ymony in support of the public hearing and otherwise. The Indiana Division of The Isaak Walton League opposed the landfill and a National Wildlife Federation establishing general principles and against the filling of shorelines.

Testifying on behalf of the Department of the Interior, my colleagues, Interior Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, said: “the Congress has declared it to be unlawful to build or fill in navigable waters
of the United States unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army. But it does not follow that, in deciding whether to make a filling, the Secretary of the Army acts only with the advice of the Chief of Engineers. The Secretary of the Army is to concern himself only with the negative aspect of whether the proposed project will unreasonably affect navigation.

... It is the applicant (Bethlehem Steel Co.) who must establish that the public interest requires the permit. As we viewed in terms of the broadest public interest, Army should, in this case especially be concerned with the harbor entrance near the head with the harbor entrance near the head of the Army Engineers for the approval of the Army. But it does not matter. What mattered to the Army Engineers was that most of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is being sent to the U.S. Senate. The Interior Department was stalled off from early July to October 11, a period during which the end of the year management agreement was negotiated and after the Army Engineers had their plan in the works. What pertinory conferences were held were not pressure on the press and public outrage. The real prizewinner in the letter is the excuse for contributing to the visual pollution of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Mr. Fitt states:

"A power plant with typical smoke stacks seems one of the most offensive to national lakeshores and the Bethlehem property."

He neglected to mention that the Lakeshore is only 1,700 feet from the smokestacks, which he was a crew member of a similar type bulldozer at the entrance to Michigan City harbor. His companion was drowned due to the fact that when he was washed overboard he was dashed against the bulkhead.

Several compromise proposals were offered, including one which I developed, which would have permitted a smaller landfill and effectively screened the industrial complex. The letters encouraged the Army Engineers nor consultations to investigate the merits of our proposals.

The Interior Department continued to ask for the Army Corps of Engineers to resolve the differences or arrive at a meaningful compromise. As late as October 12, 1966, Interior was still asking for conferences, stating that "The Interior Department is ready and anxious to provide that consultation here."

As the record now stands, it is apparent that Bethlehem has not made a case of necessity; there is both a risk of pollution and a detrimental esthetic effect. I believe that the Army Engineers have not shown to us until after the reissuance of the permit. The concessions were so minimal and the landfill was reduced from 333 acres to 300 acres. The east bulkhead of the landfill was made generally perpendicular to the shore and called for a row of trees. What kind of trees can hide 280 feet high blast furnaces?

Most revealing are the excuses being peddled by the Army Engineers to back up more of the landfill. A letter over the signature of Alfred B. Fitt, General Counsel of the Army Engineers, has been protested to the permit. He protested the landfill. It is a masterpiece of "managed news." For example, the danger of air and water pollution is dismissed being a matter of the Army Engineers interpret "the local interest," the Army Engineers interpret "local interests" as the key politicians, business and industrial interests.

The voice of the "people" and especially "conservationists" are not tolerated or the presence of the politicians is most important. Unfortunately, as the reports are often more responsive to power plays within their state, and the Army Engineers end up by being required to do something about them.

Intentional or not, that is the way it is. Once the decision is made to ultimately the permit. The Secretary of the Army benefit/cost ratio must be arranged to come out favorably. Figures don't lie, but liars can figure, and since estimates of the future can't be verified, it is a comfort to the Army Engineers tap the pork barrel realized that the Army Engineers realized that the Army Engineers realized that the Army Engineers realized that.... The Army Engineers realized that the Army Engineers realized that the Army Engineers realized that....

More and more of the contours of America are altered and buried in concrete, and today it is reported that the Chief of Engineers regards public hearings as an annoying delay before getting on with the business of resource utilization.

But lately the pioneer philosophy of exploitation is being modified to allow for preservation, recognizing that "progress" has a mystical connotation, it is a relationship, rather than destruction of nature. The problem is that such contemporary thinking has been based on a little more of determining a Benefit/Cost ratio. In 1962, Congress and President Kennedy sought to update the Army Engineers with Senate Document 97, which sets forth polices on the use and development of water resources, and thus determines the responsibility of the Army Engineers with the Secretary of Interior.

"Well-being of all of the people shall be the overriding determinant in considering the best use of water and related resources. Hardship and basic needs of particular groups within the general public shall be of concern, but care shall be taken to avoid resource use and development for the benefit of the few or the disadvantage of the many."
the concept of outdoor recreation for public works projects, but sometimes, as with Glen Canyon, a more valuable resource was lost. In such cases of conflict with conservation values, the loss is duly noted, but does not lower the Ben Franklin standard.

Quite obviously, a reformation is needed, and fast!

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. For 14 of the 18 years

of the existence of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the city of Norfolk, home of NATO Headquarters, has recog-nized and honored the NATO countries with the International Azalea Festival. Each NATO country is represented at the festival by a lovely princess and by other officials, often including the ambassador. The festival runs for almost a full week and its functions are numerous and varied. One of the highlights is the joint civic club luncheon which is attended by all of the city’s civic, polit-ical, business, and professional leaders.

Last Thursday I had the pleasure and privilege of presenting the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, who spoke at the civic club luncheon. He and I are both pertinent and timely since they occurred so close to the anniversary of the signing of the NATO Treaty in April of 1949, and dealt with subjects of major concern to the whole North Atlantic Community. So that the entire membership of the House may have an opportunity to read Secretary Fowler’s address, I am inserting it here:

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY H. FOWLER

It is a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to speak here at the head-quarters of the NATO Atlantic Fleet. It is an official pleasure because NATO, while it is a great part of our international security, is something more than that. It also has important and valuable economic aspects today’s world, and I am officially deeply interested in the economic side of NATO.

Apart from this, it is a great personal pleasure for me to take part in this Azalea festival, and join you in honoring the charming young ladies who grace it. In connec-tion with NATO, this was perhaps the most fortunate coincidence that the young lady who has been selected as Queen of the festi-val this year comes to our shores from Belgium—an ally small in territorial size—great in power—rich in wisdom—and courageous in time of adversity.

The military headquarters of NATO in Europe has moved this year to Belgium, as you know, and I feel that it is a happy quirk of history that the Atlantic Fleet Headquarters at this time we are honoring a lovely representative of the Belgian nation.

At the last NATO Ministerial meeting, Belgian Foreign Minister Harel introduced a resolution, which has since become known as the Belgian Regional Initiative, to set up, within NATO, a high-level commission for the review and exam-ination of the future course of NATO in view of changing military situations. This commis-sion will be particularly concerned with po-liitical and economic aspects of the alliance. You will wish me to make it clear that the Ministerial Meeting to be held in June, and will make its final report in December.

The commission is proceeding to wise move at this point. For we are looking today at a NATO which is in process of...
change—and that change is a tribute to the world. More specifically, the advances which the nations of Europe have made since the end of World War II and the days of the Marshall Plan.

In making this current, up-to-date backdrop that I would like today to take a look at NATO in the context of the Atlantic Community.

The Atlantic Community has come about for very good reason—principally the need for free men to band together for protection of their freedom. Many of the governing factors which brought about the creation of NATO in the first place continue to grow in importance; the reason for their existence, as we continue to knit our nations together.

Time and distance continue to shrink. Businessmen and technicians continue to weave their intercontinental links. The jets are loaded these days with them coming from or going to another continent for some commercial or scientific purpose. The seas that once did not occupy hold tourists bent on visiting countries other than their own for reasons of kinship, culture, scenery or sheer pleasure. The economic Atlantic is associated with the health of the economies on the other side of the ocean. And we know, too, that the bonds that stretch national of one of my big problems as Secretary of the Treasury is to work out with finance officials of other nations improved international monetary arrangements to avoid restrictions on this commerce and facilitate free flow of goods, toward the Atlantic Community. There are countless and meaningful links of history, culture, religion and blood. And, of great significance, we share a history of participation in the ideas of government and of the freedom of man have flowed back and forth across the Atlantic. The colonial history and the abstract thought and aspiration and many of their ideas from the writings of ancient Greece and Rome as well as their continental and British contemporaries. Basically we share the same kind of economic and industrial organizations. We have stable and abundant economies, the kind which, if properly harnessed, could take much to help hunger and misery not only in our own countries but in the less developed areas of the world.

The Atlantic Community is designed to establish and maintain security for the region. The treaty signed on April 4, 1949, opened a new era in the diplomatic history of the United States, so different from our past history of aloofness and non-involvement that stretched back to our beginnings as a nation. May I add it was also a new era in the history of the United States and the clock back to a past when the nation-state was supreme. Never has the old cliche, "Time waits for no man" been more true than today, for the clock has passed nationalist thinking.

The North Atlantic Alliance is designed to establish and maintain security for the region. The treaty signed on April 4, 1949, opened a new era in the diplomatic history of the United States, so different from our past history of aloofness and non-involvement that stretched back to our beginnings as a nation. May I add it was also a new era in the history of the United States and the clock back to a past when the nation-state was supreme. Never has the old cliche, "Time waits for no man" been more true than today, for the clock has passed nationalist thinking.

The Atlantic Community is designed to maintain security for the region. The treaty signed on April 4, 1949, opened a new era in the diplomatic history of the United States, so different from our past history of aloofness and non-involvement that stretched back to our beginnings as a nation. May I add it was also a new era in the history of the United States and the clock back to a past when the nation-state was supreme. Never has the old cliche, "Time waits for no man" been more true than today, for the clock has passed nationalist thinking.

There are countless and meaningful links of history, culture, religion and blood. And, of great significance, we share a history of participation in the ideas of government and of the freedom of man have flowed back and forth across the Atlantic. The colonial history and the abstract thought and aspiration and many of their ideas from the writings of ancient Greece and Rome as well as their continental and British contemporaries. Basically we share the same kind of economic and industrial organizations. We have stable and abundant economies, the kind which, if properly harnessed, could take much to help hunger and misery not only in our own countries but in the less developed areas of the world.

The Atlantic Community is designed to establish and maintain security for the region. The treaty signed on April 4, 1949, opened a new era in the diplomatic history of the United States, so different from our past history of aloofness and non-involvement that stretched back to our beginnings as a nation. May I add it was also a new era in the history of the United States and the clock back to a past when the nation-state was supreme. Never has the old cliche, "Time waits for no man" been more true than today, for the clock has passed nationalist thinking.

The Atlantic Community is designed to establish and maintain security for the region. The treaty signed on April 4, 1949, opened a new era in the diplomatic history of the United States, so different from our past history of aloofness and non-involvement that stretched back to our beginnings as a nation. May I add it was also a new era in the history of the United States and the clock back to a past when the nation-state was supreme. Never has the old cliche, "Time waits for no man" been more true than today, for the clock has passed nationalist thinking.

The Atlantic Community is designed to establish and maintain security for the region. The treaty signed on April 4, 1949, opened a new era in the diplomatic history of the United States, so different from our past history of aloofness and non-involvement that stretched back to our beginnings as a nation. May I add it was also a new era in the history of the United States and the clock back to a past when the nation-state was supreme. Never has the old cliche, "Time waits for no man" been more true than today, for the clock has passed nationalist thinking.
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A bill to provide for financing the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sum of $131,000, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(f)), is appropriated to the General Services Administration for the purpose of financing the construction of the Jacksonville Federal Building, and such funds shall be available for the payment of labor and materials for construction of such building and for expenditures incurred in connection with the construction of such building. 

The General Services Administration has provided 131 parking spaces for patrons of the building, which is a much-needed facility, which will house 31 Government agencies and 1,600 employees, and will save the taxpayers almost $450,000 in annual rental fees. The new building is a wonderful thing for Jacksonville and the Third Congressional District of Florida. However, it has been constructed in a very crowded area of the city and this fact has brought about a very difficult situation.

There has been no adequate planning for employee and visitor parking for the new building. When the Jacksonville Federal Building was initially authorized, the Government policy was not to provide for sufficient employee and visitor parking. In recent years that policy has been changed as to new buildings, but the change was too late for the Jacksonville project.

The General Services Administration has provided 131 parking spaces for Government employees and visitors. However, it has been constructed in a very crowded area of the city and this fact has brought about a very difficult situation.

I have been contacted by many employees of the Federal Government in Jacksonville who will be moving into the new building and the parking committee of the downtown council. They are concerned about the lack of planning for parking. In an effort to solve this problem I have had lengthy conversations and meetings with the GSA at the highest level. The GSA has made a survey of the parking situation near the building, and has come to the conclusion that more parking is needed. But no funds have been requested to provide adequate parking.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills which will bring about a speedy solution to the parking problem for the new Jacksonville Federal Building and also provide for broadened GSA authority to solve construction and alteration problems in public buildings similar to the parking problem in Jacksonville.

H.R. 9057 authorizes the GSA Administration, as to the construction of principal, intermediate, and maintenance parking facilities in Jacksonville, Florida.

H.R. 9056 provides for financing the construction and alteration of public buildings by enlargement of the activities encompassed in the present GSA buildings management fund and to designate the fund as the "Federal Buildings Fund." It will give a sound solution to the parking problem for the Federal buildings on a nationwide basis.

I have requested departmental reports and early hearings on the legislation. I am hopeful for fast action to help alleviate this pressing problem at the new Jacksonville Federal Building.

Copies of the two bills follow:

H.R. 9056

"(C) the term 'construction' includes site administrative expenses, and (N) for all expenditures, including supplemental and administrative operations of real property management and related activities.

"(3) The fund shall be credited with (1) appropriations for acquisition, development, and improvement of real property, together with improvements, in any manner authorized by law, for public buildings and parking facilities, including payments in the nature of rental equivalents for Government-owned or leased real property; (2) proceeds from sales or from any other source, including receipts from the disposal of property not acquired for real property use; (3) proceeds from parking, from available appropriations and funds of any agency, including General Services Administration, Federal employee, private, public, or organizational parking facilities, space, quarters, maintenance, repair, or other facilities which are furnished, at rates to be determined by the Administrator, and the funds provided for in regulations issued by him, on the basis of estimated or actual costs (including administrative expenses, repair, and where applicable, provision for public liability and damage claims, and depreciation), and (4) all other reimbursements, and refunds or recoveries resulting from operations of the fund, including the net proceeds of disposal of excess or surplus real and personal property and receipts from carriers and others for loss of, or damage to property.

"(4) No funds appropriated to any Federal agency and transferred to General Services Administration shall be used for the acquisition or construction of public buildings and parking facilities, unless such acquisition or construction has been authorized by the Congress: Provided, That no funds shall not apply to any project hereafter or hereover approved in the manner provided for in the Public Buildings Act of 1958, as amended.

"(5) As used in this Act-
acquisition, preparation by contract or otherwise of architectural and engineering designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, the building of new public buildings, and the related services and procedures incident thereto;

"(D) the term 'alteration' includes the repairing, remodeling, extending, or constructing changes or modifications in or of public buildings, acquisition of site additions, preparation by contract or otherwise of architectural and engineering designs, plans, specifications, and working drawings, and the related services and procedures incident thereto;

"(E) the term 'Federal parking facilities' means any single, multilevel, underground, or other structure or parking lot that has been acquired or constructed pursuant to the authorization contained in subsections for the express purpose of providing off-street parking for official vehicles owned by Federal agencies and the District of Columbia, vehicles of visitors on official business to public buildings, and private vehicles owned by employees of Federal agencies and the District of Columbia;

"(F) the term 'parking area' means those grounds, areas, courtyards, or spaces within, adjacent to, or near buildings, and other occupancies occupied either by Federal agencies or by the government of the District of Columbia, vehicles of the government of the District of Columbia, vehicles of visitors on official business to public buildings, and privately owned vehicles of employees of Federal agencies and the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia;

"(G) the phrase 'preliminary planning' includes economic investigations, cost estimates, studies, surveys, architectural concept sketches and related engineering services, site investigations, and related similar services required incident thereto and otherwise necessary to carry out the responsibilities vested by this subsection.

H.R. 9057
A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to construct, operate, and maintain a parking facility in Jacksonville, Florida

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise such real property or interests therein as may be necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a parking facility at Jacksonville, Florida, and he is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain such facility. The Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire such additional land in the vicinity of the recently completed Federal building in Jacksonville, Florida, and shall make such acquisitions by condemnation, donation, exchange, or other appropriate means as may be necessary to provide a parking facility in the vicinity of such Federal building.

A GREAT NEED FOR THE OLD-FASHIONED, PATRIOTIC SPIRIT OF AMERICA

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, last, I had the privilege of dedicating the freedom shrine at St. Augustine's Academy in New Jersey. Inside the shrine the 300,000 people who have signed the petition asked President Johnson to sign 29 documents most responsible for American freedom today. These documents are made available through the splendid work of the Exchange Clubs, bringing to the attention of the American public the need for a more patriotic public. It would be most appropriate if all other service clubs followed suit.

Recent events, more particularly the демонстрации in New York City on the weekend of April 14, where 100 draftees burned their draft cards in public and made other rash antiwar demonstrations, point to a growing threat to our national security. The greatest single need, as I see it today, is the need for a more patriotic public. As the days and weeks pass more and more such deplorable incidents are happening, even to the burning of our flag in public. All of these acts are completely out of context with American history. For example, large crowds of demonstrators who witness and do such things are treating our flag as something common if in the same parade they followed the Marine Band. The only thing that these people are doing is giving the enemy some reason to believe that there is disunity within our country. That might force the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam. The net result of it prolongs the war there.

Never before in American history has there been a greater need for the old-fashioned patriotic spirit that welded the Colonies over a period of years into the most powerful nation in the world. I have always been a firm believer in the American's chest swell with pride.
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row's hearing is the fact that the 84,568 professionals admitted under exchange programs during this period, the two largest categories being medicine with 21,655 physicians and surgeons and 8,562 professional and student nurses. This means that almost one-third of the non-student medical personnel for whom the 2-year foreign residency requirement for entry into any subject matter relating to world relationships and to the need for international trade and its effects upon labor-intensified industries that the impact of imports is upon that very region which the Congress is spending billions of dollars to rehabilitate. Because of the nature of the region, the labor-intensified industries reside there and it is in the labor-intensified industries that the impact is felt the hardest. We had testimony after testimony to the effect that if the Kennedy round succeeds in what it is designed to do, we might set this area back at least another 40 or 50 years, and backward it cannot go. We have volumes of testimony from the largest to the smallest industries in this Nation that the effect of the import of imports is not recognized or even considered by the departments of Government charged with looking after the economic welfare of this Nation. It all has happened too fast, it has been a slow but sure progress in the direction of economic oblivion for this Nation. I make that statement because in my 10 years of active study of this problem, I have watched a very direct attack made upon the American market by the exporting nations. Trade agreements are no longer consummated in the interests of the economy of the Nation or even considered by the mighty hand of the steel industry here stood aloof from world diplomacy. Even as the giant has been protesting this kind of action for many, many times on this floor as it has been predicted the day would come—when the mighty have come asking for relief. So today we have the steel industry protesting that they cannot survive in the so-called world of free trade. While the steel industry overseas was unable to produce beyond their own needs or even up to their own requirements, the steel industry here stood aloof from the glass workers, from the ceramic workers, from the little mushroom growers in southeastern Pennsylvania, from the button-makers—who have all but been forced out of business. Steel manufacturers in this country, from all of these little people who were, in the old strategy of war, separated and destroyed one by one. But today, the steel industry has reached a position where foreign countries not only can make all they need, but if given a few more years they can make all we need—and I guarantee this, if we do not change the law, they will sell all we need within this country. If the Members of this House do not believe that, they should ask the makers of fine china where in the United States they can sell and how much the British and German steel manufacturers in this country, from all of these little people who were, in the old strategy of war, separated and destroyed one by one. But today, the steel industry has reached a position where foreign countries not only can make all they need, but if given a few more years they can make all we need—and I guarantee this, if we do not change the law, they will sell all we need within this country. If the Members of this House do not believe that, they should ask the makers of fine china where in the United States they can sell and how much the British and German steel manufacturers in this country, from all of these little people who were, in the old strategy of war, separated and destroyed one by one. But today, the steel industry has reached a position where foreign countries not only can make all they need, but if given a few more years they can make all we need—and I guarantee this, if we do not change the law, they will sell all we need within this country. If the Members of this House do not believe that, they should ask the makers of fine china where in the United States they can sell and how much the British and German steel manufacturers in this country, from all of these little people who were, in the old strategy of war, separated and destroyed one by one. But today, the steel industry has reached a position where foreign countries not only can make all they need, but if given a few more years they can make all we need—and I guarantee this, if we do not change the law, they will sell all we need within this country. If the Members of this House do not believe that, they should ask the makers of fine china where in the United States they can sell and how much the British and German steel manufacturers in this country, from all of these little people who were, in the old strategy of war, separated and destroyed one by one.
unimportant to those who are not bit by unemployment of long duration, such as some of us who come from the Appalachian region.

But the serious thing before us is that we refuse to reevaluate a philosophy of trade which is as dead as yesterday's dodo bird. We are talking about going to the moon. We are dealing in a space faddism. And we are dealing in a trade philosophy that is more than 300 years old. We are talking about a philosophy that is based upon selling to another nation the goods it needs that it cannot produce and buying from that nation the goods we need that we cannot produce. Do we not all know that everybody can produce everything today?

Hong Kong, compared to the United States, is like a speck on a map of Pennsylvania, and yet it is producing for this great nation of ours a great portion of the television, electronic parts and devices we use. I visited a plant in Hong Kong, which has thousands of employees, where every pound of production is shipped back to the United States, or the United States-you tell me where it was made in, so we are helping the American manufacturer's name contained thereon of high honor, a manufacturer whose products one can see every day on the TV, bragging about the fact that they are the representatives of custom-tooled handicraft. Well, Mr. Speaker, permit me to read to the Members of this body what they say. They say, "The quality goes before the name goes on." Mr. Speaker, I am sure, however, that somewhere along the line they must have forgotten that motto with reference to this particular product. I say this because I have been told by the manager made the astounding statement that he is a Zenith, mind you, an American manufacturer's name contained thereon of high honor, a manufacturer whose products one can see every day on the TV, bragging about the fact that they are the representatives of custom-tooled handicraft. Well, Mr. Speaker, permit me to read to the Members of this body what they say. They say, "The quality goes before the name goes on." Mr. Speaker, I am sure, however, that somewhere along the line they must have forgotten that motto with reference to this particular product. I say this because I have been told by the manager who once said, "Hit me on the head with a sledge hammer," and the fellow said to him, "Why?" And he replied, "It will feel so darned good when you see me go.

The answer is not to send our industry and our jobs outside the country to produce for the American economy. The answer is to put some kind of a restraint upon the production coming in. Some people ought to see what nation with fewer than 100 million people within it expect to be the provider of manufactured consumer goods for the whole world?

We have seen nations break away in our generation from political colonialism only to become a part of a grander scheme of economic colonialism.

However, in this new kind of a twist we find a very strange phenomenon taking place. In the old days of so-called political colonialism the large countries held the small countries in the grasp of their hands, but in the industrial colonialism we find the small countries holding the big countries in their hands. If this is let go without change by this Congress this year, when the reciprocal trade agreement comes before this House I will repeat a prediction I made on the floor in 1969, which has been borne out to the letter, and say to you that given 5 more years I will not have to come here and talk about it. The people will speak at the polls. We can ignore it, but it is a mathematical argument that if we trade with one another we will not be shooting one another. Where do you think they get the bullets to shoot with? Did you see the statement on the one hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the other hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the one hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the other hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the one hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the other hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the one hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the other hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the one hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the other hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive. Did you see the statement on the one hand of (to go with the next day about their new program of sanctions and retribution against their enemies where they said they exempt those that they are in trade with? They forgive.
Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to learn that that is true.

Mr. Speaker, in the old days when one wished to purchase a dollar's worth of ham, you received a dollar's worth of ham and not 30 cents worth of promotion, packaging, stamps, and hokum.

Mr. Speaker, we are not doing anything in the United States in our pursuit of industries. We are worried ourselves into a position from which we can never recover, if we continue to follow our present policies.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me statements in support of this charge, statements by men who made no such statements a few years ago and who took no part in the fight when the few "lonely hearts" were up here bleeding for the little fellow.

Mr. Speaker, I can show to the satisfaction at least of myself, and to any other person with an open mind, evidence as a result of the testimony taken before the subcommittee which it is my honor to address to this effect: There is evidence as to the numbers of jobs lost in industry and backup employment, as a result of the trade balances of last year alone which would wipe out unemployment in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of supporting jobs in the steel industry. I am speaking about direct jobs. I am talking about related and supporting jobs which are necessary in the work forces behind every primary production job.

Mr. Speaker, I say this because one will find that for every primary producing worker in the United States, it takes better than two workers behind him.

This means that for every job you lose over a direct import of a production job product you lose three jobs in the American economy.

The steel industry alone last year lost 70,000 jobs directly, and they say, unless we make changes by 1970 it will be 150,000 jobs.

Those 70,000 jobs in western Pennsylvania and in eastern Pennsylvania in our two steel centers would wipe out all of the steel unemployment in the State of Pennsylvania.

I remember when we had 42 distinct and different flat glass producers in the United States, and we are down to four.

The recent order of the President on flat glass can well spell the death of the remaining four. Maybe not—and this is where you must understand under the so-called broad term of diversification we have allowed industries that produced in the main a certain product, for instance, glass, to go into other areas of production, such as chemical and pharmaceutical products of all kinds.

Now, when their balance sheet comes out, and they make their report to their stockholders, they show a pretty fine report. But if you go behind the figures, they have an export, as it were, of the other products. But the glassworkers have lost their jobs.

I do not believe—and I repeat—I do not believe that anywhere in the Constitution the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor, the Tariff Commission, or the Congress of the United States was ever given power to determine who was to eat and who was to starve at the employment table in the United States.

Who is to say that a glassworker's job was to be sacrificed in order that a cotton picker could work down South? Who was to say that this industry was expendable, and that this other industry was to be protected? If you do not believe there are protected industries in the United States, you do not know the tariff schedules. We say that we believe in free trade, except where it pinches our personal welfare.

I know Members of Congress who have—have rendered my position on trade. They have said I am a fanatic. Well, there have been a lot of fanatics who have gone across the pages of history. So, being a fanatic, if it is in the interest of the glass industry, then you believe it to be just. I guess it is not too bad a thing to be called. They have called me a protectionist; indeed I am. I believe it is as American it is worth protecting.

I made the statement to these Members many times that I found that if you scratch a free trader with a loss of jobs in his district he will bleed just like a protectionist. And if you find that all of the steel industry Representatives in Congress are starting to bleed just like I am. Their blood is starting to run. I hope they demonstrate how they feel more the glass industry and the vote comes up on the tariff bill.

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

Mr. DENT. I would not mind yielding to the gentleman, but I do owe it to my good friend from West Virginia, to yield to him, inasmuch as he has been trying to attract my attention.

Mr. MOORE. May I say to the gentleman I appreciate very much his very penetrating analysis of the trade problems in the country. He has used as an example the problem we have in this country as to the flat glass industry.

I would like to have him agree with us, if he will, the difficulty which this particular industry has had as a direct result of the relief which it obtained by following the procedures enumerated in the trade bill in which the Tariff Committee, because they felt that as a domestic industry it was jeopardized only to wake up and find that the nations that had the American marketplace were threatening all sorts of retaliation in other forms in other marketplaces, and substantially were usurping the rights of the Congress of the United States to legislate what should be the national policy of the country.

Am I not correct in that?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The President of the United States, the late lamented John F. Kennedy, when faced with a practical political situation in 1962, in which he needed votes on this floor to pass the 5-year trade bill known as the Kennedy round approach, made a concession to those of us from the glass industry area, that he would ask for an increase in glass tariffs. The industry at that time was promised, and I make no bones about it, because the record will show what the industry did, a higher tariff in those so long as he was President of the United States, and at that time, the industry had every reason to believe that it would be about 6 years.

So the industry went out and spent millions of dollars. In my own district alone they spent $3 million to rehabilitate their plants in my county, and two in my congressional district, two of the largest producers of flat glass—window glass—in the country.

And behold, that President of the United States had departed, and a new President has taken office. The same old Tariff Commission crowd who have never given up because it was against the recommendation of the Tariff Commission that the President put higher tariffs into effect—kept pushing for a reduction even below the Kennedy round. I am not looking into the matter seriously, the glass industry was asking for a reasonable rate of increase on tariffs—just a little bit of a hike to help them out. But when there was no small increase on glass, the everlasting credit, let it be said, he said, "That will do no good. I doubt even what I intend to ask for will do any good. But I am going to ask for"—and he reduced the rate which was higher than the tariff on glass was during the Smoot-Hawley tariff days—the old scapegoat for the great depression.

Any sane, reasonable person who looks into the tariff question cannot help but go back into history. We have in every successive action starting back in the days of the first Clay compromise to the second Clay compromise and all through separate periods when we allowed our tariff rate in the United States to go below 40 percent ad valorem, we hit a depression. In fact, we had money in the bank when the Clay compromise was put into effect. Within 4 years we were in a panic.

Two years later we repealed the Clay compromise and reinstated a high tariff policy. Within 5 years we had money in the bank again and then we got cocky and down the tariffs went with the second Clay compromise and the second panic in the history of the United States took place.

This is just plain history and it is so factual that I cannot understand how any Member of this Congress today in this generation of high obligation can think otherwise. It is within this high obligation to this history and to faceing the crisis that I mentioned in my opening remarks. Every nation needs more money than it can generate because hanging over the nations is the specter of the so-called mass movement of its people in the direction of the proletariat, or the specter of some other takeover by the proletariat, as it were.

So in order to hang on to the administrative leadership of the country diplomatically and politically, we have to do things for people that we used to let people do for themselves. I am not saying that that is wrong. I think proper education and proper recreation and
How do you like to see the American baseball teams—the American national game of a country that is not on any other nation before they field a team?

Gentlemen, I ask you to get the eight books of our hearings in 1962 and read them. Read the reports, so that you can then come here with your head up, rather than with the new report that we are preparing right now. And the new report, gentlemen, will open the eyes of any person who is willing to have his eyes opened. I believe that all of these things, in kindness to my fellow Members of Congress, I say to the Members of Congress who are so adamant, so strong, and so positive in their position on free trade that, if they get a little industry in their communities which is hurt, they will change their tunes darn quick.

You know, the other day the Senate defeated a rider on a bill to restrict the imports of beef. If you watch TV on Sunday, you will find out to whom I refer. My two Senators—without mentioning their names—both voted to refuse to curtail the import of meats.

I have been asked, I suppose, in interest of the consumers. It gave them cheaper meat. Did it? It did not. Meats in the shops are not labeled as to their origin; they know this or should. They know that we are coming from diehard free traders or, worse, fence straddlers who want to be heard from the curd. We separate them because it is apropos of what kind of books we are using in the study of economics in a graduate world.

In the junket that we made we studied trade and, with the orders of Congress, we are studying the orders of Congress to teach sophomoric economics. And that is what we are doing in economics. We are teaching our kids the economics of Adam Smith and George diluted by the new kind of economics practiced by State Department officials. In order to change this, we may have to change Congress, because I think that the majority of this Congress grew up in that atmosphere of economic teaching.

In trying to talk to some Congressmen that I have known for years about restrictive trade covenants I have found that they just look at me as if I was born in the days of McKinley. Sometimes it worries me so much that I hate to shake hands with people, especially if they have a red face and a red mouth. Many a time, one reason why we ought to have younger men in the Congress after this present flock of young men get out of the way, because they are so thoroughly indoctrinated with the free trade ideology that they are even worse than we oldtimers who have passed through that stage and, incidentally, who have gone through a change of life. We do not do the job we are paid to do a damn well.

We are beginning to realize that perhaps there is something to the plea of the little fellow who said, "I just lost my job in a sporting goods company." He was asked, "Why did you lose your job?"

He said, "Because we can't compete with the Japanese baseball gloves."

You no one? 

For the poor innocent American consumer who might buy a product packaged or made in Pennsylvania, like the mushrooms we are considering in Pennsylvania, for fear that product has been produced without the proper inspection and the proper sanitation and all these things that have to be done so the consumer who allow mushrooms to come in from Florida by the shipload, which are being sold in the U.S. markets. There is no restriction on age of workers or dress of workers or sanitation, on the fact that they ship in from processing plants or anything else. They are being sold for 49 cents for an 8-ounce can of whole button mushrooms from Florida, which are shipped over here and around the same shelf with mushrooms grown from eastern Pennsylvania mushroom producers, the finest mushrooms in the world, which are selling for over $1 for 8 ounces of button mushrooms.

Of course, it may be immaterial to the fellows in the cotton States, whether the mushroom industry is going out of business, because we are protecting the cocoa industry against overseas cocoa, the wool industry against overseas wool. I am trying to protect it until the production of cotton in many countries, including India and Latin America—under the clearing thousands of acres now in Nicaragua and Latin America with cotton—we have been dealing in cotton and textiles, under false pretenses for many years anyway, because they have been buying one bale of cotton and shipping in two bales of the same. Yet a very cotton wool textile worker job we have preserved we have lost three or four textile workers.

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

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very powerful and very interesting statement here today, for the series of hearings he has had. It is in this series, in this leadership he is exercising in this area. Particularly I thank him on behalf of the steelworkers and textile workers of my district and the many more like them whose jobs are threatened by this very problem which the gentleman has so well explored today. I thank him, too, on behalf of mothers across this country whose sons in Vietnam are threatened by the present trade policies and those the President has proposed for the future toward the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc countries, which polices the gentleman has mentioned in this hearing.

It happens that a number of my constituents are steelworkers. Their jobs were threatened last year and the year before, as they are this year by this problem, as the gentleman knows. As he has said, it is true that the steel industry is a Rip Van Winkle, which, having slept through the revolution, has now decided to wake up and stand up, pick up a new towel, and see what we can do about which of our products are threatened with importation.

And that is what is going on in this country. We have been asking over and over again for protection, for darn near 3 million pounds of horsemeat from Mexico as hamburger and boneless beef. I believe the stiffest sentence was a small fine, or something like that. I wonder how many horses I have eaten in the last 3 years? Evidently I paid like all the others in my State for "beef" not knowing it was horse meat or imported. The price was the same, the work done was the same.

We argue on this floor about laws regarding adding coloration to oranges, or having truth in advertising, or truth in packaging. We argue about sanitation laws for every product in the United States. For instance, in making cheese, we are required to wear white aprons, we have to separate the manufacture of blue cheese, of Roquefort, of Sevillian, and Swiss type and Limburger and other white cheeses. We separate them because they contaminant each other. Yet we allow tons of cheese to come into this country which has been produced under conditions which are prohibited in this country. When we analyze the imported cheese, we have difficulty separating the herd from the curd.

It is just fantastic. As I have sat here in this room and heard some of the best bleeding hearts in my life on this floor. I often want to come down and look and see how red the carpet is around them. I believe that is why we change the color. The color on the floor showed too much. They bleed for the poor innocent American consumer who
American industries threatened by this same challenge of low wage area foreign competition. When my neighbor's house is burning down, my own house is not longer safe. Now, therefore, is the time to act, and to act together. I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and thank him on behalf of the manufacturers who are citizens whose jobs are threatened, and who need our protection and our help.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

Let me say, in talking about cotton, there are some cotton textile folks who came in—Mr. Robert Stevens, Mr. Buford Brands of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, and Sidney Korzenik of the National Knitted Outerwear Association, and so on. They are lamenting, in a way, that the long-term textile agreement had been extended for only 3 years. They wanted 5.

I don't know, you fellows astound me. There is a time, perhaps, when the long-term agreement meant something, but, you know, it is absolutely worthless today, because it does not cover any textile that has less than 50 percent cotton. According to the kind of cotton they may buy, the Japanese are now the world's foremost developers of blended textiles? They are blending our cotton textile agreement right out of the window. In a few years, if you let them get away with it—if you have this kind of an agreement there will not be many straight cotton textiles imported. I have always said the LTA was as worthless as the paper it was written on; just another fake, time-consuming excuse in futility. If you do not include manmade fibers and synthetics, you may as well forget the agreement, because you are not going to be fighting, the straight cotton imported textiles, because they have discovered that blends lend themselves to our modern methods of living and our ways of living better than a straight cotton that is not in the market.

This is the truth in the whole area of production. All the way along the line, over the whole spectrum of American production, we will find the same possibility of size of any natural or of any person today has nothing to do with it. If you add value, the Lord will spare me—and I believe we might be able to sell a little bit to Joe across the street, but we can always sell a whole lot to Uncle Sucker Sam over on the other side of the ocean.* Some U.S. industries rely on the so-called anti dumping law. Did you ever review the history of the antidumping cases in the U.S. Tariff Commission? That is the most miserable record of maladministration in the history of this democracy. You do not only have to prove that he is dumping but you have to prove he is dumping today. What did he did last week? No matter. They ask, how do I know that? And then who will tell us who is dumping and where? So what is the dumping law? It is absolutely useless. The dumping law is that if a nation sells in the U.S. market at $10 worth less than they charge in their own market, it is considered dumping. If they sell at a price in their markets comparable to the price in our market, then they will never sell it. So what they are doing now is dumping at a comparable or competitive to their own market, they do it by a subsidy from their own governments.

Trade? It is a poker game in which every- body thinks they are going to come away winners. We are the biggest losers of all and we will just not admit it. Do you know why? Because no one tells us how it's working out. Mr. Stevens, you and you and everybody else in the United States, I believe, believe that we export more than we import. Gentlemen, if ever a lie was perpetrated on the American people, that is the biggest one. All the figures show that in 7 year we imported $23 billion to foreign countries?

Mr. Speaker, if you and I are in business, and if I buy less from you than you do from me, how are you going to have a surplus? That is exactly what we are telling the public.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike reading articles and various quotations. However, I do believe that upon occasions some things have to be read.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a most difficult problem at this time. I wish I had more time during which to go into this subject. And, Mr. Speaker, if the Lord will spare me—and I do hope He does—I intend to take the floor again to discuss other facets of this problem. However, Mr. Speaker, right now we are faced with a very serious reality; and that is, that the negotiations of about to expire. The Congress will probably be asked, through unanimous consent or through whatever other type of consent is necessary, to just extend the provisions of the 5-year term agreement for months or 6 months, or for an indefinite period of time, until they can get around to doing more about it. All of us know what that has held up everything, the intervention of the Szechuan, agricultural attitude. But all of us were told something was going to be done about it. What they propose to do is completely out of line with logic.

There are some features of the nomenclature Kennedy round that demand attention. I believe the proposal currently being con- sidered ought to be given full publicity. If the proposal prevails you can count on more unemployment in every sector of the industrial complex.

The so-called Kennedy round of tariff negotiations is reaching a climax within a few weeks. It has run a very tortured course indeed; and even at this late date, no one knows what it will be.
pleted in time to be proclaimed before June 30, when the President's authority for the negotiations expires.

One of the uncertainties confronting the negotiations resides in the commitment of the United States that we will not negotiate foreign lands, including this country obtains suitable concessions on agricultural products in foreign markets. It was agreed in May 1963 and May 1964 by ministerial resolutions of GATT in with respect to agricultural products the negotiations would provide "acceptable conditions of access to world markets" to permit the significant development and expansion of world trade in agriculturals.

When the European Economic Community "tabled"—that is, submitted—its offer on agricultural products in 1966, it was found to be too meager and unsatisfactory to the United States as a basis for negotiation. In other words, the offer did not represent anything that could reasonably be interpreted as "acceptable conditions of access to world markets." In view of the American commitment not to negotiate the tariff on industrial items, the deadlock was such that the negotiations could not proceed if there were such backings.

In order to break the deadlock our negotiators have suggested a substitute linked with an international grain agreement. The proposal is to induce other countries to carry their proper share in distributing the burden of feeding the hungry people of the world. The other countries should indeed carry their proper share in distributing the "quid pro quo" that we exacted from the EEC countries in return for which we would continue to import reductions on industrial items.

Now that the EEC offer under the "guaranteed access" was to be the quid pro quo that we exacted from the EEC countries in return for which we would continue to import reductions on industrial items. That "guaranteed access" was to be the quid pro quo that we exacted from the EEC countries in return for which we would continue to import reductions on industrial items. Nor was it clear therefore that the Kennedy round would be a victory for us even if substitutes should be accepted by the EEC. It would not take much to shift the burden and the President is likely to do just that, so to speak, so far as the guaranteed access is concerned. Quite surely our own appropriation for Public Law 480 and food for peace would not be reduced. The other countries might be agreeable to other countries would clearly not fill the bill. It is an outrage that the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations should entertain so wild a suggestion as that contained in the substitute. It is extralegal, and the special representative should be called to account.

In view of the foregoing statements it may well be important for us to examine the situation in certain U.S. industries. Can they stand a sell-out such as contemplated in the proposed food aid agreement?

I think not. After hearing testimony, part of which I intend to give you now; I am positive that the impending crisis in world trade will be hastened if the foregoing proposal becomes a reality.

Mr. Robert Stevens, president of the J. P. Stevens Co., stated:

With a total balance of payments deficit of $1.4 billion last year, it is an interesting but unwelcome fact that roughly two-thirds of our balance of payments deficit is represented in the form of textile products imports.

In commenting on low-cost foreign imports, Mr. Sidney Korzenik, of the National Knitted Outerwear Association, said:

"Our labor costs are 10 to 15 times greater than those of competitors overseas; and they are now using American management, American know-how, and modern machinery.

I asked Mr. Buford Brandis, of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, "What is the problem behind the import problem?" Mr. Brandis replied: "This is the cost problem.

Congressman Daniels, in pursuing my question, asked Mr. Brandis:

With American technical know-how and modern methods of mass production, would not that offset the increase in cost for wages and taxes?

Mr. Brandis replied with an emphatic, "No, sir." Mr. Brandis said that the U.S. industry has no real secret technology.

Keeping in mind the competitive advantage of foreign industries because of their low-wage production costs, I asked Mr. Morton Darman of the National Association of Women, "What is the country doing?"

If we open up the whole world to your products, if we have a complete free trade world, can the American industry survive?

Mr. Darman's reply was, "No, sir."

Mr. Cros of the Dan River Mills Co., the largest gingham producer in the United States, is a representative of a company that is fighting to keep its 1,500 workers employed.

With American technical know-how and modern methods of mass production, would not that offset the increase in cost for wages and taxes?
United States, wrote to union representatives regarding reduced production because of textile import. Mr. Cross of Jones & Laughlin SteelCorp. wrote to union representatives regarding reduced production because of textile import.

Of its total 7,464 looms, 3,397 looms or 44 percent produce gingham. A year or so ago these looms were operating a scheduled 5.6 day week, working the machines nearly 49 hours a week. Now they are back down to only four days a week. This reduction has an immediate effect on the earnings of Dan River workers and is the price they pay for accelerated imports of cotton textiles.

Mr. E. Fountaine Broun, of the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, emphasized that textile imports direct a threat to already depressed Appalachia.

There are 1,023,000 Textile Industry Jobs in Appalachia and within 50 miles of it. The danger which exists, and is increasing, to the Textile Industry is uncontrolled importation into the United States of man-made fibers and of textiles products and apparel containing man-made fibers and wool, as a result of increasing imports of cotton textile products and apparel.

They (textile imports) clearly have an adverse effect on employment and economic activity in the Appalachian Region and in other areas.

STEEL—Pig Iron Imports Adversely Affect Steel Industry

Congressman John B. Bingham, of Alabama, quoting a recent special report on steel in Business Week of June 6, 1966, stated:

While the U.S. had net steel exports of about 4 million tons in 1957, by 1963 this had been replaced by net steel imports of 8 million tons.

U.S. Department of Commerce figures on pig iron imports show that: "pig iron imported in 1965 was 882,000 tons plus; in 1966, 1,183,650 tons. Exported in 1965 were 28,555 tons; exported in 1966 only 12,122 tons."

This shows a dollar drain to the U.S. of $9,944,161 in two years, 1963 and 1966, on pig iron alone which is a small segment of the import.

Imports Threatening One of America's Most Basic and Important Industries—Steel

Quoting from figures compiled by the Iron & Steel Institute, Congressman Richard H. Bolling of Missouri, stated:

A total 90 million tons of products from steel mills were produced here by domestic corporations last year.... our country's exports hit a new low—1.7 million tons, a level that has not been seen since 1959. This has brought the United States a deficit of more than 6,900 million in internal trade. Nearly half of these imports come from Japan.

Following is an excerpt from testimony of Mr. John P. Roche, president, American Iron & Steel Institute:

Imports of steel mill products into the United States in 1965 totaled approximately 10,583,000 tons, representing 10.3 percent of the total market. Just 4 years before, in 1961, imports were 1,738,000 tons. Now, however, with the 1955-57 period when such imports averaged only 1,500,000 tons, or about 1.5 percent of the market. The significance of the increase in import volume can be gaged from the fact that it was equivalent to the combined output in 1965 of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp., the fifth and sixth largest American steel producers, which directly employ 79,000 workers.

Mr. Speaker, I include an excerpt from testimony of Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the National Committee on Import-Export Policy:

The principle of cost reduction in manufacturing which has guided government and industry for many years is a recognition that the reduction must come from the factor where the real cost lies. This is labor.

The case of steel. Here I make some calculations which are presented in a statement which concludes on page 10. First, I wish to say in the middle of the page, that the steel industry is faced with an inefficiency and it is for that reason that it is losing its export markets and it is for this reason imports are flowing in at a higher level.

Let me point out that productivity in American steel plants has risen 50 percent since 1950, while the industry produced 82.4 percent more basic steel with 13 percent fewer workers than in 1950, or a drop of 75,000 workers.

The increase in the import of this industry during the period, this sum of percent of the load placed on other industries and other economic activities by this displacement of workers was naturally heavy; for if steel had absorbed its share of the population increase the lower cost of labor would have gone to 140,000 workers instead of dropping 75,000.

The absorption elsewhere, therefore, must be $15,500 million worth of employment. The question arises of how high a mechanization speed the economy can stand.

In other words, if steel had done what coal did, discharging not 74,500 workers but about 250,000 workers. It could have been competitive. The question is: What has the steel industry done because it could have withstood the imports of steel.

The displacement in steel was not great enough in fact to effect the magnitude of real cost reduction necessary to achieve competitiveness with imports. As I point out, again making a calculation which I hope is clear and can be followed by anyone with ordinary arithmetical training, this, as I say, reinforces the conclusion that about 255,000 workers would have to be displaced out of 800,000 for steel to be competitive.

This is not offered as an exact measure. It is offered as a way of calculating what it will take in terms of employment for an industry to become competitive with imports. If the imports are underselling by as much as 10 percent, and in some instances, of course, imports undersell by more than 10 percent.

I also include an excerpt from testimony of Mr. Clark E. McDonald, managing director, Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Association:

In 1960, the U.S. manufacture of hardwood plywood produced 23 percent of our domestic consumption. That same year plywood was added to the offer list for the GATT negotiations, despite the efforts of our association, then the Hardwood Plywood Institute, which filed a brief and made an appearance before the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee of Reciprocity Information. At the GATT negotiations in 1951 the duty on plywood, other than birch, alder, and red cedar, was not changed and the ad valorem to 20 percent ad valorem.

Hardwood plywood imports in 1961 amounted to 67 million square feet. The year before, 1960, our domestic production was 165,440,000 square feet. Now, a drop of 75,000 workers. It runs in the neighborhood of 73 percent.

As a ratio of sales, it will be slightly over 60 percent. Consequently, when a family in Japan pays $3.70 an hour and makes the ware exactly in the same way as it is made in this country where we pay $3.70 per hour they could probably sell the ware for a good deal less than the $6 a dozen.

The aforementioned examples of the disparity in wages between the American potter and his foreign counterpart illustrate the difference in wages that prevail in all crafts.

The competition of increased imports appears to have been one of the major factors influencing the downward trend of recent years in employment and output in the pottery, earthenware, and household china segments but not in the commercial (hotel and restaurant) segment of the domestic pottery industry. Imports of household china rose rapidly between 1954 and 1960 (142 percent and 60 percent, respectively), but the Japanese assumed the lead which they have yet to relinquish. In the early years imports of household china accounted for 5 percent of the U.S. market (27 percent for earthenware and 90 percent for household china in 1960). The consensus of most manufacturers interviewed for this study was that the increases in the share of the market going to foreign suppliers are due to a combination of price differentials favoring imports, especially those from Japan.
I include an excerpt from testimony of Mr. William P. Holmes, president, Wilson Sporting Goods Co.:

Mr. Holmes: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is William P. Holmes. I am president of the Wilson Sporting Goods Co. and am here on behalf of the Athletic Goods Manufacturers Association, representing baseball and softball glove and mitt manufacturers of the United States.

We have approximately 90 to 95 percent of the productive capacity of this industry domestically. Imports of gloves and products which were negligible in 1956, increased substantially each year until in 1965, approximately 70 percent of the total production of baseball and softball gloves and mitts sold in the United States were actually manufactured in Japan. During this period, some domestic producers were forced out of business, and all others drastically curtailed production in line with reduced sales.

You have before you on page 2 of my testimony a table that clearly shows a historical picture of the annual losses to American workers from competition with foreign imports. You will note in reviewing this that in 1956 domestic industry had sales of $3,146,000 units and on an annual basis the sales decreased each year until in 1965 the sales by domestic producers amounted to 1,028,000 units.

In 1956 imports were negligible and not reported by the Department of Commerce. In 1957 there were 143,000 units imported into the United States and the following year 353,000 units. In 1959 this increased to 1,271,000 and in 1960 to 3,481,000, and in 1965 imports were 3,314,000 units.

Actually in 1967 imports accounted for 43.3 percent of the total dependent consumption in this country and in 1965 they accounted for 69.9 percent.

The ratio of imports to domestic sales is currently 288.6 percent. The market as you can see today is pretty well dominated by imported merchandise.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. Edward E. Kennedy, research director, International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America:

At the bottom of page 8, in relating our relatively high levels and high standards of living to the relatively low rate of growth, we think it is significant that among the principal industrial nations of the free world the United States currently exports only about 5 percent of its gross national product, while the European Economic Community countries must find an export market for about 18.5 percent of their gross national product while the United States is over 1 million barrels daily, any part of which could be in the form of asphalt bearing crude oil.

Second, there are now pending before the Department of the Interior five applications for the establishment of foreign trade zones in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands seeking permission to ship to Continental U.S. some 100,000 barrels daily of petroleum products an an unknown number of petrochemicals. These applications are now set for public hearing before the Department of the Interior.

Third, the Administration recently authorized the establishment of foreign trade zones in Bay County, Michigan, and at Taft, Louisiana, both for the operation of petrochemical plants to be supplied with petroleum feedstocks from foreign sources. The Department of the Interior is now considering whether or not such imports into a foreign trade zone should be included within the 12.2 limitation. Meanwhile, the petrochemical industry is merely the beginning of imports of petroleum and other industries and individuals and it is not fair or justifiable to accord one segment of the consumptive public special treatment over other consumers. These other objectives may be worthy ones, but en our balance-of-payments position. Oil imports are our largest deficit item, exceeding $3 billion annually.

The immediate threats come from three directions as follows:

The Department of Commerce is now considering whether or not such imports into a foreign trade zone should be included within the 12.2 limitation. Meanwhile, the petrochemical industry is merely the beginning of imports of petroleum and other industries and individuals and it is not fair or justifiable to accord one segment of the consumptive public special treatment over other consumers. These other objectives may be worthy ones, but...
the oil import program was not designed to serve them.

Your consideration of these matters would be very welcome, and I am particularly interested whether or not further legislation is needed. In the meantime, it would be most helpful if you would urge upon the President and Secretary Udall the need to continue to keep all imports within the limitations established by the 12.2 ratio.

Very best regards.

Sincerely,

L. Dan Jones, General Counsel.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

THE KENNEDY ROUND NEGOTIATIONS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under previous order of the House, Mr. Dent is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the splendid statement which has been made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] during the course of his special order should cause all Members of the House to sit up and take notice. As I listened to the gentleman's statement with reference to the import problem which is faced by every American, I felt a deep sense of appreciation for his learned analysis of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has served with distinction as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and as chairman of the subcommittee which has made in-depth studies of the effects of imports upon domestic employment and upon the agricultural economy.

Mr. Speaker, I personally express again to the gentleman my appreciation for the reception which he has given to members of the labor and management teams from my area who have been concerned about imports, as they affect the textile industry and the domestic work glove industry.

Mr. Speaker, having the privilege of representing the largest textile producing area in America, and the work glove capital of America, these studies by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his subcommittee have been very gratifying to me and to the people whom I represent.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Kennedy round of tariff negotiations is reaching a climax within a few weeks. It has run a very tortured course indeed; and even at this late date no one knows whether it will be completed in time to be proclaimed before June 30, when the President's authority for the negotiations expires.

One of the uncertainties confronting the negotiations resides in the commitment of the United States that we will not negotiate industrial tariffs unless this country obtains suitable concessions on agricultural products in foreign markets. It was agreed in May 1963 and May 1964 by ministerial resolutions of GATT that with respect to agricultural products the negotiation of "acceptable conditions of access to world markets" will permit the significant development and expansion of world trade in agricultural products.

When the European Economic Community tabled—that is, submitted—its offer on agricultural products in 1966 it was found to be very meager and unsatisfactory to the United States as a basis for negotiations. In other words, the offer did not represent anything that could reasonably be interpreted as "acceptable conditions of access to world markets" for agricultural products.

In the course of his special order not to negotiate the tariff on industrial items, the deadlock was such that the negotiations could not proceed if there were no further offers.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to say to the Members of this body that I come from a State and a district in which textile production is the principal economic mainstay and the overwhelming source of employment. The textile industry is at this very moment confronted with extremely high imports—imports that have risen sharply in the past few years.

These imports were presumably to be kept within reasonable bounds by the long term textile agreement, but the fact is that they have risen threefold in terms of yardage brought in during the course of the Government's textile expansion program. During 1966 textile imports exceeded exports by $800 million, whereas as just a few years ago this country was a net textile exporter.

Clearly, under these circumstances, it is unthinkable that textile tariffs should be further reduced; and yet that seems to be the prospect as of today, assuming that the Kennedy round is finally negotiated.

This prospect brings us back to the recent suggestion of the U.S. representatives to induce other countries to agree to shoulder a share of the burden of feeding the hungry people of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the other countries should indeed carry their proper share in distributing grain to the starving people. However, I am puzzled by the notion that this is a function of GATT, which is to say, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. How does the plan to induce other countries to participate in our food for peace program under the Kennedy round work?

Public Law 480 shipments to needy nations become involved with the trade and tariff negotiations of the Kennedy round?

The Kennedy round is the name given to the tariff negotiations that are being conducted under the authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. A reading of the authorization of the President as revised in that order shows that there is no order to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries—does not lead one to believe that inducing other countries to share our self-assumed burden to supply wheat or other food to hungry people of the world was contemplated as a part of the President's activity under the Trade Expansion Act.

What was the President authorized to do? That act when he entered into trade agreements with foreign countries? He was authorized under section 201(a)(2) to "proclaim such modification or continuance of existing duty-free or excise treatment, or such additional import restrictions, as he determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement."

That is all. There is nothing about inducing other countries to take a load off our shoulders in our effort to help feed starving people in other parts of the world. The President is authorized to deal with "any existing duty or other import restrictions, or the continuance or to modify or continue other import restrictions, on the one hand, and what may or may not be done by other countries in helping us or not helping us with the problem of feeding hungry people, on the other.

The two activities have no relation to each other.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear, I believe, that what is proposed under the food-aid commitment by other countries, is a substitute for the access commitment under which we were to be assured continuing access to the EEC grain market.

That guaranteed access was to be the quid pro quo that we exacted from the EEC countries in return for which we would consent to negotiate tariff reductions on industrial items.

Now that the EEC offer under the guaranteed access was regarded as completely unsatisfactory because of its extremely limited range, the whole Kennedy round was confronted with a crisis. The EEC had not met our conditions for negotiating the industrial items. It had not fulfilled in any reasonable degree the guaranteed access to her agricultural markets.

In this dilemma someone suggested the substitution. If instead of giving us a guaranteed access to the EEC market for agricultural products, a new program under which the EEC was defaulting, why not accept in lieu of this guarantee a helping hand toward lightening our burden incurred through feeding starving people.
Mr. Speaker, this suggested substitute is preposterous; and I do not know who but our Department of State and its representatives in the negotiations is responsible so completely the mandate of Congress as laid down in the Trade Expansion Act. Nowhere in that act is found anything that relates to a shift of financial burden, or trade restrictions, but it is a suitable subject for negotiation in lieu of tariffs and trade restrictions. Only an utter disregard of the intent and letter of the legislation, which is to say, of the Congress, could lead to the entertainment of the suggested substitute.

Why not say that if other countries will shoulder a part of our antipoverty program we will give them the Panama Canal or Alaska as a concession under the Trade Expansion Act?

The executive branch, and especially the State Department, has not been backward in ignoring Congress; but the suggestion of swapping a wholly unrelated offer for a relevant offer when the latter fails, goes even beyond the usual degree of disregard.

In order to salvage the Kennedy round, the Administration is apparently about to collapse because of our determination not to negotiate industrial products unless we receive an equivalent concession on agricultural products, it is hardly in order for us to derive that conclusion entirely outside the President's authorization under the law to make it possible to claim that our condition for continuing the negotiations had been met.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the effort to make this unjustifiable substitution is evidence of desperation in our negotiators. When they make such an outlandish offer to save the day for the Kennedy round I can only say that they are not representing this country with credit. If their lack of fortitude in this move is representative of their negotiation, I think they should be recalled. We should send over negotiators that have some minimum of respect for the law under which they operate.

I am not of a disposition to stand silently by while these negotiators undertake to cover their own shortcomings by substituting a wholly alien bargaining pawn for what the law prescribes. If we were guaranteed access to certain markets and if the promisors have defaulted on their guarantee, I do not regard it either legal, practical or justifiable to substitute something else as it is in the present case, for our trading partners. These partners are not even the initiators of the notion of a substitute. We are seeking to force it on them, so that our boys can come home claiming a great victory.

It will not be a victory even if the substitutes should be accepted by the EEC. It would let them off the hook, so to speak, so far as the guaranteed access is concerned. Quite simply our appropriation for Public Law 480 and food for peace would not be reduced. If the duty on textiles is to be reduced, it would go down much better if we had something substantial to show for it. The other countries would clearly not fill the bill.

It is an outrage that the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations should entertain so wild a suggestion as is contained in the substitute. It is extralegal, and the Special Representative should be called to account.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. WHITENER. Yes, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that I am deeply appreciative of the tremendous amount of work and effort which the gentleman has put in over the years in analyzing the trade posture of our country and the adverse effects which we have suffered with respect to the cotton industry in that part of the country from which the gentleman from North Carolina comes, as well as the other trade policies which affect parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include the following remarks:

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply appreciative of the efforts here today of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and associates in their remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few words to what has been said here this afternoon on the negotiation of the Kennedy round.

There is something ironic about the great anxiety of this country's efforts to avoid a breakdown in the Kennedy round. The irony is that we would in reality be better off without the Kennedy round. This system would eliminate any competitive advantages that imports might enjoy. Therefore the spectacle of our trade representatives in Geneva beating the bushes for some means of saving the Kennedy round from collapse, is rather pitiful.

It is not only pitiful, it goes beyond that. What they are proposing as a saving measure is objectionable; first, because the proposal that has been discussed here this afternoon, is not authorized by the Trade Expansion Act; and, second, because the tactics or lack of tactics of these trade representatives smack of an almost hopelessly naive entreaty to the EEC and the other countries to save the situation.

Mr. Speaker, the recital here this afternoon has shown all too clearly the disastrous methods pursued by our negotiators. From the very beginning they gave ground and have kept on giving ground until now they are about ready, as the saying goes, to throw the baby out with the wash. We are apparently ready to do almost anything to avoid a collapse; and, of course, our trading partners know it. It would be unusual indeed if their price did not rise with the increasing sense of our anxiety.

The President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations has set a succession of deadlines in the past several years, dates that the EEC—Common Market—and other countries were to meet, only to see them come and go without satisfaction.

We were so eager to get the Common Market established in the first place and to see it succeed that we refrained from rocking the boat. Nevertheless we kept up the pressure on the other countries to sign the trade negotiations that one by one fell by the wayside, largely because they ignored the internal purposes of the Common Market.

What has been recounted this afternoon, we began by asserting that our agricultural exports must be given access to expanding markets abroad in return for concessions from us on industrial tariffs. We firmly stated that we would not negotiate industrial tariffs unless we were assured foreign outlets for agricultural products that could expand with rising consumption. We soon settled for a guaranteed access to those markets which merely meant that we would be satisfied if our share in foreign agricultural markets did not shrink. This was probably the first retreat; but it set a pace that might be expected.

The time came when all the countries were to submit their list of exceptions, which is to say a list of items, which was to be kept to a bare minimum, that they would withhold from negotiators. We was to include agricultural products. When the time came, the EEC countries did not submit agricultural list.

What did we do? We had said repeatedly that we would not negotiate industrial items unless the agricultural offer was received. We broke down and submitted our industrial list in any event.

It was a year or more later before the EEC made their offer, including the agricultural part. The whole offer was disappointing, but the agricultural part was nearly a nullity. We should have been able to anticipate this from the fact that the EEC was going to include a common agricultural policy—CAP—among the six nations; and in order to do this they established certain guaranteed minimum prices. In order to prevent these from cutting into our exports they established variable import fees that were designed to bring import prices up to the domestic guaranteed prices. This system would eliminate any competitive advantages that imports might enjoy. Therefore it was unlikely that imports would increase. They could in fact be expected to remain at existing levels. We could do this.

We, of course, protested, but when the EEC stood adamant it was we who came forward with a substitute.

As explained here this afternoon, we were willing to give up the guaranteed access to foreign markets for farm products for something just as good. This latter happened to be in the form of the other countries taking over a part of our food for peace program, which is to say, they were asked to relieve us of some of our load of grain shipments—wheat—under foreign aid. If they would do this we would forget about the guaranteed access to foreign markets for farm products. We were willing, as a price of saving the
Kennedy round, to throw up our hands at the idea of gaining a firm assurance that our food-producing industries would be protected and that the prices of food products in the EEC would be preserved. That is where the matter stands today.

The question is why we should seek so frantically to save the Kennedy round even at the expense of violating the Trade Expansion Act. That act does not authorize the kind of an agreement now contemplated. It has to do with modifying existing duties or other import restrictions. It does not authorize fast and loose trading in other fields such as is now suggested

But why save the Kennedy round? I say American industry would be better off without it; and I shall undertake to tell you why.

Already we are at a serious competitive disadvantage in most manufactured products. Our share of the world exports of manufactured products has shrunk 20 percent since 1958. Should machinery be removed from the list the shrinkage will be more severe, since exports of machinery have risen the last 7 years as a result of our flood of foreign investment in plants and equipment. New branch plants abroad are largely equipped with American machinery—at least for now.

Also, many American industries are finding import competition very serious in our own home market. One of the latest is steel. Imports in the past 7 years have risen to the point of supplying some 11 percent of the whole market, and in some lines as much as 50 percent or more.

The same thing happened with meat. In several fields imports have virtually taken over the whole market, such as portable typewriters, transistor radios, jeweled watches, and sewing machines. Imports of footwear and of dairy products are well over 50 percent of our total. Manmade fibers have plagued domestic producers with increasing severity in recent years. Tomato imports, Imports of strawberries, organic chemicals, petrochemicals, and many other items tell the same story. The New England fisheries have been driven back by imports to a secondary position. Watch imports, imports of baseball bats, baseballs and baseball gloves, tennis balls and tennis rackets, have raised havoc with American producers. China-ware, earthenware, and glassware are other sufferers from imports.

Most of the foregoing have shifted much of their production abroad and now import. Our bicycle industry survives only because it imports the parts for assembly here. Motorcycle manufacturing is down to one company.

Mr. Speaker, if we examine our foreign trade statistics in realistic fashion, we will find that so far as private competitive trade is concerned this country is running a deficit of some $3 billion instead of a surplus of some $4 billion as reported officially.

It is for these reasons that I say we do not need the Kennedy round. We would face a large portion of the arbitrary and stubborn attitude of the European Common Market—which we should do—our negotiators appear to be using the trade problems of underdeveloped countries as a pretext for making a one-sided nonreciprocal agreement.

There can be no quarrel with the fact that the developed nations of the world are willing to use their agricultural surpluses to help the less-developed countries that are particularly hard hit in staving off famine or near-famine conditions. This is a humanitarian duty which every affluent nation has. But no stretch of the imagination can a promise by the European Economic Community to see its duty in this respect be accepted by the United States as a trade concession. It is a way of bailing out the trade concessions which we are regrettably prepared to make in the Kennedy round.

The Congress never intended to authorize the President to trade U.S. duty reductions off for promises by other nations to act in a responsible manner in the use of their agricultural surpluses for the benefit of the starving peoples of the less-developed nations of the world.

The United States appears to be so desperate to make a trade agreement in the Kennedy round that our negotiators have gone far outside of the authority delegated by the Congress to the President in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 for face-saving undertakings by other countries, especially in Europe. We have been effectively blocked out of Europe by the variable import levies on agricultural commodities and have been unable to secure a reduction in these levies or a commitment that the European Common Market countries would control agricultural production to an extent that the overproduction of the EEC and other major producers of agricultural commodities to have continued access to the European market.

Instead of walking away from the barbwire made by the arbitrary and stubborn attitude of the European Common Market—which we should do—
nate the American selling price basis of valuation for benzenoid chemicals and rubber-soled footwear in exchange for a promise by the European countries to confer upon us some of the duty reductions, the effects which we are entitled to by virtue of our offered tariff reductions on chemicals in the first place.

In other words, on chemicals as in agriculture, we are prepared to give a great deal and to accept virtually nothing in return.

During the debate on the Trade Expansion Act, many of us tried to warn the Members of this body about the mess in which we are involved and the clear result from the enactment of that act. The administration leaders on the floor of the House were determined that the bill should pass, and all appeals to reason fell upon deaf ears. Subsequently, many of the promises and assurances that were given by administration spokesmen in that debate have been forgotten.

One thing I am certain: If an attempt is made to bring onto the floor of the House a bill to extend the Trade Expansion Act or to make any similar grant of authority to the President in this area, they will find many Members of this body up in arms and unwilling to consider anything which the House of Representatives has passed since the passage of the 1963 act.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of the Third District of Georgia, which is also a leading producer of textiles, I would like to say that the import crises indeed constitute a clear and present danger to the national textile economic well-being. I would like to associate myself with the timely remarks that have been made by the gentleman from North Carolina, and commend him for his leadership.

Mr. WHITENER. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am deeply indebted to him for the interest he has shown in this problem, not just a problem of North Carolina or Georgia, which is also a leading producer of textiles, but indeed a problem of the entire United States.

The city of Birmingham, as every Birmingham resident knows, is one of the largest steel-producing cities in the United States. The steel industry in our city has the largest payroll and is our largest city industry. It represents both strong and unfair foreign competition. But our industries should not be obliged to face unfair competition created by our own negotiators in trade agreements such as may result from the Kennedy round.

Our negotiators must be aware of the urgent need of American workers and American industry for protection from excessive imports, and be guided accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to follow the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina and also to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier during colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Derr).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I say to him, I appreciate his diligence in this concern for American jobs and American people.

ROBERT DARU

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 31 New York lost a colorful and courageous crusading lawyer. Robert Daru was known for his dedication to justice and his willingness to fight for unpopular causes. Mr. Daru started his legal career as an assistant district attorney for New York County. Later he served as special counsel to the U.S. Senate Committee on Crime and Racketeering. He was board chairman of the New York Criminal and Civil Courts Bar Association and for 15 years had been counsel for its committee on justice. Two years ago, when Robert Daru filed ant segregation petitions in Alabama courts, Klansmen threatened to kill him if he returned to Alabama. With typical courage he returned to Alabama saying: "Alabama is the United States; it's my country. If I can't go there I can't stay in America anywhere."

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Daru and her family.

I wish to include in the Record two obituaries—one from the World Journal Tribune of April 21, and one from the New York Times, of April 22.

The two obituaries:

[From the New York World Journal Tribune, April 21, 1967]

ROBERT DARU DIES—CRUSAADING LAWYER

Robert Daru, 66, was a motorcycle-riding crusader who devoted his life to fighting injustice. He was a member of the Ku Klux Klan, proposing federal legislation to curb Klan activities. When he filed ant segregation petitions in Alabama courts two
years ago, Klansmen threatened to kill him if he returned to Alabama.

Undaunted, Mr. Daru went back.

Injured Throat

"I got a lot of mail saying 'stay out of the South,'" the white-hatred attorney said as he recalled.

"My wife told me, 'stay out of Alabama.' I said no. Alabama is the United States; it's my country. If I can't go to the South, I can't stay in America anywhere."

On justice, he helped free a man who spent his life threatened for the first time in the early 1960s. When he prosecuted gangster Vincent (Mad Dog) Coll, who was later shot dead by rival mobsters.

Drafted Kinslaw Law

Later, as special counsel to the Senate crime committee, he drafted the so-called Lindbergh Act providing the death penalty in kidnapping cases.

In his capacity as counsel to the committee on justice, he helped free a man who spent seven years in Sing Sing for a forgery he did not commit.

In the 1950s, Mr. Daru defended the rights of a man of the executive committee of the New York Criminal and Court Bar Assn. For 13 years he was counsel to the association's committee on justice. He also served as counsel to the Senate Grand Jury Committee, the Federal Grand Jury Assn. of New York and other crime-battling groups.

Death threats were no novelty to Mr. Daru. His life was threatened for the first time in the early 1930s when he prosecuted gangster Vincent (Mad Dog) Coll, who was later shot dead by rival mobsters.
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Never in the entire history of our trade agreements law has such a shambles been made out of our negotiations with other countries. These rigid results in negotiations are the more difficult to understand because of the really unprecedented grant of power which was made by the Congress to the President in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. With more power than any President before him, the President and his negotiators are faced with the poorest results achieved by the United States in any of the lackluster performances by our trade negotiators in past multilateral negotiations. Our negotiators are faced with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Once again the United States appears likely to be outbargained and out-traded, but this time it appears that we will not even have the face-saving comfort of theoretical reductions in tariff duties by other countries; instead, we will accept promises by them to see their duty to mankind through food aid as a type of trade concession to the United States.

We also will accept as worthy bargaining material from the affluent nations of Europe their disappointment in the legal inability of the United States to make self-executing concessions for the elimination of the American selling price, the weakening of our Antidumping Act, or basic changes in our agricultural price support systems.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the sentiment which has been expressed by other Members of this body that it would be better to call off the Kennedy round than to so forego the benefits of nonconcessions which our negotiators are discussing in Geneva.

In conclusion, the Kennedy round appears to be such a backward step that the President should call it off so that we may proceed to some negotiations we can be proud of.

U.S. TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WARRINER] in his concern over the turn taken by the negotiations under the Kennedy round.

I agree that the negotiations have gone through a torturous and agonizing course over the past 4 years, only to arrive at an impasse that apparently can only be resolved through a retreat by this country from a position that has been firmly asserted on numerous occasions.

The President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiation and his deputies have vowed over and over again that this country will not negotiate our industrial tariffs unless and until we receive acceptable concessions for our agricultural exports.

The other countries, particularly the EEC or Common Market group, have been on notice to this effect since 1963 when ground rules for the negotiations were first adopted. It was agreed that "acceptable conditions of access to world markets" would be provided for agricultural products, so that trade in such products could be developed and expanded.

In the months and years to come while the EEC countries were shoring up and protecting their agricultural products by price supports and variable import fees, no offer was made to this country on any major program of liberalization with an advertised firm deadline came and went.

We, the United States, went ahead despite the default, and submitted our list of exceptions on industrial items in any case, worldwide. In other words, we let the default pass and proceeded with our own submittal exactly contrary to what we said. This was not the tip off to the EEC. Having vowed that we would not make an offer on industrial items unless we received an offer on agricultural products at the same time, we nevertheless made our offer when the agricultural offer was not accepted by the EEC. The meaning was there for anyone to read, and the EEC read it.

The Common Market countries could easily conclude from our lack of firmness that from that time on they could outwait us, and we would be in a position of difference with fair assurance that we would back down on all other points of disagreement.

This comes very close to what happened. We fixed other deadlines, and these have also been disregarded with impunity. We still, nevertheless, cling to our determination to negotiate a Kennedy round—apparently with little regard for the cost in terms of prestige and still less regard for the lack of reciprocity that may be achieved.

One example is enough to confirm this suspicion. It has already been mentioned this afternoon on the floor, but it bears repeating and should become publicly known. I refer, of course, to the backing down from our position on agricultural products. This needs a little explanation to become understandable.

The Trade Expansion Act authorizes the President to enter into trade agreements and in their course to modify or bind tariff rates or other import restrictions. It was under this authorization that we agreed to what has come to be called a "guaranteed access" to foreign markets for our farm products. "Guaranteed access" really meant no more than a guarantee to hold our own, as measured by the restricting of our market. Thus it was a weak bargain to begin with.

In other words, we settled for nothing more than a guarantee that we would not be confronted with a freezeout by the Common Market—something that could happen under the variable import levy system they adopted.

When the EEC made its offer on farm products, however, it was a minimal proposal which was unacceptable. The American Farm Bureau Federation immediately called for abandonment of the Kennedy round in view of the paucity of the offer.

That recommendation, though fully justified, was not followed. This country was so wedded to the notion of bringing off an agreement under the Kennedy round that it looked around for some face-saving substitute for the guaranteed access formula; and hit on the import licensing of which it was so fond.

Such an agreement, of course, is not contained in the authority of the Trade Expansion Act. This fact characteristically did not stop the President's Special Representative, Mr. William Roth or his Deputy, Mr. Michael Blumenthal. They came up with the suggestion that the other industrial countries should contribute to the feeding of the hungry people of the world which thus lighten our burden. Should they agree, we would forget about the guaranteed access and consider ourselves compensated by the sharing of our self-assumed burden of feeding the world.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the desirability of what is proposed; namely, that the other countries should help relieve suffering from hunger in the overpopulated areas of the world. We should not have to buy this as a favor; and that is what we would be doing. We would give up the guaranteed access to foreign markets for farm products in return for permission to import at a price not to exceed that which they should do in any case—assuming they are so inclined.

Not only should we not have to pay for their doing their share: the Kennedy round is the right vehicle. The only authority the President has in this field is that contained in the Trade Expansion Act; and that act cannot in good conscience be stretched to encompass a deal which it never contemplated.

If the proposed deal on grain is alien to the Trade Expansion Act, moreover, we would relinquish our guaranteed access to foreign agricultural markets for the proposed lightening of our burden incurred in relieving the food deficit in needy countries. Mr. Speaker, if the President's Special Representative can go so far in stretching his power under the Trade Expansion Act there is almost no limit to which he might go.

The provisions of the law are apparently irrelevant and meaningless.

The State Department had become so accustomed to following its unilateral interpretation of the trade agreements legislation that the President's Special Representative soon fell into the same habit. Congress has been pushed aside and is no longer tolerated as the only authority in the field of trade. That it is the function of Congress to regulate foreign commerce and to lay and collect duties, is not only forgotten but is no longer mentioned.

I think it is long past the time when Congress should reassert its power and responsibility in this field.

The President's Special Representative is negotiating in two other fields that lie beyond his competence under the Trade Expansion Act. One is the proposed international antidumping code and the other, the elimination of the American price. Almost certainly the basis for levying duties on certain chemical items, rubber-soled footwear and two minor items.

Although he is not authorized to do so, the Special Representative proposes the
to negotiate separately on these items and then bring them back to Congress for approval. This procedure would be designed to bring extreme pressure on Congress, varying by amendment, to approve a bill that has been negotiated and signed. This style of forced play, Mr. Speaker, does not go down well. It represents an effort to pressure the Congress with considerations of diplomacy as the Instructed wilderness. This is neither fair as a procedure nor conducive to harmony between the executive and the legislative branch.

I wish to commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WHITMER) for airing this important subject on the floor. The weakness of our negotiating approach should have been exposed before now. We throw away our bargaining power before we are half way through, by tipping our hand and revealing our anxiety over failure to reach an agreement.

Also the disregard for the limits of authority of the President in making trade agreements is in great need of exposure. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, though on the other side of the aisle from me, has done a great service today and I gladly give him all the support I can.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The Acting Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the eminent foreign correspondent and columnist, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, recently analyzed the decline of NATO and pointed to the importance of nuclear weapons in this decline. His perceptive column follows:

REFUSAL TO GIVE U.S. ALLIES ATOMIC WEAPONS WEAKENS NATO
(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

In the international field, as elsewhere, rarely trouble come singly.

Particularly not when they are being stirred up by fanatics who have managed to stretch a controlling paw over a third of the earth's people.

Therefore none of us should be surprised that from Bolivia to Quebec, from Bonn to Peking, and from Rhodesia to the Philippines, by way of Somalia, Yugo-Fratetan, India, Ceylon, and Indonesia, new eruptions may occur at just about any time.

Western power but the United States is any longer ready or able to deal with these sorest, we Americans have no choice but to see to it that the Truman Doctrine wherever it may lead us, or to let the rest of the world go hang ... itself on a Red gang.

Of all threatened areas West Europe most needs our support. Some people say it is too late. From Oswald Spengler on, pessimists have given us the two terminal phrases "the downfall" or the "suicide" of the West. Yet, many, including Arnold Toynbee, have replied that while this may happen it need not, by way of Somalia, Yugo-Fratetan, the best governed, most prosperous, most scientifically advanced, and most powerful section of humanity.

UNIFIED FRONT NEEDED

Hailing further deterioration would seem to depend on its ability to unite and present to the entire world a unified front which it did in the early fifties.

Since then, a series of American policies, chiefly the New Frontier's infatuation with the idea of an integrated Atlantic defense, has unquestionably brought about a loss of cohesion which could lead to the West's internal disintegration, the European side, to total loss of power.

This would be an even greater catastrophe than this. These full sense is that the world is just beginning to realize.

We ought then feel happy that the "Task Force on the Conduct of Foreign Relations" of the Republican Coordinating Committee has brought out a statement urging President Johnson to put to effect his remark that an "integrated Atlantic defense is the first necessity" of our foreign policy.

This statement lists five American actions which lead to the deterioration of NATO. These were (1) permitting the construction of the Berlin Wall; (2) our unilateral withdrawal of missiles from Greece and Turkey following the Cuban missile crisis; (3) the imposition on our NATO allies of a defense policy of "flexible response" in place of "massive retaliation, the abrupt cancellation of the Skybolt missile project and giving preference to Britain; and (5) the priority and emphasis given by Washington to the "lockstep" plan, that is, by-passing our allies in favor of direct talks with the Soviet Union in case of crisis.

DEFERRED REAL POWER

With all of these I agree. Yes the "Task Force" has in my opinion overlooked the chief cause of NATO's rot. This is the consistent American refusal to give to our allies any sort of real control, unless they possess atomic weapons. For this deprives them of that real power which is the essence of all political power in a decision on the common future of the people.

And, past that, there is another point. What is the position of the West if it cannot achieve a qualitative but a quantitative distinction within NATO to which our European allies are bound—he repeat, bound—in the long run react with further resentment of apathy, together the cause of NATO's current sickness.

In fact, I dare predict: so long as the United States refuses to endow our allies with nuclear weapons of their own over which they have full control, NATO will never be able to achieve that position.

This is the reason why the realization of a nuclear non-proliferation treaty with the Soviet Union would be a catastrophe.

Think it over, Republicans.

NATIONAL HOME OWNERSHIP FOUNDATION

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the 37 Senators and the 273 House Members for their action last week in co-sponsoring the Percy plan to promote homeownership in the slums.

Lack of adequate housing has already emerged as a major problem of the nation, world problems. It is part and parcel of continuing racial tensions and the preservation of the so-called poverty cycle.

Now, for the first time we have a vehicle which can provide the coordinated impetus required from the private sector, individual citizens and government, to make homeownership a reality and not just a mere dream for those Americans continuously enduring the burden of inadequate, substandard housing.

It is not the whole answer to the slum problem. There is a need for many new approaches, but Senator Percy's program to promote the establishment of a National Housing Corporation that will move down a largely untraveled road. It is an attempt to mobilize the private sector, with Government reinforcement at crucial spots.

For too long, public housing for slum residents has been of the "Government knows what's best for you" approach. This program put the faith where it belongs, in the people.

I sincerely hope this imaginative program will win bipartisan support and that the Congress will move quickly to enact it in this session.

UNIQUENESS: THE GREAT HOPE FOR THE SOUTH

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, the South is rapidly becoming the new frontier in the second wave of development of the United States. Part of this development is being spearheaded by men such as Winthrop Rockefeller, newly elected Governor of Arkansas.

On April 14, 1967, Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller addressed Johns Hopkins University. At the time of this address to the new Institute of Southern History, the Governor made several comments reflecting on the past experiences of the South. For example, he said:

It is self-deceiving for the South to attempt to develop itself while largely ignoring modern trends and techniques. And, past negligence has left the South a great task in bringing the Negro directly and positively into its economic system.

Then the Governor talked about what the South could be like and what it needed to do to win the coming years. In talking about goals he said:

Suppose that over the next 50 years the South should succeed in this game of economic catch-up. What then? It will have achieved the dubious distinction of becoming nationally "average". I believe that the goal must be for something greater.

Lastly, the Governor discussed the challenge that was before the South when he said:

I am convinced that economic uniqueness is absolutely necessary for the South, if it is to achieve its aspirations. My presence here, and efforts by the first Republican governor in Arkansas in 44 years, serve as evidence that I believe we can achieve this uniqueness.

The complete text of Governor Rockefeller's comments is as follows:
Uniqueness: The Great Hope for the South

By Winthrop Rockefeller, Governor of Arkansas, April 14, 1967

Arkansas and all of the land of Opportunity. For more than a decade, I have been working with leaders in the States to find ways of fulfilling the promise of the sloping landscape, the moderate climate, and much more remains to be done.

During this long period of involvement, I have developed a deep affection for our southern states, and I believe that Arkansas may be applied broadly to the South as a whole. I am convinced that the South is the Land of Opportunity. If we choose to make it so.

Many things have been spoken and written—both good and bad—about the South. Its problems have been depleted, its past defended and its recent trends praised. Today I will not repeat this backward-looking literature, nor do I propose to reveal in detail the massive amount of statistical information that has been absorbed in the preparation of these remarks. While certain new and pertinent figures will arise, my primary concern is with a philosophical evaluation of this information; with the wise use of its implications, and with the opportunities that lie before us.

A number of years ago, during my early travels in the South, I came to the conclusion that the greatest problem facing the South was a massive inferiority complex. Today, much of my optimism has vanished, but in fact the South is in the process of shaking off this old complex; that it is turning away from what was and is and is future-oriented for the first time.

And we now know that a substantial fact has been accepted in the preparation of these remarks. While certain new and pertinent figures will arise, my primary concern is with a philosophical evaluation of this information; with the wise use of its implications, and with the opportunities that lie before us.

This transformation is essential if the South is to meet three vital prerequisites to truly dramatic development. These prerequisites, I believe, are understanding, motivation, and initiative.

We must understand clearly the environment that shapes our economic development. We must be most active in the initiative in creating our own opportunities. The trends of history are not with us, and we must play a vital role in its future. Obviously, we must break the box of the sociologist and not the economist. Yet I am convinced that the massive problems facing the South are not just now throwing off, but have been very involved in some painful economic crises.

Returning to history—the rest of the comparative development story is a predictable continuation of a trend. Increasing diversification of industry in the North, the discovery of the tremendous output possible through mass production, and the subsequence of the tremendous agricultural labor and income, divergence of income and income, the discovery of the tremendous emergence of the North and South became more marked.

Two powerful points can be made from this sequence of events. First, the South's almost total concentration on the production of cotton was, at that time, entirely rational. If North America and the rest of the world had not agreed in history, it would have made use of the tremendous output possible through mass production, and the subsequence of the tremendous agricultural labor and income, divergence of income and income, the discovery of the tremendous emergence of the North and South became more marked.

How may we change the trend of economic history? Obviously, we must break the box of the sociologist and not the economist. Yet I am convinced that the massive problems facing the South are not just now throwing off, but have been very involved in some painful economic crises.

Returning to history—the rest of the comparative development story is a predictable continuation of a trend. Increasing diversification of industry in the North, the discovery of the tremendous output possible through mass production, and the subsequence of the tremendous agricultural labor and income, divergence of income and income, the discovery of the tremendous emergence of the North and South became more marked.

Second, and more importantly now, we must recognize the long-run consequences of such a change, since to this day the resulting divergence of incomes between the North and the South persists. As change comes, the divergence can be eliminated—but the South must be careful not to become engulfed with another falling star.
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How may we change the trend of economic history? Obviously, we must break the box of the sociologist and not the economist. Yet I am convinced that the massive problems facing the South are not just now throwing off, but have been very involved in some painful economic crises.
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state-by-state ranking of per capita income continues as a striking reminder of the differentials.

The normal course of events, the South might hope for income equality in a half-century or so—if it can sustain its recent rapid growth.

In his fine book about education in North Carolina, Governor Terry Sanford wrote, "The mystery of the age is not the moon; it is man's failure to understand the mystery, and this is seen with stark clarity in the Southland."

In the South—where the search for an answer is for something the numbers and beyond is rapidly intensifying—is also where the simplest kind of motivation can re­present the hope of something in the future. Why? Because the standards the people ac­cept for themselves have been shaped by poverty. The standards that leaders in gov­ernment are forming now in an attempt to catch up with the national average.

The facts of economic growth in this country show us two things. First, the kinds and number and rate of growth depends largely upon the growth of the nation as a whole.

When the nation grows rapidly, the less developed areas of the nation, the South, in­cessantly reflecting the growth of the nation as a whole. The quest for national growth involves a long, slow process, any significant varia­tion from it almost certainly will require breaking the pattern.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. The South should succeed in this game of eco­nomics as a whole, not necessarily with the sort of manufacturing employment and growth are leveling off nationally and therefore increas­ing selectivity in the types of manufactur­ing it develops. Along with this, we should actively participate in attracting the members of our potential work force who are of age and under.

The quest for quality standards in basic education in the next century would be one of the nation's great blessings, or one of its great problems.

Certainly, very few areas of the United States are suitable for leisure time develop­ment in the total sense, and only the barest beginning has been made to develop the potential for the volume of participation that the future might hold.

Unquestionably, the South can assume a leading role in the development of this in­dustry. What is the third area of opportunity?

The quest for quality standards in basic education in the South must not falter. It must, instead, gain momentum. It is my belief that American educators and the South's educational leaders in particular can have the effect of greatly intensifying this quest.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. The challenge of the South, and welfare programs is to attend to the deeply troubled: to those who, even given the opportunity, cannot help themselves by their own efforts, to recognize this ob­ligation, as must other regions, and is pre­pared to live with it always.

But among these sixty million people there are many and for whom welfare programs are the only welfare work is to create jobs that are competitive with and preferable to, occupying a spot on the public welfare rolls.

If I were not to make reference to the problems growing out of new concepts of the federal system. Areas of the South, as the nation as a whole, are more self-sufficient than ever.

With the federal income tax most sensibly reflecting the growth of our national economy—at the rate of from six to nine mil­lion dollars a year—many new-found tax dollars are being earmarked for the states on a matching grant-in-aid basis.

A primary reason the under-developed Southern states, are being hard put to find the matching funds, and at the same time make the sacrifices neces­sary to provide these opportunities; to provide for furthering that area's educational standards, and for ever more expensive state services.

I am pleased about the growing aware­ness of the dilemma of the states, and the recognition that failure to help could be re­sponsible leadership when the federal gov­ernment recognizes the necessity of unen­cumbering the states for such efforts. And, there are a number of alternatives in the immediate future, and decisions made must be in the best interest of the region's growth.

First, each state's growth depends largely upon the growth of the nation as a whole.

Second, education, rather than proliferating the industrial revolution. From this vantage point we can contemplate the great growth industries of the 20th Century. Let us consider some alternatives.

Hopefully, industrial growth in the South will continue for some time, and it will be valued for its favorable position in attracting and developing both a strong, steady stream of population and new industries. One of the South's great problems.

The challenge of the South, and it is a daunting task in time to come. Very likely we have reached a transition in mankind's existence that will bring about tremendous growth in the highly technical so-called "Think" industries. As man's knowledge deepens and widens, and as he encodes more and more of himself into machines, the ownership, storage and control of knowledge becomes paramount. The South's abundant water supply puts it in a uniquely favorable position for attracting more and more of the traditionally higher paying jobs, such as are found in the booming paper industry.

What are to be the big growth industries in the next century?

First and quite obviously, the future will bring about tremendous growth in industries such as are found in the booming paper industry.

Unquestionably, the basic educational system of much of the South must undergo considerable change. Furthermore, in the context of these remarks, however—and at the risk of being misunderstood—I am saying that the regional policy ought to consider both a "symptom" and a "cause" of under­developed, and that therefore it falls within the "cause-up" concept.

What is the third area of opportunity?

First, the quest for quality standards in basic education in the South must not falter. It must, instead, gain momentum. It is my belief that American educators and the South's educational leaders in particular can have the effect of greatly intensifying this quest.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. The challenge of the South, and welfare programs is to attend to the deeply troubled: to those who, even given the opportunity, cannot help themselves by their own efforts, to recognize this ob­ligation, as must other regions, and is pre­pared to live with it always.

But among these sixty million people there are many and for whom welfare programs are the only welfare work is to create jobs that are competitive with and preferable to, occupying a spot on the public welfare rolls.

If I were not to make reference to the problems growing out of new concepts of the federal system. Areas of the South, as the nation as a whole, are more self-sufficient than ever.

With the federal income tax most sensibly reflecting the growth of our national economy—at the rate of from six to nine mil­lion dollars a year—many new-found tax dollars are being earmarked for the states on a matching grant-in-aid basis.

A primary reason the under-developed Southern states, are being hard put to find the matching funds, and at the same time make the sacrifices neces­sary to provide these opportunities; to provide for furthering that area's educational standards, and for ever more expensive state services.

I am pleased about the growing aware­ness of the dilemma of the states, and the recognition that failure to help could be re­sponsible leadership when the federal gov­ernment recognizes the necessity of unen­cumbering the states for such efforts. And, there are a number of alternatives in the immediate future, and decisions made must be in the best interest of the region's growth.

First, each state's growth depends largely upon the growth of the nation as a whole.

Second, education, rather than proliferating the industrial revolution. From this vantage point we can contemplate the great growth industries of the 20th Century. Let us consider some alternatives.

Hopefully, industrial growth in the South will continue for some time, and it will be valued for its favorable position in attracting more and more of the traditionally higher paying jobs, such as are found in the booming paper industry.

What are to be the big growth industries in the next century?

First, the quest for quality standards in basic education in the South must not falter. It must, instead, gain momentum. It is my belief that American educators and the South's educational leaders in particular can have the effect of greatly intensifying this quest.
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"Think" industries, food technology and leisure time—are the areas which, I believe, hold forth truly exciting promise for the creating of a better way of life in the South.

The South today is drawing very near to an important crossroads, from which it will choose the road it shall proceed to do. One will invite us to proceed as usual, locked on course, and in perhaps half a century find ourselves pulling abreast of the stated described as being nationally "average".

The alternative choice will be a much higher road, leading us into the spiritually infallible markers to guide us surely along the way; nor can we even be sure where it ultimately shall proceed to do.

But I am an incurable optimist, and I inherited more than a fair share of family tenacity. And so in my own mind there is no doubt about where our destination can be.

Robert Browning said, "What I aspired to be, and am not—comforts me."

As long as I do not aspire to be "average". Before we are a greatly enriched way of life, and a position of economic leadership.

So I will choose the high road—and gladly—because out there is fulfillment of that promise: "The Land of Opportunity"

JOHNSON OIL DIPLOMACY BUILDS SICK BUT DANGEROUS BRIDGES TO THE EAST

Mr. BUSH: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. Fino) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, to read this week's newspapers is to read about escalation of the war in Vietnam. Each day, our jet fighter-bombers fly raiding missions to destroy North Vietnamese fuel supplies, including oil supplies largely provided by the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

It is true, therefore, to read that the incumbent Democratic administration of these United States is helping the Kommies to supply North Vietnam with oil and petroleum products. This charge is very easy to document, and I shall proceed to do so.

My enclosures are as follows:

First. Allen and Scott column of February 22, 1967, describing how U.S. State Department has given "encouragement" to U.S. oil companies in Iran to make Iran-produced oil available to the Soviet bloc—which could be transshipped to Vietnam.

Second. Excerpts from State Department letter to me of March 14, 1967, describing the legal situation with respect to U.S. oil company sales of foreign-produced oil to the Soviet bloc, and noting that U.S. oil companies participating in the United States-Iranian Oil Consortium were, in fact, furnishing or about to furnish such oil to the Soviet bloc.

Third. Excerpts from April 2, 1967, London Economist article describing how Iran agreed to sell the Soviet Bloc crude oil and provide natural gas and petroleum products to the Soviet Union through a pipeline to be built from the Persian Gulf to the Soviet

VIETNAM, to be provided in return with technicians, a steel mill and armaments.

Fourth. Excerpts from U.S. News & World Report's article of February 20, 1967, describing how the Soviet bloc is using its Middle East oil to purchase arms, and how the multi-million dollar business of such arms sales to the Soviet Union.

Fifth. Wall Street Journal article of April 15, 1967, describing how the Soviet Union has given the Government of Iran an $80 million loan for help to provide U.S. equipment for a petrochemical plant at Shahrud, near the terminal of the pipeline to the Soviet Union.

Sixth. Excerpts from April 20, 1967, Moscow Narodny Bank Weekly Press Sheet describing April 15 oil agreement signed between Russia and Iran to explore and exploit Iranian oil resources outside the area already operated by a consortium of Western oil companies.

Seventh. Article from April 22, 1967, London Economist detailing Soviet-Iranian oil agreement of April 15, stating that the 60 million dollar deal with Russia, payments to be made in gas and petroleum products, in addition to the joint oil exploration agreement. The Economist map shows the pipeline going near to or to Shahrud, where Exxon is financing construction of a petrochemical plant, control of which will be in the hands of National Iranian Oil Co. with aid from Sun Oil Co. of Iran. These Iranian Government-owned corporations are those participating in the oil deals with the Soviet bloc.

Eighth. Excerpts from January 16, 1967, Barron's weekly article entitled "Dangerous Bridges," which describes how the Soviet Union uses oil as a foreign policy weapon in Africa and Asia, and how the United States has gone along with the Soviets, even granting a steady stream of approvals for export of oil drilling and gas production equipment under the Export Control Act. The article also describes how the Export-Import Bank has made sales of this equipment to the Soviet bloc.

The enclosures follow:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Feb. 22, 1967]

SOURCE MATERIAL, UNITED STATES-SOVIEIT-IRAN OIL TRANSACTIONS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

The U.S. is helping Russia realize a long-sought goal in the Middle East by giving access to the vast oil resources there. With encouragement from the State Department, American companies with concessions in Saudi Arabia, Iran and Iraq have begun selling oil to Russia and the Eastern European satellites.

The multi-million dollar oil sales, arranged under the greatest secrecy last month, represent a serious shift in United States policy after Middle East governments began pressuring American firms to take advantage of the offers.

These unreported Middle East developments are considered by Administration insiders to be a direct outgrowth of efforts by President Johnson to seek a détente with Russia by offering to increase trade.

Still unresolved among U.S. officials is how much of the new Russian trade can be kept from shipping the Middle East oil to North Vietnam, Cuba and North Korea.

Although there is no evidence that the initial shipments were destined for these countries, Russia, as chief oil supplier of these Red regimes is expected to use future oil pur- chase to establish the Middle East as a haven for these commitments. This development, when it occurs, could touch off a major political crisis in the Middle East and compel the United States to take a stand on the future of the Persian Gulf. Thus, the Soviet Union would be expected to use future oil purchases to further cement Red regimes is expected to use future oil purchase to establish the Middle East as a haven for these commitments.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINO: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of March 3, 1967 concerning a recent story in the "Northern Virginia Sun" which reported that the United States had been encouraged to sell petroleum to the USSR and other Eastern European countries. You expressed strong opposition to such trade.

The United States Government has not encouraged United States oil companies to sell petroleum to the Soviet Union or to the other Communist countries of Eastern Europe. Under the Export Control regulations, United States oil companies are required to obtain an export license from the Department of Commerce before selling domestically-produced petroleum or petroleum products to the USSR and other Eastern European countries. Export license applications for such sales would be subject to the usual controls and if it would not be approved if it were determined that such sale is in the interests of the United States.

A different situation prevails with regard to petroleum and petroleum products produced by foreign States companies from their overseas operations. Sales of such products to the USSR and the other Eastern European countries are not subject to the Export Control regulations. The United States has no control over such purchases. It is possible that Eastern European countries are major importers of crude petroleum. At present the US is one of the world's leading exporters of crude petroleum, having exported over 60 million tons of crude petroleum last year. It is estimated that the total production of crude petroleum is around 24 million metric tons. For this reason it is extremely doubtful that the USSR could be able to buy the crude petroleum it needs from the United States. A different situation prevails with regard to petroleum and petroleum products produced by foreign States companies from their overseas operations. It is possible that such companies could increase their sales of crude petroleum to the USSR and other Eastern European countries. If such a situation were to occur, it would be in the interest of the United States to ensure that such sales do not take place.

The United States Government has not encouraged United States oil companies to sell petroleum to the Soviet Union or to the other Communist countries of Eastern Europe. Under the Export Control regulations, United States oil companies are required to obtain an export license from the Department of Commerce before selling domestically-produced petroleum or petroleum products to the USSR and other Eastern European countries. Export license applications for such sales would be subject to the usual controls and if it would not be approved if it were determined that such sale is in the interests of the United States. A different situation prevails with regard to petroleum and petroleum products produced by foreign States companies from their overseas operations. Sales of such products to the USSR and the other Eastern European countries are not subject to the Export Control regulations. The United States has no control over such purchases. It is possible that Eastern European countries are major importers of crude petroleum. At present the US is one of the world's leading exporters of crude petroleum, having exported over 60 million tons of crude petroleum last year. It is estimated that the total production of crude petroleum is around 24 million metric tons. For this reason it is extremely doubtful that the USSR could be able to buy the crude petroleum it needs from the United States. A different situation prevails with regard to petroleum and petroleum products produced by foreign States companies from their overseas operations. It is possible that such companies could increase their sales of crude petroleum to the USSR and other Eastern European countries. If such a situation were to occur, it would be in the interest of the United States to ensure that such sales do not take place.
The Economist of London, April 2, 1967

**RUSSIA AND IRAN: FRIENDS ACROSS THE FENCE**

In the early 1960’s Iranian relations with the West was at a peak. Today, contact with the communist world is expanding in all directions.

Negotiations signed over the last two years have pushed up trade with half-a-dozen east European countries. A recent agreement under which Iran will sell Russia $100 million worth of crude oil over a ten-year period in return for heavy plant and machinery is typical of these trade treaties. Discussion is going on about using the credit, worth nearly $40 million, that has been offered to Iran by Poland, Hungry, and Czechoslovakia. The volume of trade is still in return. But if these agreements are implemented, equipment is being bought in east Europe in exchange for traditional Iranian exports, such as cotton.

These arrangements are largely adjuncts to the surprising expansion in Iranian-Russian ties. The Russians last year became the largest single buyer of Iranian oil--a fact which catches even people used to it. After Iran formally pledged in 1963 that it would not allow foreign missile bases on its soil, nor allow Iran to become a base of aggression against the Soviet Union, the two countries have signed a number of long­standing agreements. The Russians have already held their first industrial exhibition in Teheran; Aeroflot now flies regularly between Teheran and Moscow; a cultural agreement is in the pipeline. The two countries are co-operating in constructing a dam across the water gap, and include extraneous matter.

The crowning act to these multiple moves towards a rapprochement came last December, when a large Russian trade mission arrived under which the Russians are to provide Iran with $386 million in credits to finance an industrial complex consisting of a steel mill, a machine-toool plant and, possibly, a factory for making farm implements. The steel mill, with an initial annual capacity of 600,000 tons, will be expanded at a second stage to 1,200,000 tons. At the same time, the Russians are to help Iran build a $450 million steel mill.

Iranian oil fields to the southern Soviet republics 780 miles away.

The most immediately important has been the gestating steel mill for some 20 years. But repeated negotiations with the United States and west Europe have not worked out and the issue had become highly political. It will give a Russian slant to Iran’s biggest venture into heavy industry; it will make a Russian technician in Iran and mean that several hundred Iranian technicians and workers will be trained by Russians.

**BUSINESS AROUND THE WORLD**

All at once, Iran is reminding everybody that it hasn’t really changed so much after all, and is an effective commercial power and irrigation purposes, and such as cotton and dried fruit.
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objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have written to the President to ask him to have members of the House and Senate Banking Committees to the White House for a meeting on the U.S. gold problem.

Today we are reaching the point where our gold reserves cannot supply more than a tiny fraction of world dollar claims against gold so long as we must keep gold supplies on hand to the extent of 25 percent of our currency. There can be no question that the administration is preparing to scrap the 25-percent gold backing for the currency. No new legislation has to be introduced, because Chairman Henry Reuss of the International Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee dropped such a bill in the hopper months ago. According to the London Times of April 19, the administration is about to ask Congress to repeal the 25-percent gold cover. Inasmuch as the Times is a quite reliable newspaper, I think that the President ought to let members of the House and Senate Banking Committees in on his plans. This administration is throwing up which could make things more difficult if the administration later seeks rubberstamp committee action.

I enclose the Moscow Narodny Bank's London Times article stating that the administration is about to seek repeal of the gold cover for our currency:

The U.S. Administration will shortly ask Congress to free the entire American gold stock for international transactions by repealing the law which requires a 25 percent gold backing for the currency. The amount of gold available to meet foreign demands would be increased by this move from the present $2,600 mn to the full $14,100 mn contained in the U.S. gold stock and the ration of foreign claims to "free" American gold would be reduced from 10-1 to only about 3-1.

REORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WITMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITMAN. Mr. Speaker, the residential mortgage market crisis of 1966 generated not only legislation which was enacted last year but study on the part of trade associations in the real estate and mortgage lending fields as to methods for averting future crises when ever pressures are put on the capital market.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards has made a thorough study of the structural defects inherent in our basic arrangements for residential financing, and has recommended a substantial reorganization of the Federal National Mortgage Association with the object of preparing it to meet mortgage crises such as that of 1966 which saw residential sales and home building take a sharp plunge downward.

Briefly, the bill would do two things:

First, it would reconstitute the Federal National Mortgage Association as an independent corporate instrumentality of the United States; and

Second, it would authorize it to deal in conventional loans as well as FHA and VA loans.

This represents an enlargement of its powers under the secondary market function to a degree that making the conventional loan a nationally marketable commodity as is the case today with respect to FHA and VA loans. Of course, national standards will have to be developed by FNMA. Such national standardization is necessary in the State legislatures to remove some of the legal impediments and technicalities which deter the marketability of so many conventional mortgages across State lines.

Reconstituting FNMA as a separate agency, divorced from the welfare and subsidy oriented Department of Housing and Urban Development, is not as enormous a change as would appear at first glance. In 1966, when the Congress rechartered FNMA, reference was made to the ultimate retirement of the Treasury's investment, and the submission at that time of a plan to the Congress for the conversion of FNMA into a privately owned corporation. It could be said, therefore, that this new FNMA bill represents an intermediate step between FNMA as it is constituted today and its eventual transfer to private ownership.

I believe that these proposals for FNMA, as developed by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, merit the serious study and consideration of this House. I am therefore introducing the measure so that it might be considered by the subcommittee during its current deliberations on housing legislation.

The bill, and a section-by-section summary follows:

H.R.-

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, to read as follows:

"(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 not less than two years from the date of his appointment. A 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, none 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 in his stead. Another member of the board shall be the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Ex officio, another member of the board 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 Federal Reserve System ex officio, except that he may designate another member of the Federal Reserve Board to serve as such member in his stead. The other four members of the board shall be persons elected annually, except that the President may designate an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary of the Federal Reserve Board to serve as such member in his stead.

The common stock of the Association outstanding from time to time shall be the common stock of the Association as defined in the bylaws. The president of the corporation may be located in a space which is not subject to taxation.
the board of directors. Each share of such common stock shall entitle the holder thereof to one vote. No cumulative voting shall be allowed. Such meetings shall be held at such times and places, and shall be subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed in the bylaws by the board of directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and shall be called at the call of its chairman; 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 operation of the Association.

The board of directors shall meet and the call of its chairman, who shall require ten 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 operation of the Association. The board of directors shall select and appoint as provided in section 302 (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 call of its chairman, who shall require ten to meet not less often than once each quarter; or a meeting may be called by any four other members." and inserting in lieu thereof: "At the option of the Association, all of the preferred stock shall be repayable at par value thereof, and any common stock acquired by the corporation and held by it as corporate investments for not less than $100,000,000 of such common stock will thereafter remain outstanding. The amount of preferred stock authorized to be outstanding during a fiscal year shall be the amount otherwise provided for in this section reduced by an amount equal to the 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 (b) of section 301 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, "prude" means the carrying charge when the original principal on the mortgage (when, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, the President has determined that it is in the public interest) is followed: "as the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;" and

(b) by striking out "as 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 "as the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;" the following: "as the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;" and

(c) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(3) Exempting its activities carried on in a fiduciary capacity pursuant to subsection (e) 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 and shall be subject to the supervision of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and in connection therewith and subject to the supervision of the Secretary, theisans of the board of directors shall be consistent with any written statement of policy and procedures of the Association shall be consistent with any written statement of policy and procedures of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the chairman of the board.

Sec. 5. Section 302 (c) (2) of such Act is amended—

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

(b) by striking out "such an entity may not be used with respect to the 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 "The rate or rates of interest (when, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, the President has determined that it is in the public interest)" the following: "as 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 "as the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;" the following: "as the expense of and for the ultimate account of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;" and

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

"(2) Exempting its activities carried on in a fiduciary capacity pursuant to subsection (e) 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 and shall be subject to the supervision of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and in connection therewith and subject to the supervision of the Secretary, theisans of the board of directors shall be consistent with any written statement of policy and procedures of the Association shall be consistent with any written statement of policy and procedures of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the chairman of the board.
tions of the Association under this section shall be at the expense of and for the ultimate benefit 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: "Excluding 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 promoted 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 Secretary shall reimburse the Association for the amount of its administrative expenses allocable to such operations, on a fairly prorated basis."

SEC. 306. The amendment made by subsection (c) of section 305 of such Act, and by subsection (d) of such section, and by striking out everything following "related obligations of the Association," and by inserting in lieu thereof: "its promoted 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 Secretary shall reimburse the Association for the amount of its administrative expenses allocable to such operations, on a fairly prorated basis."

SEC. 307. The amendment made by subsection (c) of section 305 of such Act, and by subsection (d) of such section, and by striking out everything following "related obligations of the Association," and by inserting in lieu thereof: "its promoted 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 Secretary shall reimburse the Association for the amount of its administrative expenses allocable to such operations, on a fairly prorated basis."

SEC. 308. (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 pay and sell in the open market, under the direction and regulations of the Federal Open Market Committee, any obligations issued by the Association."

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

A bill to reconstitute the Federal National Mortgage Association as an independent corporation under the laws of the United States, to enable it to deal in all outstanding mortgages, to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market, and for other purposes.

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 body 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 provide otherwise for the further development as a secondary market facility, and would provide otherwise for its future development as a secondary market facility. That purpose would be accomplished by amending 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, FNMA would be authorized, to purchase and sell, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility. That purpose would be accomplished by amending 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, FNMA would be authorized, to purchase and sell, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility. That purpose would be accomplished by amending 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 3. This section would restrict re­
terms 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 Holding Company, the FNMA would provide for automatic annual reductions in the amount of authorized preferred stock equal to the amount of 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 all outstanding mortgages, to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility, and to provide otherwise for its future development as a secondary market facility. That purpose would be accomplished by amending 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, FNMA would be authorized, to purchase and sell, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility. That purpose would be accomplished by amending 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, FNMA would be authorized, to purchase and sell, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility. That purpose would be accomplished by amending 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 8. This section would provide for an open market purchase and sale of Federal Reserve open market purchase and sale of purchase. Otherwise, a privately insured mortgage would be eligible for purchase if the mortgage were not covered by any insurance. Such mortgage would be eligible for purchase.
FNMA obligations and other securities. The potential flexibility of open market transactions would be increased, which could serve to make FNMA securities somewhat more attractive to private investors.

THE 73D MEETING OF THE ACOUSTICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUPFERMAN) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the absence of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of addressing the Acoustical Society of America at their 73d meeting at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in New York City on Thursday evening, April 20, on the subject of noise pollution.

The outgoing president of the society is Martin Greenspan, of the National Bureau of Standards in Washington, D.C., who presided, and among others in attendance were incoming president Ira J. Hiraldo, of the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, and former CEO of Microwave and Acoustics, Inc., and professor Knudsen and accompanying material from his back yard and made available only to Vern Knudsen Graduate Fellowship University of Chicago. Here he studied physics under Millikan, Millikan, and Gale. Millikan wanted him to work on the contribution of electrons to the specific heat of metals for his dissertation. Knudsen wanted to work on some problem in acoustics on which he could utilize his knowledge of vacuum tube circuits. This impasse was resolved, however, for Millikan went to Europe. With Gale's assistance, Knudsen had his first impressions of the differences in loudness and frequency so well so long after the way by the time Millikan returned that he too could make the horserace. In June 1919, Knudsen to Dr. George E. Shambaugh, the dean of otoologists of that day. This contact resulted shortly in two significant papers on which Knudsen's name was sufficiently rated: "Sensibility of Pathological Ears to Small Differences of Loudness and Pitch," and "Report on an Investigation of Ten Cases of Deafness.

Vern Knudsen received the Ph.D. degree in Physics from the University of Chicago magna cum laude in 1923. In 1924, he entered the Department of Physics at UCLA (then known as University of California Southern Branch). In 1926, he was promoted to a position without which we now consider essential for a modern Department of Physics. An early Knudsen effort was the trek across the plains a generation before to settle in the desert of Utah. Vern confronted the lack of research space and equipment with the same drive and spirit that his father displayed. He found in the Los Angeles area many auditoriums and classrooms, mostly music and physical science rooms. He got a pipe and stop watch in hand, he began the research on architectural acoustics.

With Dr. Shambaugh's advice, he joined forces with John H. Potts, of the Los Angeles County Otolaryngological Society, to make a definitive measurement of the physical world and understanding of the physical world and understanding of human beings and had his confidence well explained by interactions between the bound volumes, I find it easier to locate Vern's papers among the well-used pages than to find them.


In 1934, Vern Knudsen was made Dean of the School of Architecture at the University of Southern California. In 1935, he was elected the first president of the California Institute for Cancer Research and was chosen as the first recipient of the Wallace O. Sabine Medal from The Acoustical Society of America in 1957. He was the recipient of the 1957 Presidential Medal from The Acoustical Society of America in 1949.

The Acoustical Society of America again requests to do honor to Vern Oliver Knudsen by presenting him the Gold Medal 1967.
who is under 35 years of age on 1 January of the year of the Award and who during a period of two or more years immediately preceding the Award, has been active in the affairs of the Society and has contributed significantly to the advancement of theoretical or applied acoustics or both.

WALLACE CLEMENT SABINE AWARD

The Wallace Clement Sabine Award is presented at one- to three-year intervals to an individual of any nationality who has furthered the knowledge of architectural acoustics, as evidenced by his contributions to professional journals and periodicals or by other accomplishments in the field of architectural acoustics.

PIONEERS OF UNDERWATER ACOUSTICS AWARD

The Pioneers of Underwater Acoustics Award is presented in the Fall of odd-numbered years to an individual, irrespective of nationality, age, or society affiliation, who has made an outstanding contribution to the science of underwater acoustics, as evidenced by publication of research in professional journals or by other accomplishments in the field.

THE GOLD MEDAL

The Gold Medal is presented in the Spring of odd-numbered years to a member of the Society, without age limitation, for contributions to acoustics. The first Gold Medal was presented in 1952, at an even-numbered year, on the occasion of the Society's Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Celebration.

FORMER RECIPIENTS

Wallace Waterfall, 1954.
Harvey Fletcher, 1957.
Edward C. Wente, 1959.
R. Bruce Lindsay, 1963.
Hallowell Davis, 1965.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND COORDINATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.
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There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?
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Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDade. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposed Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act of 1967.

This is a bill which has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) may enter in his 1967 record the following statement:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.
friendly reactions to the Percy plan, and there's a chance it can win congres- sional approval. We hope it does. But even if the new bill fails, Percy's achievement in uniting all Re- publicans behind a forward-looking new program will remain a truly impressive feat.

TESTIMONY OF SPOKESMAN FOR THE IOWA PRIVATE UTILITY COMPANIES

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEN) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEN. Mr. Speaker, the vice president and general counsel of the Iowa Corn Belt Power Cooperative, Mr. William B. Waterman, Davenport, Iowa, was in Washington on several occasions recently awaiting the opportunity to testi- fy before the House Agriculture Com- mittee.

Mr. Waterman had been designated as the spokesman for the private utility companies in Iowa. On the day he was to testify, the public hearings were abruptly ended and after waiting for some time, Mr. Waterman was not al- lowed to testify. For this reason I am placing a sum- mary of Mr. Waterman's remarks in the Record.

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY W. B. WATERMAN

The witness spoke on behalf of his own company and of Iowa Electric Light and Power Company at Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Iowa Power and Light Company at Des Moines, Iowa; Iowa Public Service Company at Sioux City, Iowa, and Iowa Southern Utilities Com- pany at Humboldt, Iowa. These companies, in- cluding the investor-owned members of the Iowa Power Pool, a facility for the association of generation between its members, which also includes Corn Belt Power Cooperative at Humboldt, Iowa, have indicated an interest in acquiring government-subsidized cooperative power. One group of 12 municip- alities in northern Iowa comprising some 32,000 consumers, have joined together to form a municipally owned utility. Corn Belt Power Cooperative at Humboldt, Iowa, which both generates electric energy and ac- quires power provisions, energy generated by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The witness believes the challenges in the context of the more limited powers of the Administrator in the Rural Electrification Act as indicative of the direction which will be taken by the new power administration. He states: "The socialization of the electric power in- dustry in western, northwestern and north central Iowa, reached $6 billion were made available under this Federal Electric Bank proposal, H.R. 1400, 1964, for the construction of the House Agriculture Com- mittee. This statement was sub- mitted to familiarize the Committee with the coordinated activities being carried on between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration to extend the availability of preferential rates, tax- tion and subsidized Rural Electrification generation through the Rural Electrification Act.

THE 26TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF WORKMEN'S BENEFIT FUND OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) may ex- tend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1967, the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America will hold its 26th national convention in New York City. Founded in 1884 by a group of German-American immigrants to provide insurance for wage earners in hard times, this fraternal society has grown through the ensuing years to become one of the most respected and active organi- zations of this type in our Nation. I am proud to testify that the headquar- ters in the 21st Congressional Dis- trict which I have the honor to represent. I want to call my colleagues' attention to an important address made before a meeting of that branch recently by Jack Hengerson, national chairman of the Workmen's Benefit Fund, which follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY

(Address by Mr. Jack Hengerson)

Grover Cleveland was the Democratic can- didate for President, James Blaine the Re- publican candidate. The country was recovering from a disastrous financial panic, when a small group of German immigrants met in October 1864, and formed the General Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of New York City and Vicinity, a fraternal bene- fit society founded to provide mutual assist- ance in times of illness and death.

Today, the outgrowth of that small group, now the Workmen's Benefit Fund, is entering upon its 82nd year. Its membership has grown from a dozen founders, to a group with branches in 22 States. During the first year, it paid out $150 in benefits to its mem- bers; last year almost $1.25 million in benefits were paid. During the past 81 years, it has paid out over $44 million in hospital, surgical, medical, dis- ability and death benefits.

RECORD

The story begins—like the American story—with a group of men who sought polit- ical asylum. With their families they fled the oppressive laws of Germany under Bis- mark, the Iron Chancellor, in the 1860's. They came to the United States. They became freemen-machinists, cigarmakers, and other skilled craftsmen, to work and to raise their families in freedom. A major part of that freedom is the right of men to organize to protect themselves from political tyranny, from economic exploitation, from poverty which follows upon the sickness or death of the family's provider.

Wage earners in the 1860's could not fall back upon savings, as their paychecks were small. Neither was there any aid from the Government, or organized charity, which they might turn. On September 12, 1864, a group of those exiled German workers met for the purpose of forming an association which would protect its members in times of sick- ness or death. Scandals had brought the established profitmaking insurance com- panies into disrepute. Two members died. The $150 needed in death benefits had not yet been collected in the treasury. Had the society failed its members in that crisis, it could not have survived. But the enterpris- ing members raised $750 by writing letters to friends from Germany. The death benefits were paid, and the society's reputation for hon- esty and financial integrity was established.

The membership rolls expanded. By 1887 there were four branches with 697 members. By 1907, 16 branches with 2,950 members, and 15 branches in 3 States—New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts. Growth was so rapid and extensive that the society's name had to be changed to include the wider ter- ritory; it was now called—Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America. (Address by Mr. Jack Hengerson)
fits were raised from the original $75 to $150 in 1888 and $250 in 1891. With such rapid growth, there was a sharp need for new administrative machinery. In 1892, Mr. Joseph Boutin, who founded the society had provided a completely democratic organization, and the organization proceeded to the necessary to meet the need of expansion. Headquarters were expanded, too—from a small office on East Fourth Street at $8 a month to a store at $12, later to a five-story building on its own building at 714 Seneca Avenue in Brooklyn.

The problem of coordinating the activities of the member branches with the main administration was met and solved by holding a convention. The first was held in November 1892 and there all branches were represented. A second convention met in 1893 and a third in 1898. In 1898 the national executive board applied for incorporation of the society. There were now 161 branches in 21 states and over 20,000 members. Eminent personalities began to join the society. Charles Steinmetz, for a time was the financial secretary of one of its branches, Daniel Hoan and James Hoan were members of two branches in Milwaukee and Bridgeport, respectively.

By 1895, the society had grown so large that it was obvious that it must announce, in every branch office in the land, what was happening. The society adopted the publication of a paper, "Solidarity." Its first issue appeared in April 1906 and it has since been published regularly over half a century as the official organ of the society. It was stated clearly in that first issue: "Our paper shall be a means of the enlightenment and conciliation. Its best efforts will be given to clearly in that first issue:

The Workmen's Benefit Fund continued to expand its activities and its services to members. The 20th national convention of 1943 set up a life insurance program of regular and endowment policies. The emergency relief fund had been greatly strengthened and its membership list to include many families that suffer from unemployment or other financial distress, such as that caused by floods, etc. The executive committee were set up to coordinate the activities of the many branches. These include not only the insurance and health benefits, but such varied services as camps for children in various parts of the country, homes for the aged and convalescent. Local branches are, and continue, such national activities and support national and community drives for charitable and health and welfare institutions, hospital, and to senior citizen care and, in metropolitan areas, an excellent medical specialist service.

By 1899, the membership had greatly expanded, including all branches of industrial, ethnic and national backgrounds, and religious faiths—with branches in 22 States and the District of Columbia. Its economic strength was reflected not only in the reports of its activities by the Insurance Department of the State of New York, which carefully supervised its services, but in increased services to members as providing life insurance policies up to $25,000 and the addition of medical care for families that suffer from unemployment or other financial distress, such as that caused by floods, etc. The executive committee were set up to coordinate the activities of the many branches. These include not only the insurance and health benefits, but such varied services as camps for children in various parts of the country, homes for the aged and convalescent. Local branches are, and continue, such national activities and support national and community drives for charitable and health and welfare institutions, hospital, and senior citizen care and, in metropolitan areas, an excellent medical specialist service.

By 1899, the membership had greatly expanded, including all branches of industrial, ethnic and national backgrounds, and religious faiths—with branches in 22 States and the District of Columbia. Its economic strength was reflected not only in the reports of its activities by the Insurance Department of the State of New York, which carefully supervised its services, but in increased services to members as providing life insurance policies up to $25,000 and the addition of medical care for families that suffer from unemployment or other financial distress, such as that caused by floods, etc. The executive committee were set up to coordinate the activities of the many branches. These include not only the insurance and health benefits, but such varied services as camps for children in various parts of the country, homes for the aged and convalescent. Local branches are, and continue, such national activities and support national and community drives for charitable and health and welfare institutions, hospital, and senior citizen care and, in metropolitan areas, an excellent medical specialist service.

By 1928, the society had grown so large that it was necessary to found an institution of similar services by local administration, and the Workmen's Benefit Fund asserted its autonomy, and, therefore, became a purely protective institution, a service of the society. In 1930, it celebrated its 25th anniversary with the knowledge that it had survived war, labor unrest, and the great depression. During the period of great unemployment, its relief fund had helped thousands of members to survive. No person was dropped from membership for nonpayment of dues, so that regardless of the members' economic condition, they were eligible for benefits in times of sickness and distress.

OPPOSITION TO TOTALITARIANISM

In a new era, which recognized the rights of man to determine his own destiny, the society moved ahead steadily. In 1939 at the 18th convention, its name was officially changed to the Workmen's Benefit Fund. Once again, as it had done many times before, the Workmen's Benefit Fund asserted its fundamental policy of in opposition to all forms of totalitarianism. Publication of a "Fighter" on the cover of a Zine may-tenn.

I am, as a German-American, most interested in the fundamental aims of the society, which are to be a means of the enlightenment and conciliation. Its best efforts will be given to clearly in that first issue:

The Workmen's Benefit Fund continued to expand its activities and its services to members. The 20th national convention of 1943 set up a life insurance program of regular and endowment policies. The emergency relief fund had been greatly strengthened and its membership list to include many families that suffer from unemployment or other financial distress, such as that caused by floods, etc. The executive committee were set up to coordinate the activities of the many branches. These include not only the insurance and health benefits, but such varied services as camps for children in various parts of the country, homes for the aged and convalescent. Local branches are, and continue, such national activities and support national and community drives for charitable and health and welfare institutions, hospital, and senior citizen care and, in metropolitan areas, an excellent medical specialist service.
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This former school teacher, by name, Lyndon B. Johnson, said on that occasion, “The past is a point of departure. It holds promise. It holds bondage.” And, he said further, “We must think in terms of the twenty-first century and the twenty-second century and not the eighteenth, nineteenth, twentieth century.” These words, I am certain, were not spoken lightly by the President. Nor should they be taken lightly by those of us to whom they were directed. For in them lies the seed of personal challenge.

History does not tell us that there would have been a President of the United States had not John F. Kennedy not believed he could overcome the problems of a financially, emotionally demoralized nation. Or had not Winston Churchill thought the impossible was possible, he and his Churchillian spirits might not have stopped the Battle of Britain. Or if John Kennedy had not had the vision that, by his words and deeds, he could rekindle the spirit of America in a divided world, faltering on the knife edge of nuclear holocaust.

But history does tell us that times of peril and trepidation in the world have brought forth the greatest leaders. The men of courage who seized our nation at the challenge at hand. The need for leaders of this magnitude, in these times and the times to come, is a desperate need. And I, for one, look hopefully to our colleges and universities to bring forth this leadership.

It is simply not enough for our centers of learning merely to cure the shortages of doctors, teachers, atomic scientists, or other categories of expertise, even though this is important. For, in my view, a university that has stimulated the mind and not the spirit, has failed its mission.

If you learn medicine and not humanity, you are only half a doctor. If you learn law and not justice, you are only half a lawyer. And, if you learn how to make a comfortable living but feel no part in the challenge of tomorrow, then you are less than half a man.

Much has been said about the government service being the breeding ground for technocracy. In my view, if there is a prime potential breeding ground for a technocracy in this Nation, it is in our colleges and universities.

There is, for example, danger in a medical student thinking that just to be a good doctor is his ultimate goal. There is danger in the student engineer being told that his ultimate task is the maximization of his days in his field. For therein lies the foundation of a generation feeling little responsibility to society and, even worse, a repentance to the day when active, responsible leadership in community leadership or political leadership.

Of all the things I have read about Florida Atlantic University, nothing has impressed me more than a short simple statement by your own President Williams when he said, “Florida Atlantic is experimental. It is innovative. It is unusual.”

Too many of our universities have become merely training mills, turning out cautious graduates who are comfortable within their fully plotted path, leading safely to financial security. The only experiments are performed in a laboratory. The only innovation is in the language. There is present on the campuses of some of these same schools what Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John N. Winpisinger has scornfully called the “leadership vaccine.” This desiccating serum is often administered in several doses.

First, there is the specialization injection. No display of genuine, genuine concern for the need for high competence in specialized areas in a world that grows more complex by the day. And therein lies the danger. We have to be given, and soon, to increasing the small number of people devoting their energies and talents to leadership and the type of leadership that deals with and thinks in terms of the great world problems and the national goals and objectives of this Nation.

Take, for example—a prime example—the great and overriding problem of hunger and poverty here at home and throughout the world. Or the exciting and complex challenge of pollution. The ways and means to improve opportunities for education and training. We must have expert designers to robotize hospital nurses, and dentists to help eradicate sickness and disease. New techniques in farm­ing. Yet, all these great goals will have to be developed to adequately feed a growing population.

We will need an increasing supply of business executives, entrepreneurs, who can keep our economy sound and provide the needed jobs for full employment. As needed as all this expertise is, it will not come un­naught without men of vision and talent who see the total problem and provide the common leadership and motivation for solution. A man it is, or “the anti-leadership doctrine” immunizes the potential leader against making hard decisions. The theory is, when a decision is to be made, it is up to the committee, or take a poll, or send it through an elaborate system of clearances, or simply wait and hope the problem goes away. The only alternatives are an “anti-decision,” or no decision at all.

Harry Truman once spoke four words that I believe deserve a place in the Great American Creed, the Golden Rule, of decision makers. He said simply, “The buck stops here.”

This does not mean that we operate in a vacuum, flying, so to speak, by the seat of his pants. What it does mean is that when all the facts have been developed, when all the alternatives are considered, there must be someone to make the hard choice and to move ahead with it.

To paraphrase President Johnson—we simply cannot operate with all Indians and no chiefs.

Another ingredient in the anti-leadership campaign is the one that says—"all politicians are incompetents. All Government ad­ministrators are bureaucrats submerged in a sea of red tape where the people are anti-society. All union leaders are socialists.” I suppose the theory is that we are so paralyzed by the fear of influence to straighten these leaders out but not dirty our hands by aspirtling to undertake their often awesome responsibilities.

TGTaken together, I think you can see this is a rather potent and dangerous mixture. It is a philosophy that divorces responsibility from freedom, encourages picketing rather than participation, places individual desire over the common good, allows violence to replace reason and cynicism to be substituted for honest discussion.

It is an easy trap for the unwise to fall into because protest has become fashionable and for too many, words like dedication, de­cency, loyalty, patriotism and trust seem out of vogue. -Pseudo-leaders with his phony slogans find it easy to attract the lazy and the indifferent. The lazy because they have no time to seek truth and with the indifferent, those people who fail to understand their national heritage and the relationship between individual rights and the national security.

The challenge we face today is inherent in the affirmative answer to the questions—"Will I know that I have done to my country, to my fellow man, as I take my place in society? Will I be willing to utilize my ability and my energy in such a way that it will be said of me by future generations—"the community, the state, the nation, the world is a better place in which to live because of the way I have conducted my life?"

It has been said, and rightfully so, that this is a land of opportunity. Nowhere is this more evident than in this fine new school, built by the citizens of Florida for its young people.

It is the great challenge in the gleaming new buildings and the new types of courses. In the un­structured atmosphere. And, mostly, in the new attitudes that are obviously present. Much has been said about the government service being the breeding ground for technocracy. In my view, also has President Johnson successfully brought many of the great business leaders, educators, and other leaders into the service of the country, often at great personal sacrifice.

This Nation is neither as great as it has to be, nor half so bad as it appears to be in many other parts of the world. But with world leadership comes the responsibility to take on the challenges facing the world—to help find answers to the problems of hunger, blight, poverty, despair and misunderstanding. I believe there is need to dramatize and articulate this Nation’s com­mitment to its people as a leader and as a seeker of world peace and brotherhood.

Would it not dramatize this commitment were every American college student pub­licly to pledge a portion of his life toward working for the public good? Would this not present America as the land where the students not only exercise their right of dis­sent, but also where they fully intend, indeed, they have pledged themselves, to be involved in the great decisions and the great challenges of tomorrow?

It is a good point to make here, if, indeed, every college student in this Nation merely thought about such a pledge. And, what better place to begin than here at Florida Atlantic University—"Where tomor­row begins.”

I ask you to think about this. I believe the world awaits your answer.

Thank you.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER'S PROPOSAL TO AMEND CERTAIN PARTS OF PRESENT HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT LEG­ISLATION

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend
The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I was privileged to appear before the Housing and Urban Development Committee of the Congress and the Banking and Currency Committee in support of my three bills: H.R. 6028, H.R. 7245, and H.R. 8620, which would provide for open-space land development. I was privileged to appear before the Committee on Business for the first time in order to have the privilege of being here this morning to testify before this distinguished body on the vital subject of the Nation's Cities. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to present particularly the support of three bills, H.R. 6028, H.R. 7245, and H.R. 8620, that I have recently introduced dealing with the utilization of open space land. I know some great legislation will come out of the Committee in this field. I have long been a staunch supporter of vigorous Federal action in the fields of housing, improved city government and urban development. I have also generally supported the Administration's programs in these areas, including the Federal open space program and the urban renewal program.

These programs represent sound and constructive approaches to the problems of attempting to improve the quality of urban life, and to provide adequate housing for all, for the protection of space, social, safety, and natural resources. However, as programs become operational and experience is gained in their administration, it becomes obvious that they may be strengthened and improved are frequently required. The three bills that I have introduced are designed to help provide some of the needed improvements in present programs.

The first, H.R. 6028, is designed to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to eliminate an inequitable situation in the Federal open space program. This bill would broaden the open space land provisions to permit development of open space land for purposes, regardless of how that land is acquired. Under present law, only an open space land program is eligible for development assistance. This provision obviously distorts the objectives of the open space land program of providing the maximum possible amount of open space in our congested urban areas.

Under the language of the present law, land acquired by any means except purchase as part of an open space project is ineligible for open space development funds. This means that a community may acquire land as part of another project, and who wishes to utilize some of this land for open space purposes, must develop and pay for all development expense which has been incurred for this land. This is an unnecessary restriction on open space land development assistance, which my bill will help to eliminate.

There is no argument as to the desirability of providing Federal assistance for the development of open space land which will take a significant step to broaden the provisions of present open space legislation so that the development of open space land may be encouraged by urban communities throughout the country.

The second bill, H.R. 7245, is designed to amend the Housing Act of 1949 and 1954 to permit the utilization of private planning consultants by local communities for purposes of urban planning. The Amendment to the 1949 Act would change the language of the preamble in order to reflect the desirability for eliciting the talents of private planning consultants in order to help solve the urban housing problems. Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 would also be amended to allow planning grants to the extent that is necessary for recruiting private planning consultants, instead of attempting to build their own individual planning staffs.

The present congressional objectives of the Housing Act of 1954 is "to encourage such (local) governments to establish and improve planning staffs." The philosophy of this Congress was to encourage local planning activities. The aim was not to restrict 701 planning grants only to localities with planning staffs on the local level. In the interim, however, the administration has been given a strict interpretation in the administration of Section 701 planning grants. This has resulted in the grants generally being made available only to localities employing their own planning staffs. This has served adversely to affect those Section 701 applicants who desire to have urban planning services performed by outside professional planning consultants.

There could be any number of reasons why a community might not have developed a regular planning staff of its own, or might wish to have some of its planning functions performed by consulting firms. In such situations the community might find it advantageous to hire an outside consulting expert on a contractual basis. In these instances I feel that the community should not be denied the opportunity to utilize such professional services, simply because of a narrow and probably erroneous interpretation of what Congress intended when it passed the Housing Act of 1954.

I hope that my bill will be favorably acted upon by this Congress and that this bill will make clear the intention of Congress to maximize the utilization of free professional services in urban housing and urban development needs. It will do this by explicitly permitting the use of private planning consultants, where appropriate under the present law.

My third bill, H.R. 8620, is an important measure designed to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more equitable compensation payments to businesses that are forced to relocate because of urban renewal activities. This bill contains three basic objectives: (1) the elimination of the restrictions that relocation payments may be made only to businesses earning less than $10,000 per year; (2) an increase in the maximum payable relocation benefits to a more equitable level than at present; and (3) the provision of fair compensation to businesses that are injured by the displacement of their customers by urban renewal.

My approach to this problem should provide a workable means of helping to solve the problems of providing just compensation to businesses resulting from urban renewal activities. In many cases the total relocation payments to a business may not exceed $8,000 and no payments are made to businesses earning less than $10,000 per year. This is largely caused by urban renewal. I believe that the businessmen of this country must be sufficiently and fairly compensated for the sacrifices required of them by urban renewal projects. This is not only a matter of equity, but represents a sound investment in the future of the entire urban renewal program as well.

I interpolate, Mr. Chairman, and gentleman members of the Committee, that I had when I was actively practicing law. A man had a business right adjacent to the property which was to be acquired. They built an overpass and took all of the traffic away from his business. They left his business there but no way to get to it except through a very circular route and, therefore, they left his business there but no way to get to it except through a very circular route. Strawberry or a hard way. I believe that that man's business had been taken for public use, which is the position I strongly take in this bill.

It is well recognized that a renewal project has small chance of success without the wholehearted support of the community in which it is located. It is unlikely to be forthcoming if the businessmen affected know that they will be required to accept a part of the cost of their own relocation. Without adequate compensation for relocation, this is precisely what the busi-
nessmen are asked to do. Thus, it is obvious that in order to help insure the long run success and success of urban renewal, equitable relocation payments to businesses affected by the urban renewal programs, must be made.

The rapid growth of American business activity since the amount of relocation payments was determined has meant that the present payments scheme is, in many instances, totally inadequate. The $10,000 maximum earning restriction is one example of this inequitable payments to businesses affected by the urban renewal programs. Under today's conditions many relatively small business operations earn amounts in excess of this maximum. Of course, we must do something for the businesses that suffer the greatest hardships caused by urban renewal dislocations.

My bill will raise the maximum allowable earning level for any amount above the present unrealistic $10,000 per year level, so that these businesses may be permitted to retain the benefits of relocation. Similarly, the $3,000 maximum allowable relocation payments are often utterly inadequate to compensate businesses for the relocation burden. My bill will affect an increase in the maximum payable relocation benefits to a more realistic level. I believe such payments should be made.

The urban renewal program is one of the most important means available to help provide the growing needs of our rapidly expanding families, and to help eradicate the decay and blight that has found in the central parts of many of our major cities. The urban renewal program was initiated in 1949, all too little has been done for the unfortunate businessmen who are displaced by this program. Seventeen of the leading businessmen who are in this situation, but certainly waiting longer only compacts this situation and compounds the problems. The present payments scheme, as I see it, does not do justice to these people, and we must do it during this session of Congress.

These, in summary, are the modifications that I would like to see in the Urban Renewal Act itself. As the above discussion has indicated, their purpose is to provide for the growth and success of urban renewal, and what you will continue to do will mean so much to human health and happiness in this country that I am glad to have had this opportunity to share with you.

Mr. Chairman, if that intent is clearly expressed in the report I think that that would provide much needed help with a bill that has been the cause of so much unhappiness. If there is an ambiguity in it, then the clarifying statement in the report should certainly achieve the objective that we have in mind.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I think the Department of Housing and Urban Development, if it could have in mind the report, from recent history in other areas. Mr. PEPPER. Since we are talking about administrative action and not court action, I would think that the statement in the report will achieve the results that we have in mind.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions.

Mr. Speaker. The Committee will come to order. Mr. Speaker, I have not hesitated to meet new needs and problems. The Federal extension services give national leadership and the State extension services give State leadership to the program. About 372,000 men and women serve as unpaid volunteer local club leaders, and are assisted by about 142,000 extension workers.

This is more than ample proof of the effectiveness and wisdom of such Federal, State, and private action.

It has long been the dream of the University of Georgia to bring to the world a lasting peace. To accomplish this, our youth must be fully prepared to meet the challenges that tomorrow holds. Youth organizations, such as the 4-H Clubs of America, are vital to our Nation in this respect for they help to provide the background for these young Americans of whom we are all so justly proud.

Our 4-H Club members and their leaders way have not been slow to meet new challenges and to set forth workable programs to meet new needs and problems. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, about 230 outstanding 4-H Club members are in the Nation's Capital for the National 4-H Conference. These outstanding members have been named by their States for exceptional personal development, and for major achievement in community service, 4-H clubs, development, and what you will continue to do will mean so much to the growth and success it has enjoyed since it was founded around the turn of the century.

There are many who have played a strong and important part in this continuing growth and success. I want to call my colleagues' attention to one of these 4-H members—to whom specific reference will be made hereinafter—although all of them deserve mention and a heartfelt welcome done from the entire Nation for the contribution they are making to America. About 2,750,000 boys and girls, from ages 9 to 19, enjoy and benefit from 4-H work coast to coast. Since it was founded in 1913, 4-H Clubs and informal educational programs are now spread around the world—having been adapted to suit the needs of about 75 countries on all six continents.

The 4-H Clubs of America, Mr. Speaker, are the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State land-grant universities, and the counties. The 4-H Clubs of America, Mr. Speaker, are the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State land-grant universities, and the counties. The Federal extension Services give national leadership and the State extension services give State leadership to the program. About 372,000 men and women serve as unpaid volunteer local club leaders, and are assisted by about 142,000 extension workers. It has long been the dream of the University of Georgia to bring to the world a lasting peace. To accomplish this, our youth must be fully prepared to meet the challenges that tomorrow holds. Youth organizations, such as the 4-H Clubs of America, are vital to our Nation in this respect for they help to provide the background for these young Americans of whom we are all so justly proud.
Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it was a great honor for me, over the recent Easter recess of Congress, to travel to the combat areas of southeast Asia as a member of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. The very able chairman of that subcommittee was the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE).

It was a pleasure and an honor to serve under the leadership of Mr. BYRNE. He was very largely responsible for organizing and carrying through a most informative and highly beneficial visit on the part of all members of our subcommittee.

A week or so last Saturday, while other people were demonstrating against our Nation's policy in Vietnam, burning draft cards and American flags in New York City, Chairman James Byrne was addressing a patriotic rally on the steps of Independence Hall in the historic city of Philadelphia, which Chairman Byrne himself represents so very ably in this House.

The rally was sponsored by the Philadelphia County Council of the American Legion.

Chairman Byrne's address at that patriotic rally deserves to be read by every Member of this body, because it contains some very basic reasons that the members of our committee came back with from Vietnam.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I therefore include Chairman Byrne's address at this point:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BYRNE AT DEDICATION DAY PROGRAM SATURDAY, APRIL 15, AT INDEPENDENCE HALL, SPONSORED BY PHILADELPHIA COUNTY COUNCIL, AMERICAN LEGION.

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is truly a pleasure to be here with you today. It is a privilege to address you once again in this historic hall to rededicate ourselves to the cause of free men everywhere.

Your meeting here today as well as similar meetings which are taking place across this great land of ours, takes on particular significance because it is the answer to a small but vocal minority in this country who, by demonstrations and protests, are misleading the American people that the American people do not have the stamina or the stamina to carry this effort through.

The message of this meeting must carry through to the communist leaders everywhere that the American people have the right as free men to select their government and leaders and not to have imposed on them a communist form of government either by subversion or invasion from without.

Frankly, I feel very humble here in this sanctuary of freedom because only very recently, from a tour of our military installations in South Vietnam and Thailand, I had the opportunity of talking to outstanding military leaders as General William C. Westmoreland, Lieutenant General Lewis W. Walt, who commands the Third Marine Amphibious Force.

Four of these outstanding 4-H'ers have come to this national conference representing Colorado. I am proud to say this nation-wide running--4-H members reside in the Fourth Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in this distinguished Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay special recognition to 4-H and the 4-H clubs in Colorado. Ann Williams, of Greeley, a member of 10 years' standing. This young lady was named National Leadership Girl of the year in 1968 by the President of the United States. And my date picked me up. We had a wonderful evening but, to my dismay, when we got home promptly at 12 o'clock, mass confusion was reigning on the ranch! Two hundred head of cattle were running loose on not only our farm, but in about a five mile radius. Indeed I learned a little more responsibility and care about shutting the cattle in at the end of the day. Having chased obnoxious heifers until 2:30 in the morning.

At this time I had taken a large variety of projects in the home economics area and planned to do the same in agriculture.

One of the most important things I have learned in leadership is how to be a good leader when necessary, but more important, how to be a good follower when the occasion calls for it. This was particularly true when I was State 4-H President and there were four vice-presidents. Each of us had activities to lead and at the same time we had to be participants in another one's leading. This was quite an experience!
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at Danang and whose troops guard and patrol the areas just south of the dividing line that separate South Vietnam from Cambodia border; and Admiral Novellis C. Ward, who directs our extremely difficult operations in the Gulf of Tonkin. Today, we talk with 124 boys of every grade and rank from my own congressional district here in Philadelphia. To a man, they understand our responsibility in the Far East. They recognize that Vietnam, going back perhaps a generation or two, has never been a place of peace, but has been the scene of a great deal of international rivalry and diplomacy. To a man, they understand that we are committed to defend Thailand, just as we were in Korea about 20 years ago. I guess the simple answer is that communist leadership has not yet learned that armed aggression is a force that will not be permitted in the second half of the Twentieth Century.

I cannot help but recall an illustration General Westmoreland used during a discussion with a congressional delegation from the Philadelphia area. He compared the committee which I had the honor to Chair on our recent inspection trip over the Easter recess, to the ragtag, raggedy gang of men who were fighting to hold and control that position. I know, too, that it is distressing to our pilots to bomb a railroad installation once, only to have that target repaired within a matter of weeks, and then have to bomb the same target again. One after another, we have put into effect while some major targets for obvious reasons are.

I am not discussing or suggesting escalating the war, although the hard truth of it is that every day by the use of new weapons the enemy is getting stronger and stronger in the battle for survival. I am not suggesting that we are failing to defeat the enemy. I am talking about intensification of our efforts and determination to win.

But we must win the war in Vietnam, and we are winning! In my opinion, the time will come when the leaders in Hanoi will realize that our policies in Vietnam are for the benefit of the American people. We recognize that if we give up in South Vietnam that communist campaigns in Thailand will intensify. Undoubtedly Laos and Cambodia would then follow—not by choice but by external force. What would be our choices in such an event?

I am not discussing or suggesting escalating the war, although the hard truth of it is that every day by the use of new weapons the enemy is getting stronger and stronger in the battle for survival. I am not suggesting that we are failing to defeat the enemy. I am talking about intensification of our efforts and determination to win.

I am not a military man, thus I would not attempt to determine how long or how short a period of time it will take to accomplish a military victory in South Vietnam. But I do know it is disheartening to our troops to make a successful assault upon an enemy position and then have to withdraw because we do not have sufficient manpower to hold and control that position. I know, too, that it is distressing to our pilots to bomb a railroad installation once, only to have that target repaired within a matter of weeks, and then have to bomb the same target again.

It is that every day by the use of new weapons the enemy is getting stronger and stronger in the battle for survival. I am not discussing or suggesting escalating the war, although the hard truth of it is that every day by the use of new weapons the enemy is getting stronger and stronger in the battle for survival. I am not suggesting that we are failing to defeat the enemy. I am talking about intensification of our efforts and determination to win.

We have no desire to prolong the war; we want to bring about a political settlement that will make a free society possible in South Vietnam. In my opinion, the time will come when the leaders in Hanoi will realize that our policies in Vietnam are for the benefit of the American people. We recognize that if we give up in South Vietnam that communist campaigns in Thailand will intensify. Undoubtedly Laos and Cambodia would then follow—not by choice but by external force.

For instance, in the field of education alone, the country is better off than before. But it will still take some time to see the results. We are making great progress, but we must remember that the war is not just military. We are trying to build a strong, independent, self-reliant South Vietnam. We are making great progress, but we must remember that the war is not just military. We are trying to build a strong, independent, self-reliant South Vietnam.

And at the same time, we are assisting the peoples of South Vietnam through a social revolution. We are assisting their government to bring down the terror to every village and hamlet in the nation.

But both jobs are difficult and, in my opinion, not easy. We are still engaged in this battle and time will be needed to bring about a political settlement that will make a free society possible in South Vietnam. In my opinion, the time will come when the leaders in Hanoi will realize that our policies in Vietnam are for the benefit of the American people. We recognize that if we give up in South Vietnam that communist campaigns in Thailand will intensify. Undoubtedly Laos and Cambodia would then follow—not by choice but by external force.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, although the Department of Defense issued a directive on February 17, 1960, establishing new minimum ratios to the maximum extent possible in the retail activities of commissary stores, a study published by the Comptroller General of the United States, in December 1965, estimated that the Army, Navy, and Air Force were using the services of about 4,000 enlisted personnel, receiving about $172.2 million annually in pay and allowances, in commissary sales stores.

These personnel were performing standard supermarket jobs; such as stocking fruit, vegetables, and canned goods; metering and supervising functions. The Comptroller General's report found that for the most part these men were not "developing and/or maintaining proficiency in specific nonmilitary activities as officers and noncommissioned officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, and golf courses.

Nonmilitary activities: assigned to services at gymnasia, libraries, service clubs, and fieldhouses.

Shown below are three examples of enlisted personnel who were assigned to nonmilitary activities:

1. The serviceman enlisted in the Air Force in December 1961. For 9 months he was trained as a ground communications technician, and then was assigned to the Utah Air Force Base in Mississippi. Generally this job specialty involves the operation, installation, and maintenance of the communications equipment. After working approximately 1 year in the occupation for which he was trained, he was assigned to Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska. In October 1963 he was assigned to the Hi-Fi Hobby Shop at Offutt, and he was still assigned to that activity at the time of our review.
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the performance of needed military duties, which is an important Army training additional personnel in this skill.

Mr. Speaker, the use of servicemen as game wardens, cadets, or storekeepers is scandalous and I fail to understand how the Military Establishment can allow such practices to exist. The use of military personnel should be restricted to military-type duties. By way of contrast, I might add that in a military force obtained through voluntary recruitment, each man would be assigned to his proper function and this financial waste and misassignment would not occur.

EDUCATIONAL TAX CREDIT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the tasks facing our national wealth which allows America to remain the leader in an ever-changing world is our remarkable and constantly expanding educational system. Our elementary, secondary, and higher educational facilities are unmatched in excellence and the opportunities they offer to the student. Our system lays at the feet of our children—our young men and women—inestimable combinations of education to allow future fulfillment in every conceivable field of endeavor. Never before in history has such opportunity been professed.

As a direct consequence, the demand for more highly educated individuals has escalated beyond the wildest dreams of 50 years ago. Where at one time a high school education was sufficient for practice of any job, today a college degree is required. I have no doubt that in foreseeable future a master's degree and, eventually, a Ph.D. will be prerequisites for many of the occupations of tomorrow. Furthermore, the benefit of providing our children with the best possible education drops a heavy financial weight on the shoulders of the parent and in increasing instances on the student himself. Recent surveys have shown that from 65 to 80 percent of the students at an average college pay some or all of their expenses. Many young married people work during the day and attend night classes to further their education. And, of course, many parents foot the entire bill of sending their children through college. The high cost of sending a young man or woman to college is many times a bar to attending college and participating effectively in the future of our great Nation and the world.

PROTECTION OF RELIGIOUS SCRUPLES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, early in the session I introduced H.R. 265, a bill to protect civil service employees whose religious obligations forbid them to work on certain days. This legislation would permit Sabbatarians in the Federal civil service to have their work schedules adjusted, where possible, so they would not be required to work any day which would violate their religious obligations so long as the time was made up on other days.

I think it is of interest that my home State of New York has recently enacted very similar legislation to protect the religious scruples of State and local civil servants. I am most pleased to see my own State take the lead in this matter. I urge the New York legislation to counteract this kind of religious discrimination in the State and local civil service. Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the New York legislation in the Record, and hope that its passage in New York will give added impetus to our efforts to adopt similar religious safeguards on the Federal level:

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. Statement of legislative purpose. It has long been the policy of this State that every individual shall have the right to obtain employment free from discrimination because of his religion. It is a long-standing requirement of the Legislature that, in accordance with this policy, no individual shall be prohibited, prevented or disqualified from, or discriminated against in obtaining or holding any public employment because of his observance of any particular day or days or portion thereof as his sabbath or other holy day as a requirement of his religion. Questions have recently been raised, however, as to whether the provisions of the laws against discrimination and other laws are sufficiently clear to prevent the discharge of individuals holding or seeking public employment who observe any particular day or days or portion thereof as a sabbath or other holy day as a requirement of their religion. This act is therefore enacted to clarify the existence of this right and to provide specific assurance of it, and should in no way be construed to limit the rights assured by the provisions of the law against discrimination or any other law, rule or regulation. It is the intention of the Legislature that this act shall be construed liberally to effectuate the purposes for which it is enacted.

§ 2. Subdivision nine of section two hundred ninety-six of the executive law, as added by chapter eight hundred fifty-one of the laws of nineteen hundred sixty-five, is hereby renumbered to be subdivision ten, and a new subdivision nine is hereby inserted in such section, to read as follows:

(a) It shall be an unlawful discrimination practice for any officer, agency, or department of the State or any of its political subdivisions, including, but not limited to, the educational authorities of any school district, to prohibit, prevent or discriminate against any person from, or otherwise discriminate against any person on account of his observance of any particular day or days or portion thereof as a sabbath or other holy day in accordance with the requirements of his religion.

(b) Except as may be required in an emergency or where his personal presence is indispensable to the orderly transaction of public business, nothing in this act shall prohibit the State or any of its political subdivisions or any school district from requiring any person from, or otherwise discriminate against any person on account of his observance of any particular day or days or portion thereof as a sabbath or other holy day in accordance with the requirements of his religion.

(c) No employee of any governmental subdivision of the State of New York, on account of his observance of any particular day or days or portion thereof as a sabbath or other holy day in accordance with the requirements of his religion, shall be prohibited, prevented or disqualified from, or otherwise discriminated against in obtaining or holding any public employment.
any such absence from work shall, wherever practicable in the judgment of the employer, be made up either in whole or in part by the expenditure of time and work at some other mutually convenient time, or shall be charged against any leave with pay ordinarily granted, other than sick leave, and beyond further, however, that any such absence not so made up or charged, may be treated by the employer of such employee with respect to the record of work in the absence of any such leave, whether paid or unpaid.

(c) This subdivision shall not be construed to apply to any position dealing with the personal or family matters of an individual, so that the personal presence of such position is maintained, "Mrs. Mildred W. Niles Junior High School, in Georgia?"

There was no objection.

POWELL FIASCO

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. Burton) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the near future we will be considering amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Among the many vital programs included in this year's legislation, none is more creative and exciting than the work of the Peace Corps.

The Corps is made up of dedicated young teachers, operating in teams under the guidance of a "master teacher," who bring their intelligence and fresh ideas and enthusiasm to stimulate children in deprived areas.

I had the pleasure this week of visiting Niles Junior High School, in my congressional district, and observing the fine work that members of the National Peace Corps are doing. In a letter urging me to do what I could to "see that this program is maintained," Mrs. Mildred W. Sabolove, the very able principal of Niles, commended the efforts of the National Peace Corps program in this school because a wonderful asset to us. The people in it are a cut above the average teacher in enthusiasm, integrity, and interest in their students. They are seasoned professionals in the field of education and indicative of the contributions being made to the development and education of children in our underprivileged areas.

The two teams working at Niles have concentrated on developing a close and personal relationship with disturbed children in the school and with their families in order to give the children additional help to the children. The teams have also worked on community projects, which involve the children and their parents in efforts to recognize and deal with neighborhood problems. For example, an empty store has been turned into a part-time adult education center for the teaching of English, typing, and Spanish. Thus, many of the parents who are too timid to attend official board of education night classes, and who also fear to travel the streets at night, are able to take advantage of local classes as well as have their children looked after in an informal child-care center.

The nu­

This cannot be viewed with anything but disquiet and apprehension, given the historic role of Greece as the fountain which watered and nourished representative government, gave birth to the great philosophers, and developed the concept of the "enlightened man."

The great bond which ties Western civilization and culture to Greek history makes us feel deeply the troubled times she now endures.

In including in the Record at this time the New York Times editorial of April 22, 1967, entitled "Greek Tragedy."

GREEK TRAGEDY

No convincing case can be made for imposition of an army-backed dictatorship in Greece. Under much graver circumstances the country survived a major Communist strike for power in 1944 and a civil war against a Communist-sponsored insurgency in 1946-49 without resorting to dictatorship.

It is doubtful that young King Constantine was unaware of the coup that he has sanctioned and supported in his name. But what is certain is that his clumsy political machinations over two years helped to polarize the country's political and social life and to create the environment in which an inv­

The King's abrupt dismissal of Mr. Papandreou and his replacement by Constantine have furnished all Greeks with an opportunity to show their true feelings.

But Mr. Papandreou and his demagogue son, Andreas, cannot escape major portions of blame for the coup that has now placed them both in detention. The father frittered away a golden opportunity to bring needed economic and social reforms to Greece after his landslide election victory over Mr. Papandreou in 1964. Whether he was entirely aware of the so-called Aspida plot of left-wing officers, he certainly set about to install army leaders and support for his charges that the palace was meddling unacceptably in politics to favor international forces.

The House now has been overruled by the voters of Harlem. They obviously can be de­

adam clayton powell should be seated, and formal censure. And if he has done anything criminal in his fast and loose handling of public funds, the proper law enforcement agency should seek to punish him, not Congress.
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The King's abrupt dismissal of Mr. Papandreou and his replacement by Constantine have furnished all Greeks with an opportunity to show their true feelings.

But Mr. Papandreou and his demagogue son, Andreas, cannot escape major portions of blame for the coup that has now placed them both in detention. The father frittered away a golden opportunity to bring needed economic and social reforms to Greece after his landslide election victory over Mr. Papandreou in 1964. Whether he was entirely aware of the so-called Aspida plot of left-wing officers, he certainly set about to install army leaders and support for his charges that the palace was meddling unacceptably in politics to favor international forces.

The House now has been overruled by the voters of Harlem. They obviously can be de­
Communists, Andreas Papandreou bid openly for far-left support; threatened to realign Greece's foreign policy and turned the family's sentiments with conspiracy into a nation-rending campaign against the monarchy itself.

When the conservative National Radical Union must bear some of the blame for the deteriorating situation, though Premier Kanellopoulos' declaration restated the king's under arrest. The Radical Union gave Greece nearly eight years of stable government, but rigged an election in 1961 that it did not win fairly, thus giving George Papandreou the comeback opportunity that led eventually to his 1964 victory.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) may extend her remarks in the Record.

There was no objection.

Mr. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the many talents of a fine young constituent, Miss Jo Ann Yukimura, of Lihue, Kauai. Miss Yukimura, a 17-year-old high school senior, will represent Hawaii in the 34 entries submitted by Lions clubs participating in the National Science Fair. Her long list of achievements in the opportunities to grow to his ultimate capacity as a person.

HAWAII'S REPRESENTATIVE IN THE PEACE ESSAY CONTEST
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?
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Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of all Members of this House an article which was published in the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper in northern New Jersey, on April 18, 1967, on Mayor Healey. It is an honest appraisal of Healey's great contribution to his town during the last 18 years.

The article follows:

HE'S THE NEWS—MAYOR HEALEY SETS A FAST PACE FOR KEARNY

As Kearny celebrates its centennial this year, there's no doubt that one man is right in the middle of things—the town's personable mayor, Joseph Healey.

And why? Healey remains as vigorous as ever after a career as councilman and mayor spanning more than a third of the town's history.

Ever since he was a newspaper delivering boy to Chateau Belgrive, the former residence of General Robert E. Kearny, U.S.A.—the town's namesake—the mayor also has been a keen student of the nine-square-mile town's history.

The mansion was torn down many years ago—"I wish I had been mayor then," Healey said yesterday. However, every street sign in Kearny today bears a tiny patch that emblazoned the uniforms of the men in Gen. Kearny's Union army during the years just before the Civil War.

"We'll have a time capsule, too," Healey notes proudly, "with the signatures of each of the town's past children inside.

Friends say there is a simple explanation for the mayor's phenomenal strength as a vote-getter during his 18-year incumbency, for Joseph Healey is Joseph Healey and Kearny loves Mayor Healey right back.

Typically, he lists his finest project as the development of the lovely, three-mile-long Riverbank Park on the Passaic River, Hudson County's first reclamation project financed by the state's Green Acres program.

In eight years and the cost of $100,000, Hudson County Parks Commission for funds to spruce up the then-bedraggled eyesore. The Commission, fearing a hue-and-cry and loss of a million dollars would be needed.

Healey decided to go ahead, using a recipe of daring, imagination—and city employees.

The result proved better than anyone had hoped.

Riverbank Park has its own zoo, picnic grounds and more than 60 recreational areas—all at a cost of $100,000.

The development of Fort Kearny, the birth for 10 ocean-going ships last year, is another favorite achievement. The mayor lives in a modest home at 244 Forest St.—"in the same ward where I was born"—close by Kearny High School, where he was a member of the first graduating class. Since the completion of an outdoor refinishing, Healey's family has dubbed their home "the Little White House."

Kearny's first lady is the former Ann Carey. Their eldest daughter, Mary Ann, a graduate of Kearny High School, currently teaches as a volunteer for the Catholic Extension Society in La Junta, Colo. Joseph Junior is a freshman at the College of the Holy Cross where his older brother, Mass, and Thomas, the youngest son, is a freshman at St. Cecilia's High School.

L.B.J.: A RESPONSITIVE EXPONENT OF AMERICAN LIFE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Anderson] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

SUN EDITOR FINDS JOHNSON KENNEDY FEELS RESPONSIBILITIES—PRESIDENT APPEARS IN VIGOROUS HEALTH, CONFIDENT OF FUTURE

(John M. Jones)

No matter how you regard Lyndon B. Johnson, one of the most controversial presidents, (Roosevelt, Kennedy and Johnson), I came away with these impressions.

Johnson's was the most challenging personality—the most dynamic man by far. Kennedy was the most appealing with an amazing grasp of facts and information. Johnson is a rugged individualist, very determined and a responsive exponent of the American way of life. Certainly Johnson is faced with the most complex responsibility of the three, because of the enormous nuclear capacity of two and perhaps four nations in our region, for total destruction of modern civilization.

The responsibilities of the presidency weigh heavily on President Johnson and are quickly apparent to anyone who spends an evening in his presence.

He carries this responsibility well. He is relaxed, obviously healthy (he says he feels good and he looks it) and moves with quiet confidence through discussions of the daily and long range problems he faces as commander-in-chief of a nation at war in a world now capable of its own total destruction.

JONSON FAMILY TEAM

Perhaps, more than any first lady in recent history, Lady Bird Johnson is a partner, advisor, and actual participant in the president's day-to-day work. She never takes a back seat, but is by sheer tact, charm and an obviously vice-like grip on the problems he faces, bolster, expands and contributes to practically any subject of conversation.

Both the President and Mrs. Johnson show the strain of the terrible responsibility of his office. Yet, they have a sense of humor, camaraderie and a natural friendliness and charm which give a lift to those about them and an extra measure of confidence for the daily pressures in their own lives.

The public image of President Johnson, the consummate politician, fades perceptibly as he is pressed by the weight of his daily problems, some global, some local.

The American people ask much of their president. He is a target for all of his nation's enemies, but for political competitors, the dissatisfied, cynical and, of course, the probing, searching eyes and ears of the aspiring president who follows him wherever he goes. Sometimes it must seem to the president that most of the press is dedicated to finding every way to find an exterior motive or an unknown objective.

Never before in American history has a president, during war time, suffered the harassment in congress, press and in minority
groups who fill the air waves and pages of our publications with questions that border on defiance of stated and open foreign policy of the nation as passed and approved by Congress.

There seems little doubt that the war in Vietnam has been prolonged and American involvement in the false hope that we can win the game in the minds of our enemy, that we will tire of our task and quietly abrogate our solemn commitments to our treaty allies.

Some observers toward carries Johnson shows no obvious bitterness toward his critics. One gets the feeling, however, that sometimes he deplores the lack of open discussion. He has not done anything in the way of getting to a congressman or senator to look at the problem through the eyes of the man whose name appears on the letterhead with perhaps a fuller explanation of background and reasoning which for strategic reasons cannot be made public.

President Johnson clearly values patriotism not only in those who agree with him, but also in his critics.

What has been described as arm twisting is in his own view, just persuasion by placing the point in question in its proper perspective with facts which sometimes cannot be made public. He stated that he felt the President and Mrs. Johnson had had a long hard day and since they had to fly back to Washington that night, that he thought the guests would not want to delay their rest any.

SECRET SERVICE MUCH IN EVIDENCE

The entire group rose and said their goodbyes. Mrs. Kennedy inquired if the party to go to the airport to see the President off and the entire group piled into waiting limousines in a caravan of secret service cars. At the airport where “Air Force One,” the President’s personal plane was waiting.

He boarded the plane with the President and Mrs. Johnson while a crowd which had gathered to see the President off, applauded and waved. A few seconds later, the Governor came to the door of the plane and said that the President would like for the other dinner guests to come aboard to see the plane.

“Air Force One” is luxuriously appointed with working office and bedroom for the President and his personal staff. It is an enormous jet plane with the United States of America in blue letters painted practically the length of the fuselage.

ABOARD “AIR FORCE ONE”

When the party entered the President’s personal plane there was a large and spacious, the Life magazine photographer who had been taking pictures all day asked for a seat for the day and for the shot inside the plane. The President consented and he invited the entire party to sit down while he called for a steward to bring handkerchiefs to Madam Johnson. He gave the talking. Mrs. Johnson rejoined the conversation but other subjects ranged from President DeGaulle of France, the Manchester book, our allies and enemies, to Bobby Kennedy. All of this occupied nearly seven hours of conversation in which several fortunate newspaper men in Tennessee were privileged to participate.

Shortly after 10 p.m., Governor Ellington stated that he felt the President and Mrs. Johnson had had a long hard day and since they had to fly back to Washington that night, that he thought the guests would not want to delay their rest any.

CONVERSATION OFF THE RECORD

Conversation during the evening was off the record, but practically every major subject was touched upon during the course of the evening. In some cases, the President has gone forth in great detail. He gave the impression that he welcomed an opportunity to share his thoughts and to discuss issues with those in the party. He obviously had not had a group respect his off the record views.

Vietnam, very logically, occupied most of the evening. Most of the subjects touched from President DeGaulle of France, the Manchester book, our allies and enemies, to Bobby Kennedy. All of this occupied nearly seven hours of conversation in which several fortunate newspaper men in Tennessee were privileged to participate.

A Hit

The president’s personal plane is large and spacious, the Life magazine photographer who had been taking pictures all day asked for a seat for the day and for the shot inside the plane. The President consented and he invited the entire party to sit down while he called for a steward to bring handkerchiefs to Madam Johnson. He gave the talking. Mrs. Johnson rejoined the conversation but other subjects ranged from President DeGaulle of France, the Manchester book, our allies and enemies, to Bobby Kennedy. All of this occupied nearly seven hours of conversation in which several fortunate newspaper men in Tennessee were privileged to participate.

We were told by one of the Governor’s aids that the President and the Governor and Mrs. Ellington were at that moment meeting with a group of educators and the press in a room downstairs and that they would all four join our party shortly.

A few minutes later the President, the Governor, Judge Champion, walked in and each of us was presented.

A famous Life magazine photographer followed them into the room and was given a free pass and key to the entire group both formally and informally.

The President sat in the center of a large sofa and after the introduction of the flowers the group was partially blocking the view of one of the party. He said, “Bird, move the flowers.” The Life photographer objected to the flowers being moved and the President quietly said, “Move the flowers.” One of the guests quickly moved them. There was no doubt about who was in charge from that moment.

CONVERSATION OFF THE RECORD

After the room was cleared of staff and photographers, the President relaxed in a comfortable chair and said, “I didn’t want to be down here with all you people but I must ask for our conversations here tonight be off the record. Let’s talk about anything on your minds and I will do my best to answer them.”

For hours, conversation never lagged and naturally the chief executive did most of the talking. B. Johnson is truly a product of the party after changing clothes and frequently joined in the discussion of various subjects.

President values Lady Bird’s opinion

It was quickly clear that the President valued and sought her advice and knowledge. He speaks quickly, clearly and convincingly in an accent that might be described as a cross between typical Texas and typical Southern.

You have the impression, when Lady Bird Johnson speaks, that she is talking to you and you alone.

I came away thinking that Lyndon B. Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson are a happy family and that the enormous responsibility of the office occupied by the President and burdened with cares beyond the average of men.

Their conversation is frequently broken with smiles and laughter as the President rolls out some of his famous Texas stories and anecdotes. They must have clear meaning and message in relation to the subject being discussed.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE
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SAY GRACE BEFORE MEALS

They normally say grace before meals just as is done in most other Christian homes.

When the President and the other guests were seated at the table, the Governor bowed his head and offered thanks to All Mighty God for gifts which has he scattered upon us.

We were seated in a quiet room, an ever thoughtful of the keen interests of their Tennessee guests seated the President and Mrs. Johnson at the ends of the dinner table so that the President and Mrs. Johnson would be shared more easily by the entire group.

Dinner consisted of a shrimp cocktail, roast beef, asparagus, corn o’brien, lettuce with french dressing and a creme de menthe parfait with two small cookies. The President ate heartily as did the entire party.

GUESTS FROM BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES

They represented both political parties and had been supporting candidates opposing President Johnson.

When he is popular and strong at home, down the road appears to have taken with little Melinda Wagner, daughter of beautiful blonde Ann Ellington and her husband, Tim Wagner and granddaughter of Governor and Mrs. Ellington.

The Buford Ellingtons grace the governor’s mansion with charm and hospitality. They seem to abhor any pretense and a guest in their home can feel that they are of the same friendly and natural people whether the President of the United States is present or a group of friends is in their home.

SECRETARY GARDNER PRESENT

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner, accompanied the President and Mrs. Johnson back to Washington. He had just met by the three dozen flowers of Mrs. Johnson in North Carolina, West Virginia and Tennessee where she visited various Appalachian area projects.

It all started with a call from Governor Ellington the night before inviting me to join a small group of friends to have dinner. The President was told to be at the governor’s mansion at 6:30 p.m. and that a hotel reservation would be made for me. The Governor said, “We will sit around and talk for a little while and then have dinner.”

To my amazement, when I arrived at the governor’s mansion, I was ushered into an upstairs sitting room, adjacent to the Governor and his other invited guests had gathered. This turned out to be the “small party” which the Governor had said we would join at the mansion.

The one thing this group had in common was that they were all longtime newspaper friends of Governor Ellington.
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he has known, first hand, hard times and hard work. He frequently alludes to the period in his life when he was a school teacher. Although he has been a power in the affairs of this country for more than thirty years, his vast experience and knowledge of government and the affairs and international scene of this country had uniquely equipped him for the job he now holds.

He appears mindful not only of his power, but also of the great responsibilities. One gets the feeling from talking with him that he keenly feels the anguish in a mother's heart who has lost a son in Vietnam and the pride he holds in the United States fighting man who has won glory on the battlefield. His words overflow with a voice that can choke up on the mere mention of this type of homecoming of a father whose son has returned victorious. When he speaks of the concerns of the national life. What's happening now—and what's ahead.

NATIONAL RAISIN WEEK

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of the Congress the week long Society Hill celebration to be held in the city of Philadelphia the week of June 3 to 11. It is my pleasure to represent the Third District of Pennsylvania in which Society Hill is located. This is the Independence Hall area, which is the "Cradle of Liberty" for our great Nation.

I would like to extend an invitation to my colleagues and to the people across the Nation to visit with us in this unique renewal area during this observance and participate in the week-long activities. This program is still yet to be completed, but you will find listed below the events which have been scheduled thus far:

SOCIETY HILL WEEK, 1967

PROGRAM OF EVENTS—JUNE 3-11

June 3

"Ye Olde Market Fair"—Day-long fair sponsored by Old St. Joseph's Church, featuring old-time entertainment, refreshments, and booths. Will be held at historic New Market at Second and Pine Streets.

June 4

"Open House"—Official opening of historic Hill-Physick-Keith home, including open house for individuals and groups at famous Society Hill churches; guided tours of area; friends invited to spend the day in Society Hill.

June 5

"School Night"—Special programs and open house at schools of Society Hill; tours, motion picture, concerts and refreshments will highlight evening.

June 7

"Pennsylvania Hospital Day"—Traditional day-long country fair in Washington Square, sponsored by Pennsylvania Hospital. To include all types of booths; fashion show; art show; antique auction and other activities. To be held in Washington Square.

Community Salute—Program to salute individual activities and organizations responsible for continuing development of Society Hill. Main event will be a community symposium "Philadelphia: 1967" Town-meeting discussion groups will be held on topics ranging from educational issues to the environment.

June 8

"Society Hill Week"—Activities in and around New Market area. "Old Guard" Pike and Drum Corps will perform games and displays of police and fire equipment will be featured.

June 9

"Volunteer Day"—Activities for children in and around New Market area. "Old Guard" Pike and Drum Corps will perform; games and displays of police and fire equipment will be featured.


June 10

"Children's Day"—Activities for children in and around New Market area. "Old Guard" Pike and Drum Corps will perform; games and displays of police and fire equipment will be featured.

HENRY ANDREAS. This trip was the most thorough and complete investigation of the board's forward marketing program ever undertaken.

Over a period of 33 working days, Mr. Andreas visited and evaluated each of 10 project countries visited by Mr. Andreas were Ireland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, West Germany, Switzerland, and Japan.

According to Mr. Andreas' report, trade contacts witnessed a great deal of good will in every country. In Japan, the All-Japan Federation will, for the first time, cosponsor baking demonstrations with the California Raisin Advisory Board.

Obviously, officials of the California Raisin Advisory Board have shown what initiative and imagination and hard work on the part of private industry can accomplish in the fields of international relations and international trade. It has helped to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the American people and the people of other countries that have helped our Nation while advancing the interests and progress of the members and industry it serves.

I can think of no more fitting an occasion to commend the California Raisin Advisory Board and the raisin industry for their great and growing contributions to the welfare of our Nation and our people than this 58th anniversary of National Raisin Week.

H.R. 2808. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING BILL MAY CAUSE INCREASED CONFUSION, EVEN MORE CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTINGS, AND GREAT INEQUITIES AMONG THE SEVERAL STATES

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Conyers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have filed minority views with House Report No. 191 which opposes the passage of H.R. 2808, a bill to establish Federal guidelines for the drawing of congressional district boundaries. That bill is scheduled for House consideration on this Thursday.

In preliminary there were four criticisms: that the standards for population disparity of 30 percent for the 1968 and 1970 elections were far too great and in fact had been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court; that there was no effective requirement that the
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districts be in a compact form and in fact the language of the bill seemed to offer the State legislatures a license to gerrymander the congressional districts; that the effect of this bill would be to overturn the decisions of the court on the Constitution and so was a serious attack on the American system of separation of powers; and finally that no hearings had been held on this subject in either the 90th or the 89th Congress and so this very important subject was being pushed through the House without adequate consideration of all its many serious implications.

Therefore, I would like to address myself to a somewhat different point; namely, that this bill may cause increased concern on the part of the Members from these States because the very hurried fashion in which this bill was prepared and passed by the House has not been the result of thorough study and discussion of the implications in the result of the very hurried fashion in which this bill was prepared and passed by the House has not been the result of thorough study and discussion of the implications of this bill and in reducing the number of times congressional districts are changed. Unfortunately I feel that, largely as a result of the very hurried fashion in which this bill was prepared and passed by the House will result in the exact opposite of what the Constitution requires while waiting for the Supreme Court to make its decision. The Members from these States have reasonably conformed with the standards included in the one-man, one-vote standard with an allowed deviation, much larger than the very easy 30-percent deviation which is currently allowed in the State of Nebraska. The Members from these States have therefore an incentive to redistrict their congressional districts and establish valid districts in accordance with the provisions of this act."

In case some of my colleagues might feel that I have interpreted this provision in the exact opposite manner than the, analysis of this bill contained in the current issue of Congressional Quarterly, usually considered an authoritative source in analyzing legislation. In discussing this bill I just quoted to you, Congressional Quarterly states:

"The effect of this provision would appear to be to permit states already redistricted on the one-man, one-vote principle to court order, with their own redistricting schemes, which could allow a 50-percent deviation, much larger than the standards currently being applied by the court, April 31, 1967, p. 626.

In the 22 States where this might have relevance, certainly there must be quite a few legislatures that would jump at the chance to redraw congressional districts. Since the act sets the upper limit in the interests of their political parties, their personal ambitions, their sectional interests, or whatever. I would point out to my colleagues that in many States party control of the legislature and the Governor's office has recently changed hands so that this possibility might become very relevant.

The actual intent of the entire bill, and particularly this last sentence, was to prevent repeated redistricting. But though this bill ties the hands of the courts in this area, it is at the same time a license for easy redistricting and possibly gerrymandering offered to State legislatures by the Congress.

REGARDING THE EIGHT STATES WHICH ARE BEYOND EVEN THE 30-PERCENT POPULATION STANDARD INCLUDED IN H.R. 2508 (SEE TABLE 1 IN MEMORANDUM)

There are eight States which have districts with population disparities even greater than the very easy 30-percent standard established in this bill. Among the eight States are the following: California, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Mississippi. The Members from these States may be unhappy to learn that they will not get a 5-year reprieve from conforming with the one-man, one-vote policy established by the Supreme Court as will many Congressmen from other States. I would guess, however, that instead of my colleagues from these States who have been so concerned about the provision in the bill that all eight of these States will have to contract with the Bureau of the Census for a special state-wide census. Though this is a very expensive and burdensome act, the cost of such a special census will have to be borne by these eight States.

In California, our largest State, there is currently no pending court suit regarding congressional districts. But as Mr. Smuin of California pointed out during the Rules Committee consideration of this bill, and as was agreed to by our distinguished chairman, Congressman Celler, passage of H.R. 2508 as its present form would automatically require that California redistrict. In effect this bill would relieve any possible litigant from the very arduous, difficult, and expensive task of examining the relevant statistics and precedents and arguing them before the courts.

Though I would certainly be in favor of requiring all States in the Union to conform to the one-man, one-vote doctrine I must say it is hard for me to see how we can justify, automatically and immediately forcing some States to redistrict, and for them to bear the financial cost at the same time postponing any redistricting for another large group of States until 1972 when a new census will have been taken—at Federal expense—and when the number of Congressmen apportioned to many of the States will have changed. It would seem to me to be hard to justify that Nebraska with 31.1 percent disparity in population will immediately have to go through this very expensive and arithmetic exercise while Mississippi with 28.5 percent disparity will now be allowed to wait 5 years before it implements what the Supreme Court has stated is the clear requirement of the U.S. Constitution.

CONCLUSION

I would invite all of my colleagues to examine the statistics included in the Legislative Reference Service memorandum following my remarks and to examine the statistics myself to determine whether they come from the lucky or from the unlucky States.

The Library of Congress
Legislative Reference Service

To: Hon. John Conyers; attention, Mr. Horvitz.

From: Leader, Wisconsin Law Division.

Subject: Congressional districts statistics.

In response to your request we have enclosed tables setting out, as of this date (April 24, 1967) the statistics of congressional district population variations. Listed are the percentages by which the largest district exceeds the smallest in population and the deviation above and below the one-man, one-vote standard for each State. Calculations are based upon population statistics rounded to the thousands.

With regard to your question as to the
appropriate formula for determining the percentage by which the population of the largest district exceeds the smallest, it appears that the simplest one is $X = \frac{L-S}{S}$ where $X$ is the percentage, $L$ is the population of the largest district, and $S$ is the population of the smallest district.

I would want to point out that the deviation of the largest from the smallest district (the standard used in H.R. 2508) would, in the case of a district with a variance greater than the sum of the greatest deviations below and above the average district (the standard often used and which Congressional Quarterly uses). This is due to the fact that the mathematical base for the first figure is smaller than the base for the second figure while the total population disparity, of course, remains the same.

JOHNNY H. KILLIAN,
Legislative Attorney.

I. Congressional districting statistics—All 50 States in alphabetical order

II. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT STATISTICS—ALL 50 STATES ACCORDING TO HOW THEY MIGHT BE DISTRICTED UNDER H.R. 2508

(Note:—The following four tables attempt to classify the various States according to how they might be affected by passage of H.R. 2508. The tables separate the States into four categories: 1) those with district population variations over 30% and therefore beyond the maximum allowed by H.R. 2508 for the 91st and 92nd Congresses; 2) those under 30% but listed by Congressional Quarterly as currently "imperiled" by being subject to a possible court finding of unconstitutionality; and 3) those which are now presumed by Congressional Quarterly to be on a sound constitutional basis, and 4) those States whose Congressmen are elected on at-large basis.)

COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING CLASSIFICATION OF THE STATES

Congressional Quarterly developed a classification of the States regarding the compliance with the "one-man, one-vote" doctrine in its January 20, 1967 Weekly Report following the Supreme Court's January 9 decisions in the Missouri Congressional District case, Kirkpatrick v. Frecker, 383 U.S. 450 (1967) and the Indiana Congressional District case, Daddleton v. Grimes, 388 U.S. 455 (1967). Briefly, Congressional Quarterly pointed out that since in the Missouri case, the greatest deviation from the average was 10.4%, while in the Indiana case, the greatest deviation from the average was 12.5%, then the two orders apparently mean that even a 10 percent variation from the state average district population is too large to meet the Court's "one-man, one-vote" rule. Thus 22 States, each of which had at least one district varying by 10% from the average, were listed as probably not in compliance with the Court's decisions.

It is important to note, however, that the Supreme Court has warned against any "uniform formula" and the establishment of "rigid mathematical standards." Roman v. Sincock, 377 U.S. 665, 710 (1964). In fact, the Court has cautioned: "What is actually possible in one State may be unsatisfactory in another, depending on the particular circumstances of the case." Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533, 578 (1964).

And further: "The fact that a 10% or 15% variation from the norm is approved in one State may be unsatisfactory in another, depending on the particular circumstances of the case." Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533, 578 (1964).

It should also be noted that the mathematical standard established by H.R. 2508 differs from that used by Congressional Quarterly. Congressional Quarterly calculated the percentage deviation from the average district. The bill sets a standard measured by the percentage by which the population of the largest district exceeds the smallest (a measurement recently used by the Supreme Court, incidentally, see Swann v. Adams, supra, 444). One should also note that the latter figure may not be obtained by adding together the greatest deviations below and above the average. In fact for any particular State the deviation of the largest from the smallest would always be somewhat greater than the sum of the greatest deviations below and above the average. In order to prevent any confusion, the following tables provide the statistics in both ways. The first column of percentages is that by which the largest exceeds the smallest, and the second column is the largest variation from the average district.

It is noted that when Congress Quarterly published its findings, Oklahoma was ruled "imperiled" (as March, so that now the maximum deviation from the average is 21.2% with the deviation of the largest from the smallest is 3.9%, and therefore Oklahoma would probably be free from being ruled invalid by the courts for population disparities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percent deviation of largest district from smallest</th>
<th>Percent of largest district is average</th>
<th>Year of last redistricting</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percent deviation of largest district from smallest</th>
<th>Percent of largest district is average</th>
<th>Year of last redistricting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE A—States exceeding the 30-percent standard of H.R. 2508 for the 91st and 92nd Congresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percent deviation of largest district from smallest</th>
<th>Maximum percent deviation from average district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. California</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ohio</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Illinois</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indiana</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michigan</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pennsylvania</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New Mexico</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Court challenge pending.
2. Under court order to redistrict before 1968 elections.
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND
MEANS—PERMISSION TO HAVE
UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO
FILE A CONFERENCE REPORT ON
H.R. 286, DUTY-FREE TREATMENT
OF DICYANDIAMIDE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that the Committee
on Ways and Means may have until mid-
night tonight to file conference report
on H.R. 286, duty-free treatment of
dicyandiamide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gentleman
from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence
was granted to:

Mr. MULter (at the request of Mr.
Booie), for April 25 and 26, on account
of Jewish holy holidays.

Mr. BROTMAN, for April 26, 27, and 28,
on account of official business as a mem-
er of the Board of Visitors to the U.S.
Air Force Academy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to
address the House, following the legis-
lative program and any special orders
herefore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr.
BRINKLEY), for 5 minutes, today; to
revise and extend his remarks and in-
clude extraneous matter.

Mr. RENICK (at the request of Mr.
BRINKLEY), for 1 hour, on April 26; to
revise and extend his remarks and in-
clude extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to
extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL
RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks
was granted to:

Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. Saylor and to include extraneous
matter.

(The following Members at the re-
quest of Mr. Buchanan) and to include
extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRAY.
Mr. McCLORY.

(The following Members at the re-
quest of Mr. BRINKLEY) and to include
extraneous matter:)

Mr. EILERS in two instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Woff.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following
title was taken from the Speaker's Table
and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 375. An act to amend the Communica-
tions Act of 1934 with respect to obscene
or harassing telephone calls in interstate or
foreign commerce; to the Committee on In-
testate and Foreign Commerce.

JOHNNY H. KILLIAN,
Legislative Attorney.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signa-
ture to a Joint resolution of the Senate of
the following title:

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate
April 28-29, 1967, as 'Rush-Bagot Agreement
Days.'

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move
that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly
(at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the
House adjourned until tomorrow,
Wednesday, April 26, 1967, at 12 o'clock
noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive
communications were taken from the
Speaker's table and referred as follows:

691. A letter from the DEputy Secretary
of Defense (Properties and Installations),
transmitting a notification of the location,
nature, and estimated cost of additional
nonarmory facilities projects to be
undertaken for the Army National Guard,
pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2256a
(1), and to the authority delegated by the
Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on
Armed Services.

692. A letter from the Secretary of the
Treasury, transmitting the semianual con-
solidated report of balances of foreign cur-
rencies acquired without payment of dollar,
as of December 31, 1966, pursuant to the
provisions of Public Law 87-123; to the Com-
mittee on Internal Revenue.

693. A letter from the Comptroller Gen-
eral of the United States, transmitting a re-
port of financing the civil service retirement
system administered by United States Civil
Service Commission; to the Committee on
Government Operations.

694. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic
Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of
proposed legislation to authorize approca-
tions to the Atomic Energy Commission in
accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of
1954, as amended; to the Joint
Committee on Atomic Energy.

695. A letter from the Comptroller General
of the United States, transmitting a report of
review of Federal excise tax exemption on
beer and tobacco products given to certain
categories, Internal Revenue Service, Trea-
ury Department; to the Committee on Gov-
ernment Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUB-
LIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of
committees were delivered to the Clerk
for printing and reference to the proper
committee, as follows:

Mr. POOL: Committee on Post Office
and Civil Service. H.R. 8555. A bill to
extend the authority of the Postmaster General
to enter into leases of real property
for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other
purposes (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the
Committee on the Whole House on the State
of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4341. A bill
to amend the public health laws relating
mental health to extend, expand, and
improve them, and for other purposes; with
amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the
Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union.
Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 286. An act to permit duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act and to amend section 403(b) of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CORMAN: H.R. 9106. A bill to provide for the adjustment of annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund where persons otherwise eligible to receive survivor annuities are not so treated as an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program. To the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. POUL: H.R. 9109. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADAIR: H.R. 9121. A bill to prohibit mutilation and desecration of the national flag; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBINSON: H.R. 9123. A bill to amend title 26 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON: H.R. 9124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 with respect to the inclusion in the treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAWYER: H.R. 9125. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits, reflecting the length of time spent in covered employment or self-employment, to individuals having 40 or more quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL: H.R. 9126. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK: H.R. 9128. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STANTON: H.R. 9129. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT: H.R. 9130. A bill to include prepared or preserved beef and veal within the quotas imposed on the importation of certain other meat and meat products; to reduce the percentage applied to certain aggregate quantities of such imports, in part, to determine such quotas from 110 percent to 100 percent; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK: H.R. 9131. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1956 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. WIDNALL: H.R. 9132. A bill to include in the title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that Federal urban renewal funds may not be used for grants to projects which are included within the designation of city demonstration programs except to the extent that such funds are specifically earmarked for projects included therein; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON: H.R. 9133. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: H.R. 9095. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain combinations and arrangements of newspapers, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY: H.R. 9096. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in the year 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTIN: H.R. 9097. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BREITZMAN: H.R. 9099. A bill to vary the boundaries of the Badlands National Monument in the State of South Dakota, to authorize exchanges of land mutually beneficial to the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: H.R. 9100. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in the year 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California: H.R. 9101. A bill to provide for the early transition to a fully voluntary military manpower system by further improving, upgrading, and strengthening the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS: H.R. 9102. A bill to relieve the Postmaster General of responsibility for determining mailability under the congressional frank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROHILL of Virginia: H.R. 9103. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code by making it clear that the tax exemption of a public or private organization exclusively for the promotion of social welfare shall not be affected by income, including subscription and advertising income, from carrying on any publication, such as a journal, which is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah: H.R. 9104. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLANCY: H.R. 9105. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOKE: H.R. 9106. A bill to provide for the adjustment of annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund where persons otherwise eligible to receive survivor annuities are not so treated as an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program. To the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAZEN: H.R. 9117. A bill to provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where United States Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the Pan American Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEE: H.R. 9118. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN: H.R. 9119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 to provide an additional deduction of $1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON: H.R. 9123. A bill to amend title 26 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAWYER: H.R. 9124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 with respect to the inclusion in the treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAWYER: H.R. 9125. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits, reflecting the length of time spent in covered employment or self-employment, to individuals having 40 or more quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL: H.R. 9126. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK: H.R. 9128. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STANTON: H.R. 9129. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT: H.R. 9130. A bill to include prepared or preserved beef and veal within the quotas imposed on the importation of certain other meat and meat products; to reduce the percentage applied to certain aggregate quantities of such imports, in part, to determine such quotas from 110 percent to 100 percent; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK: H.R. 9131. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1956 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. WIDNALL: H.R. 9132. A bill to include in the title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that Federal urban renewal funds may not be used for grants to projects which are included within the designation of city demonstration programs except to the extent that such funds are specifically earmarked for projects included therein; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON: H.R. 9133. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period within which certain ministers, members of religious orders, and Christian Science practitioners may elect coverage under the otherwise survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINLEY:
H.R. 9150. A bill to classify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:
H.R. 9151. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 to authorize annual appropriations for such Agency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:
H.R. 9152. A bill to establish a joint congressional committee to make a continuing study and investigation of the activities and operations of the Central Intelligence Agency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POPE:
H.R. 9153. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1972 to prohibit certain practices affecting producers of fuels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLLE:
H.R. 9154. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1994, to provide more economic, efficient, and effective implementation of the various Federal loan and grant-in-aid programs, to improve the quality of urban and rural life through improved comprehensive development planning, programming, and coordination among and between Federal agencies, States, regions, metropolitan areas, and local governments, and to encourage greater coordination between States and their political subdivisions in the planning and programming of Federal loan and grant-in-aid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:
H.R. 9155. A bill to amend section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:
H.R. 9156. A bill to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTDT:
H.J. Res. 532. Joint resolution to prevent the subversion of the United States and the American continents as proposed by the Government of Cuba under Castro; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:
H. Con. Res. 323. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been re­ directed toward peace and an honorable settle­ ment and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTLEY:
H. Con. Res. 324. Concurrent resolution to provide for the services of the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADAMS:
H. Res. 450. Resolution authorizing Mem­ bers of the House of Representatives to em­ ploy during each summer one student con­ gressional intern; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG:
H. Res. 451. Resolution relating to the salary of the technical assistant to the attending physician; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.
159. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the construction of Federal build­ ings so as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KUPPERMAN:
H.R. 9159. A bill for the relief of certain Philippine nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUCINISI:
H.R. 9160. A bill for the relief of Ioannis O. Katsioli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.
70. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Katherine Jackson, of Oakland, Calif., relative to the civil rights of her son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
Svetlana Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Svetlana Stalin is a living eyewitness to a period of Russian history that will probably never be fully explained or explored. The late Sir Winston Churchill once described the Soviet Union as "a mystery wrapped in a riddle inside an enigma." The secret, closed nature of the Soviet state has effectively prevented the rest of the world from probing too deeply into the intrigues and mysteries of the Kremlin and its rulers since the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917.

Svetlana Stalin was born in 1925, 1 year after Lenin's death. Not until 1966 had the first book of her father's Soviet Union. She was 28 years old when her father died in 1953. For this period, it is probably no exaggeration to say that she was closer to Joseph Stalin than any other human being.

Until publication of her memoirs, no one can say for sure just what new light will be thrown on this dark and bloody period of Russian history. Millions died in purges and the Soviet state was nearly destroyed in World War II. American experts who have seen the manuscript of Miss Stalin's memoirs say it is essentially nonpolitical. It all will be quite valuable as a historical document.

I believe the most significant statement has already been made by Miss Stalin. Upon her arrival in the United States she said, in part: "I was born in a family where there was never any talk about God. But when I became a grown-up person I found that it was impossible to exist without God in one's heart. Without God, the main dogmas of communism lost their significance for me."

She went on to say that she hoped to find in America "the main purpose of my journey—the freedom of self-expression which I seek."

Let us hope that Miss Stalin's actions and remarks will be carefully noted by those Americans who attack their own country and praise the Soviet Union. Let them be carefully noted, as well, by the world at large. They stand as a clear and ringing rebuke to the baseless and slanderous charges made against our national integrity, our national honor and our basic international good will.

It must be a shock to those who condemn the United States—Americans as well as foreigners—to read what this woman has done, and her own words telling why she felt as she did. Miss Stalin's father was for years the world's most powerful man and she has had an unequalled opportunity to see at first hand exactly what communism is, and what it means. Joseph Stalin's very name was synonymous with atheism and godless communism. His policies and intrigues shaped human history in the past and what he has done will influence mankind for decades to come.

Now his daughter, by her own choice, has sought the very opposite of all that in which her father believed. And she has chosen to seek it in the United States of America, the country that more than any other is shaped by her father, and the heritage of tyranny and despotism he has left to the world.

Common Situs Picketing
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Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciated an invitation recently to offer testimony in behalf of H.R. 100. I sponsored a related bill, but as I told the special subcommittee, even if the rules of the House allowed, there would be no pride of authorship on my part in regard to this bill. It matters not that H.R. 1969 is or is not adopted over H.R. 100. I feel very strongly that whatever does matter is that some legislation is passed to correct inequities which exist over the problem of common situs picketing.

The Denver building trades decision of the U.S. Supreme Court notwithstanding, it seems to me that those of our citizens who happen to make their living in one or more of the building trades have been placed at a great disadvantage; one that is not rectified by their counterparts in almost any other trade.

Were these men employed in a factory, for example, they would be able to bargain collectively with other members of their craft, with their entire plant, with other employees of the company regardless of craft, or even with all other employees of the industry across the country. Thus, a railway clerk at least theoretically is in a position to bargain to improve his lot together with engineers and trainmen on his railroad, and indeed, with employees of a great many transportation companies. Under collective bargaining, the same rights extend to steelworkers, rubber workers, automobile workers, and practically all other labor groups.

Many times these employees, too, are assigned by their employers to temporary locations or sites that are not part of the primary facility in which they were hired. Why then, should a plumber, painter, carpenter, or laborer be denied for hire and by his colleagues? The fact that his employer may be one of several, all fulfilling parts of a general contract on a common site is not reason enough for denial of this right.

I am sure the Members of this House know of upheavals caused among the building trades since the Denver building trades decision was handed down. This has been as difficult a decision for affected tradesmen in this field to understand as it has been for them—and many others of us—to accept. There can be no real justification for singling out the building trades as a group apart from other segments of American labor. I feel sure Congress never intended to establish such discrimination; yet we have allowed this situation to persist since 1951.

I must permit myself to believe that the 90th Congress is ready to correct these inequities. For while this bill favorably affects a segment of our population that could be called labor, it is primarily designed to end a large slice of nonsense. And this Congress already has been labeled a "no nonsense" one.

I have tried to point out that similar restrictions on collective bargaining do not apply to members of other labor organizations. Similarly, they do not apply to trade and manufacturer's organizations or combinations of companies.

My plea to you at this time is not to help create an advantage for a disadvantaged group, but rather to eliminate a disadvantage under which one segment of our population has suffered for 16 years.

National 4-H Conference
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Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the 37th National 4-H Conference is being held here in Washington this week at the National 4-H Center, attended by delegates from each of our States and Puerto Rico. The 103,000 4-H members from the New York State will be represented by five delegates, one of whom is Miss Janice Glover, a constituent of mine from Westbury, Long Island.

Recently the Long Island Press, a leading newspaper on Long Island, carried a feature story, "The Glover Family Operates as a Unit." The article quotes Mrs. Glover's praise of Janice, the oldest daughter, that:

A night never goes by that I don't wait in from work to find dinner ready to be served. Janice usually gets home by three o'clock in time to get a little one, plan the dinner and keep up with the ironing.

This is much appreciated by a busy mother of six who has a full-time job and takes classes beside. It was through her 4-H work that Janice learned to cook.

Despite the unusual demands at home, Janice manages a well-rounded school and social life. An excellent student with her eye on a career in science, she has just been accepted into the National Honor Society.

Janice has been a 4-H member for 7 years, giving special attention to projects...
in clothing, food, home improvement, horticulture, and gardening. She has been a full-fledged junior leader for 3 years where she says her responsibilities and opportunities are unlimited. Her leadership work in 4-H has contributed to her goal to be a vocational guidance counselor in an underdeveloped area.

She is vice president of the teen club of the council, and is on the student council for Westbury High School in Nassau County. Janice edits the county 4-H paper, "4-H Bugle."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to talk about the program of the 4-H group. The members of the 4-H group are doing in their respective communities and wish them every success in the future.

Lowering Social Security's Retirement Age to 60
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Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge a simplification of our social security system, which would substitute full benefits at age 60 as a right for everyone, man and woman alike, with no reduction in benefits, for the present jigsaw puzzle of alternative retirement ages which older people must face.

In the original Social Security Act of 1935, age 65 was somewhat arbitrarily set over 30 years ago as the appropriate retirement age for everyone. Writing of these times, Wilbur J. Cohen—then a staffman for the Committee on Economic Security which outlined the original act and now Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—has written:

There was no scientific, social, or gerontological basis for the selection. Rather, it may be said that the general consensus was that 65 was the most acceptable age.

We have recognized through the years, notably with the increased efficiency of our productive plant, that waiting until they reach age 65 in our times causes real hardship for many of our older people whose jobs have become obsolete or who find themselves unable to continue the pace of their younger years. Sometimes this means that they have to resort to charity, in other cases, where they can continue on the job but for shorter hours and less pay, the amount of their benefit can actually be reduced because of the lower wages. But we have recognized these developments in a sporadic and expedient way.

In the 1956 amendments we lowered the retirement age for women to age 62, with full benefits for widows, but only actuarially reduced benefits were provided for wives and women workers who retired at the earlier age. In the 1961 amendments men were made eligible for actuarially reduced benefits at age 62, with full benefits for widows, but only at a reduced rate for each year until age 65. It is even more difficult to know the correct amount to be paid at any age after 60 at good wages would hardly want to retire and draw benefits. The major beneficiaries, therefore, would be the less fortunate people who cannot work or whose earnings are so small as to barely keep them alive.

We could also, at no further cost, add the principle of providing automatic cost-of-living adjustment benefit increases for the future, such as those proposed by the ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. John W. Wydler. You will recall that in 1965, we provided a 7-percent increase in benefits. With the automatic cost-of-living adjustment to provide for the future, I am convinced that the alternative now of using the savings to lower the retirement age to 60 with full benefits should receive the very serious consideration of this committee.

And because I am aware of the careful consideration you give to all possible alternatives, I am sure my proposal will get that kind of consideration.

Heroism of Harvard, Ill., Busdriver Saves Children
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Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday afternoon one of the most destructive tornadoes in history raced across northern Illinois, leaving death and heavy damage in its path.

My heartfelt sympathy and personal concern have gone to all those who suffered as a result of this terrible disaster. Truly, the loss of lives and property damage caused by the tornado has brought a solemn sadness into our hearts.

Yet, amid this widespread sorrow, there are reasons for rejoicing and for renewed hope. Countless citizens have responded immediately to the tragedy, giving aid, comfort, and encouragement to those in need. The rebuilding has already begun.

One special act of great heroism occurring in my congressional district warrants commendation. For afternoon, Boyd Jones, a young man from Harvard, Ill., was driving his schoolbus down a country road in Dunham Township, McHenry County. The bus was filled with 32 children ranging from kindergarten youngsters to high school students.

When Boyd Jones reached Busse Road just off State Route 23, he spotted a dark funnel cloud bearing down rapidly. Jones brought his vehicle to a quick standstill, led the children out of the bus, and directed them to lie down in a mud and water-filled ditch on the west side of the road.

No sooner were they in the ditch than the violent wind struck the bus, completely destroying it. The body was torn from the chassis, and parts were tossed high into the air severing nearby powerlines. Only debris remained.

All of the children were safe, and only a few received minor injuries. As Boyd Jones and the children looked up, they saw the road their bus had traveled, which was now strewn with piles of timbers that had been farm buildings only moments before.

Boyd Jones marched the children a
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Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, midway through last week's Second International Conference on Urban Transportation, held in my home city of Pittsburgh, more than 1,000 delegates from seven States and 26 foreign countries were inspired to work at developing urban mass transportation.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.

Underlying my remarks, I insert the text of Mr. Weaver's address at this point in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MASS TRANSPORTATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Second International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh Hilton, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1967)

Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

That is why HUD recently made sizable grants to both the Watts area of Los Angeles, and to Nashville, Tennessee. In both of those cities, the problems are so acute that everyone can well remember—that there was no good, cheap public transportation between the neighborhoods where many low-income families lived and hospitals, employment centers and, in fact, the rest of society.

Instead, there had been actual, physical isolation and alienation. That is something we can cure without even pondering the deeper questions of race prejudice and the other social problems that we have to confront by making a bus system in now, and that is being done.

The problems of cities will not be solved by that; the deeper questions will have to be faced. But that is a subject for another forum. For this forum, it raises the question of developing a balanced, national transportation system that does not permit this kind of inquisition that will that city's decline, or which destroys or destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.

Underlying my remarks, I insert the text of Mr. Weaver's address at this point in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MASS TRANSPORTATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Second International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh Hilton, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1967)

Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.

Underlying my remarks, I insert the text of Mr. Weaver's address at this point in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MASS TRANSPORTATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Second International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh Hilton, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1967)

Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.

Underlying my remarks, I insert the text of Mr. Weaver's address at this point in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MASS TRANSPORTATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Second International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh Hilton, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1967)

Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.

Underlying my remarks, I insert the text of Mr. Weaver's address at this point in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MASS TRANSPORTATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Second International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh Hilton, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1967)

Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.

Underlying my remarks, I insert the text of Mr. Weaver's address at this point in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MASS TRANSPORTATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Second International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh Hilton, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1967)

Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.

Underlying my remarks, I insert the text of Mr. Weaver's address at this point in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MASS TRANSPORTATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Second International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh Hilton, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1967)

Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.
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Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.
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Mr. Weaver said that the delegates that although the theme of their Conference was "Cities in Motion," they should be aware of "the needs of people" in developing balanced mass transportation systems.

Emphasizing that transportation is a key element in HUD's efforts to make cities livable, Mr. Weaver warned that a transit system which fails to serve all areas of a city, or which destroys or blocks the view of its natural beauty, or which contributes to its air or noise pollution, will hasten that city's decline rather than enhance its future.
Last summer at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, we had a group of experts from many fields and many disciplines considering what we ought to be doing across the whole range of housing and urban development, and transportation was one of the important centers of interest.

We think this is entirely a proper role for government to stimulate the broadcast and longest-range thinking, as well as in terms of immediate solutions. We feel that the total program being developed will permit us to move on short, middle and long-range problems.

As we fit all these factors into the transit equation, it becomes more certain all the time that transportation responsibility to emphasize the esthetic design of transportation systems, so that they preserve and improve communities, as well as move people and goods.

HUD is making concerted efforts to stress excellence of design in many programs, but there is an unusual opportunity in transit systems where physical design can be combined with social considerations and planning.

We expect design will be a major topic in two-week seminar being sponsored this summer at West Virginia University and Kent State in Ohio for key management officials of transit systems. They will be examining the potentials in planning, economic, environmental, and land use, and engineering advances, for the total development of transportation systems.

Even more directly, we are inviting several hundred transit officials, engineers, architects, urban planners, bus and subway train manufacturers to Washington in May. We want them to see what is being done around the nation to make design an essential component from the beginning of transit development. We will also review European and Canadian approaches.

As so many American cities and their metropolitan regions begin to move into mass transit in a major way, it is clear that some are highly conscious of the importance of the designer. But the quickest way to make them all aware of the possibilities is to permit them to exchange views. And that, too, is entirely a proper role for government in transportation systems, so that they preserve and improve the physical design of these systems of the future.

Festival of Passover
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Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as the Passover season begins it is a pleasure for me to extend greetings to my colleagues of the Jewish faith and to invite my other colleagues to join with us in observing another anniversary of the Exodus.

Like many others in this House, however, I am concerned that some people in parts of the world may not be allowed to celebrate the coming because of continuing religious persecution. I know that a very great number of my colleagues have joined in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 114, including the leadership on both sides of the aisle. On the first day of this holiday I am proud to be in their company in expressing the sense of the Congress in condemnation of religious persecution in the U.S.S.R. The compelling need for enactment of this resolution is obvious. In the Soviet Union, places of worship have been closed, religious education of children has been prevented, and severe restrictions have been placed on activities of rabbis and other religious leaders. I cannot think of a more appropriate time for a joint effort calling for religious freedom, not only for Jews, but for all people who are being harassed and persecuted in practicing their religion.
specialized needs of Spanish-speaking grade and high school students living in the 25 counties of Southern Florida. French-speaking youngsters in certain areas along the United States-Canadian border, as well as other non-

English-speaking children residing in wide areas of other States, are members of our national recognition as one of the most critical education problems in the Nation's school-age population. The situation is just beginning to receive national recognition as one of the most critical education problems faced by the hundreds of thousands of non-English-speaking children who are members of our non-English-speaking ethnic and nationality groups.

There is an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, to find constructive solutions to the unique bilingual-bicultural education problems faced by the hundreds of thousands of non-English-speaking children who are members of our non-English-speaking ethnic and nationality groups.

The measure would provide $7 million the first year to enable local school districts to initiate comprehensive bilingual systems of teaching non-English-speaking students.

The Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act provides Federal financial assistance to local educational agencies to conduct a variety of programs such as: original research and demonstration pilot projects in the field of bilingual education; intensive preschool Headstart-type programs specifically designed to orient and prepare non-English-speaking children for smoother transition to and more fully utilize the rich abundance of 20th-century America.

My bill, therefore, is an effort to develop the kind of local-State-Federal cooperative approach I believe is necessary to meet the special educational needs of the large numbers of students in the United States to whom English is a second language.

The measure would provide $7 million the first year to enable local school districts to initiate comprehensive bilingual systems of teaching non-English-speaking students.

The Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act provides Federal financial assistance to local educational agencies to conduct a variety of programs such as: original research and demonstration pilot projects in the field of bilingual education; intensive preschool Headstart-type programs specifically designed to orient and prepare non-English-speaking children for smoother transition to and more fully utilize the rich abundance of 20th-century America.

My bill, therefore, is an effort to develop the kind of local-State-Federal cooperative approach I believe is necessary to meet the special educational needs of the large numbers of students in the United States to whom English is a second language.

The measure would provide $7 million the first year to enable local school districts to initiate comprehensive bilingual systems of teaching non-English-speaking students.

The Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act provides Federal financial assistance to local educational agencies to conduct a variety of programs such as: original research and demonstration pilot projects in the field of bilingual education; intensive preschool Headstart-type programs specifically designed to orient and prepare non-English-speaking children for smoother transition to and more fully utilize the rich abundance of 20th-century America.

Mr. Speaker, because of its importance as a symbol of widening grassroots support for a system of bilingual education, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Congressional Record the pertinent sections of the letter I have just received from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors supporting their wholehearted endorsement for Federal legislation to establish new programs designed to improve educational opportunities for bilingual children.

The letter follows:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 21, 1967.

Each Member, House Education and Labor Committee, Each Member, Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, California Congressional Delegation.

GENTLEMEN: At its meeting of April 18, 1967, Supervisor Ernest E. Debs directed the Board's attention to proposed federal legislation to establish new educational programs intended to improve educational opportunities for the bilingual child.

In presenting this matter for the Board's consideration, Supervisor Debs declared that the implementation of federal legislation is vital to solve the Nation's most serious educational problems, that of hundreds of thousands of American children who are members of non-English-speaking minority groups. He pointed out that the problem exists not only in Los Angeles, but is also apparent in many other locales throughout the Nation.

Therefore, on motion of Supervisor Debs, the Board adopted an order unanimously endorsing the bill which proposes the kind of local-state-federal cooperative approach necessary to meet these existing educational handicaps.

The Board further ordered that the House Education and Labor Committee, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the California Congressional Delegation, and Senators Thomas Kuchel and George Murphy be informed of its sponsorship and support of these Bills.

Very truly yours,
JAMES S. MIRE.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Congressional Record at this point the text of H.R. 8000, the Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act:

SEC. 2. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by re-designating title VII as title VIII, by redesignating sections 701 and 702 and references thereto as sections 801 and 802, respectively, and by adding after title VI the following new title:

"TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES"

"SHORT TITLE"

"Subtitle A. Bilingual Educational Opportunity Programs"

"DECLARATION OF POLICY"

"Sec. 701. This title may be cited as the 'Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act'."

"AUTHORIZATION AND ALLOTMENTS"

"Sec. 702. In recognition of the special educational needs and the special talents and needs of students in the United States to whom English is a second language, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative and elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs.

"Sec. 703. (a) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000 for each fiscal year, beginning June 30, 1968, and thereafter for such additional sums as may be necessary to meet the special educational needs of those students described in this title and for the purpose of providing financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative and elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet the special educational needs of those students described in this title and for the purpose of providing financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative and elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs.

"Sec. 704. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 705, for:

(1) special bilingual and bicultural educational research, and demonstration projects; and

(2) pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans and programs so developed; and

(3) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such programs and necessary equipment, designed to meet the special educational needs of students who speak English as a second language through activities such as--

"Sec. 705. Grants under this title must be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 704, for:

(1) intensive preschool, Headstart-type programs.
programs specifically designed to orient and prepare non-English-speaking welfare recipients, and other persons in the community, to make better use of the English language, to provide them with the knowledge and skill which will enable them to make a smooth transition from their home or regular place of business, to higher levels of employment, and to have a better understanding of their rights and responsibilities as good citizens; and (3) programs designed to attract and retain as teachers promising individuals of non-English-speaking or nationality background; (4) efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home; and (5) other activities which meet the purposes of this title.

"APPLICABLES FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL"

"SEC. 706. (a) A grant under this title may be made to a local educational agency or to an organization to assist the Commissioner at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary, to accomplish— (1) provide for the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant; (2) set forth a program for carrying out the purposes set forth in paragraphs (a) or paragraph (b) of section 704 and provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such program; (3) set forth a program of such size, scope, and design as will make a substantial step toward achieving the purposes of this title; (4) set forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 704, and in no case sup­plement funds in a manner which will reduce the Federal share of the total of all funds made available by the applicant under this title; and (5) provide for such fiscal control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to prevent the embezzlement and misappropriation of Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and (6) provide for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title and to de­termine the extent to which funds provided under this title have been effective in improving the conditions of the opportunity of education for persons in the area served, and for keeping such records and for recording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find neces­sary for the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioner only if— (1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a); (2) the information in the application is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of assistance among the various States, for which criteria shall be developed by him on the basis of a consideration of (A) the geographic distribution of non-English-speak­ing students within the State, (B) the relative ability of the program described in paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of section 704, and their financial ability to provide those services and activities, and (C) the relative ability of particular local educa­tional agencies within the State to provide those services and activities; (3) the Commissioner has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations. (c) The Commissioner shall, in making a determination of the amount of any grant under this title, consider— (1) the amount to be made available under section 704(b) and (2) any other information that the Commissioner may require.

"PAYMENTS"

"SEC. 706. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 708 the Commiss­ioner shall make grants in such amounts as he determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, and the Commissioner shall pay to each applicant in that State an amount equal to the sum in the amount equal to the sum which the Commissioner determines is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the purposes set forth therein. (b) Payments under this title may be made in installments.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE"

"SEC. 707. (a) The Commissioner shall es­tablish in the Office of Education an Ad­visory Committee on Increasing Educational Opportunity for Bilingual Children, consist­ing of the Commissioner, who shall be Chair­man and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Com­missioner with the approval of the Secretary. At least four of the members of the Advisory Committee shall be educators experienced in dealing with the educational problems of persons in the Government.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner on the following subjects: (1) the qualifications of persons who speak English as a second language. In addition, at least four of the members of the Advisory Committee shall be of non-English-speaking or national­ity background. (2) The Advisory Committee may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Advisory Committee. (c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be required to accept compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular place of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, includ­ing per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 706 of title 40 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. (d) The Commissioner shall make grants in such amounts as he determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, and the Commissioner shall pay to each applicant in that State an amount equal to the sum in the amount equal to the sum which the Commissioner determines is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the purposes set forth therein. (e) The Commissioner shall, in making a determination of the amount of any grant under this title, consider— (1) the amount to be made available under section 704(b) and (2) any other information that the Commissioner may require.

"PAYMENTS"

"SEC. 706. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 708 the Commiss­ioner shall make grants in such amounts as he determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, and the Commissioner shall pay to each applicant in that State an amount equal to the sum in the amount equal to the sum which the Commissioner determines is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the purposes set forth therein. (b) Payments under this title may be made in installments.

"AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958"

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 601(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after the word "or" the word "and" and the word "other" and the word "community" and the word "municipal" and the word "special" and the word "grant" and the word "or" and the word "to each" and the word "and" and the word "in" and the word "for" to each municipality in which such programs are intended to be carried out. (b) Section 303 of such Act is amended by striking out "$18,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,000,000." (c) The term "special grant" in section 305 of such Act is amended by inserting after the second sentence a new sentence as follows: "Any such grant or contract may include a curriculum designed to provide special training of teachers of bilingual children."

"AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958"

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 1101 of the National De­fense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "and each of the two succeed­ing fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "and the succeeding fiscal year, and $51,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968." (b) Section 4 is further amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (4) of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or", and by inserting after such clause a new clause as follows: "(5) the Commissioner is preparing to engage in special educational programs for bilingual students."

"AMENDMENTS TO COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT"

"SEC. 5. subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Cooperative Research Act are each amended by inserting "and title VII" after "section 508(a)(4)."

Community Leadership Conference on World Problems II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. As previously reported, on February 22 I had the honor of cosponsoring, with New York University, a community leadership conference on world problems, specifically dealing
with such areas as Vietnam and southeast Asia, the Middle East, Rhodesia, and southern Africa, and Europe.

The following is a summary of the remarks made by speakers on the problem of Rhodesia and southern Africa. The panel was moderated by Prof. Conor Cruise O'Brien, of New York University, and consisted of such distinguished authorities as Chief Debo, Nigeria; Lord Caradon, a member of the U.N., Lord Caradon, the British Ambassador to the U.N., Mr. Christopher Phillips, president of the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce and a former U.S. representative on the U.N. Economic and Social Council, and Dr. Tilden J. LeMelle, assistant professor of political science at Fordham University.

**Panel on Rhodesia and Southern Africa**

The moderator of this panel was Prof. Conor Cruise O'Brien, of New York University, well-known expert on Africa.

The first speaker was Chief Adebo, permanent representative of Nigeria to the United Nations.

Chief Adebo said that the purpose of this panel is to explore the problems of southern Africa, and the possible solutions to them. The Union of South Africa and Rhodesia, he said, presented the most serious problem areas. The question is not one of destroying the white people in South Africa or of making Africa completely black, but of creating countries where all people, white and black, could live in peace with complete equality of the area need to be given the right of self-determination.

South Africa is the greatest problem, Chief Adebo said. Although 62% per cent of its population are black, the Government does not recognize them as people, but merely as objects of exploitation. They are segregated politically, socially, and economically.

Rhodesia, which at one time had the possibility of being a free country where all the inhabitants would be able to work and live together as equals, is now becoming a slave country where the majority of people will be held in slavery. The peoples of the area need to decide whether the right of self-determination should be given to the people of Rhodesia. The test should not be whether other African countries are having problems with independence after long years of servitude. It is true that, because the Africans in Rhodesia have not been given any experience in self-government, a democratically constituted Rhodesia shall run into difficulties, but people are entitled to make their own mistakes in learning to govern themselves. The African countries could be given an opportunity to learn from others to minimize their errors.

Unfortunately, Great Britain's reaction to Rhodesia's acts has been to issue declarations and to support sanctions. If words alone could dispose of apartheid or colonialism, there would not be apartheid in Africa. People in Africa, apart from apartheid or colonialism, so many have been the words of protest. However, words are not enough and the sanctions which were imposed, both voluntary and mandatory, have been ignored by various countries.

The problem of South-West Africa, Chief Adebo further said, is separate in some way from the problem of South Africa. South-West Africa does not belong to South Africa, but it is a trust territory having international status. The people are refused the right of self-determination by South Africa. If a country which continues to administer the area nondemocratically even though the mandate has now been terminated. The International Court having refused to act on the question, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution taking away from South Africa the right to administer South-West Africa. Further U.N. action is being awaited.

Mozambique is also an area where the people are oppressed and denied the right of self-determination. Portugal claims that Mozambique is not a part of Africa but an extension of Portuguese territory which, in Africa, is by mistake by God. Of course, the Portuguese do not give the right of self-determination even to their own people in Portugal. Hopefully, someday this policy will change.

South Africa is the greatest problem, Chief Adebo said. Although 62% per cent of its population are black, the Government does not recognize them as people, but merely as objects of exploitation. They are segregated politically, socially, and economically.

Rhodesia, which at one time had the possibility of being a free country where all the inhabitants would be able to work and live together as equals, is now becoming a slave country where the majority of people will be held in slavery. The peoples of the area need to decide whether the right of self-determination should be given to the people of Rhodesia. The test should not be whether other African countries are having problems with independence after long years of servitude. It is true that, because the Africans in Rhodesia have not been given any experience in self-government, a democratically constituted Rhodesia shall run into difficulties, but people are entitled to make their own mistakes in learning to govern themselves. The African countries could be given an opportunity to learn from others to minimize their errors.

Unfortunately, Great Britain's reaction to Rhodesia's acts has been to issue declarations and to support sanctions. If words alone could dispose of apartheid or colonialism, there would not be apartheid in Africa. People in Africa, apart from apartheid or colonialism, so many have been the words of protest. However, words are not enough and the sanctions which were imposed, both voluntary and mandatory, have been ignored by various countries.

The problem of South-West Africa, Chief Adebo further said, is separate in some way from the problem of South Africa. South-West Africa does not belong to South Africa, but it is a trust territory having international status. The people are refused the right of self-determination by South Africa. If a country which continues to administer the area nondemocratically even though the mandate has now been terminated. The International Court having refused to act on the question, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution taking away from South Africa the right to administer South-West Africa. Further U.N. action is being awaited.

Mozambique is also an area where the people are oppressed and denied the right of self-determination. Portugal claims that Mozambique is not a part of Africa but an extension of Portuguese territory which, in Africa, is by mistake by God. Of course, the Portuguese do not give the right of self-determination even to their own people in Portugal. Hopefully, someday this policy will change.

Rhodesia is at the top of the list, Lord Caradon said. There Great Britain has a special and acknowledged responsibility, deriving from the fact that Rhodesia is a British colony. But we have to remember that there has not been any direct British administration in Rhodesia. Any British action in Rhodesia, a country which has been administered by the white people of Rhodesia, as it is still so administered today.

It would have been easy for the United Kingdom to have handed over Rhodesia, 1965, when Rhodesia illegally declared its independence, "We will take no action." But the United Kingdom took positive steps first to block oil delivery through BEIRA and then to cut off all British trade with Rhodesia, suffering economic loss as a result.

The contribution of the United Kingdom has been greater than that of any other country. However, it has so far been ineffective. The United Kingdom asked the U.N. to have its member countries refuse to accept exports from Rhodesia. As a result, such exports have fallen substantially.

No country can continue to survive when it suffers impairment of its exports to the serious extent of their dropping by more than half. We miscalculated in that we thought that the United Kingdom would be able to last so long. But the United Kingdom is determined to continue these economic measures and it has now declared that it will not grant independence to Rhodesia except under majority rule.

There is criticism that the United Kingdom should have used force by invading with an army brought in by air. Such an air invasion has never been attempted. It is easier to start a war than to stop it. The British policy has been to solve the problem without bloodshed.

There is another criticism, Lord Caradon said, that the United Kingdom has not been prepared to impose sanctions against South Africa. But who will provide the ships and meet the enormous cost of a blockade? Who will suffer the losses? The United Kingdom would suffer most, since it would be impossible to maintain its balance of payments. The new countries could not possibly compensate for such a loss.
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to go about it. Great Britain has made its position known and firmly intends to carry out the policy it has stated.

Professor LeMelle commented that Lord Caradon's use of the word "invasion." Since Rhodesia is part of the British Dominions, the movement of troops does not constitute an invasion. Certainly, when the British moved heavy military and security forces around his own country of Ireland, they did not call it an invasion.

Lord Caradon replied that he meant invasion in the sense that it would mean moving in troops against resistance. The Irish question would be left till another time.

The next speaker was Mr. Christopher Phillips, president of the U.S. council of the International Chamber of Commerce, and former U.S. representative on the U.N. Economic and Social Council.

Mr. Phillips commented that there is no easy panacea to the complex problem of apartheid in South Africa. The question is, what are there available to influence South African policies?

U.N. resolutions have proven to be quite ineffective. Economic sanctions, even if enforced by all the Western nations, would not moderate the Government's policies and might well lead to even greater xenophobia. The use of force is impractical. Isolation of South Africa tends to increase resistance to change and to result in greater fears of the outside world.

What we should do is to try to bring South Africa back into contact with the rest of the world. Mr. Phillips said he would not produce any quick changes, an improvement in relations with other African governments might begin to create a better climate in which change is more possible. Recently, there have been one or two straws in the wind indicating slightly more flexibility: relaxation of apartheid in certain international sport contests; the reception by the Government of the heads of black African states for the first time.

The existence of new, independent black African states within southern Africa, economically beholden to South Africa, may have the effect of mitigating South Africa's pathological fear of black Africa. These may seem like small and inadequate changes when viewed against the repressive actions of the South African Government. But the business of having to maintain decent relations with independent black states, of having to meet and deal with their leaders, could in time bring about adjustments in thinking and attitudes.

They could become the basis for a resort to tense relations, to improve understanding, and to reduce fears. Of course it would be a slow process at best. Certain economic factors within South Africa might also chip away at apartheid. Labor shortages, not merely of menial labor, but of technical, administrative, and professional personnel, will bring pressure to white South Africa and will tend to increase de facto integration. Black Africans will have to fill the jobs and so create a more integrated society. It may not work, or it may work too slowly, but what better course is there now available to cope with this complex and dangerous problem?

The last speaker was Dr. Tilden J. LeFevre, professor of political science at Fordham University.

Professor LeFevre stated that Rhodesia, South Africa, Angola, and Mozambique are all part of the same problem. The apartheid system in South Africa is an expression of the indigenous African peoples for democratic majority rule and the intransigent determination of the minority to continue arbitrary minority rule. The problem has both a political and racial dimension, both of which must be solved.

The political aspect is that a relatively small minority arbitrarily makes all the decisions and has absolute control over the affairs of the nation. The majority is systematically excluded from even minimal participation in decision-making. The majority has risen in passive and active rebellion against this intolerable situation. The resistance began peacefully, but only hardened the minority's insensitivity. The majority was threatened with death or imprisonment, and forced to choose between quiescence or rebellion. They chose the course of rebellion, so that today violence has become the official policy of both the ruling minorities and the oppressed majority. The use of violence is a threat to international peace.

The racial aspect of the problem, Professor LeMelle said, is based on the minorities' assumption of white racial superiority. In South Africa, Rhodesia, and South-West Africa, the racial policy is expressed by forced separation of the races; in the Portuguese colonies by forced assimilation. The Portuguese have given the "inferior" black man the benefit of the doubt; that is, he can be lifted up to the white's level.

To both types of racist policies, the Africans have reacted to assert the black man's essential worth and equality.

The step is the same, is an intimately intertwined political-racial one, the socioeconomic aspects being functions of the other two. Even the political problem can also be viewed as a step-by-step approach. Rhodesia, South-West Africa has the racial policy by forced separation of the races; in the Portuguese colonies by forced assimilation. The Portuguese have given the "inferior" black man the benefit of the doubt; that is, he can be lifted up to the white's level.
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HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. John E. Huss, Charleston Heights Baptist Church, Charleston Heights, S.C., offered the following prayer:

It is with sincerity, Father in Heaven, that we earnestly pray for peace to come to our troubled world.

We pray for our enemies, even as Jesus taught us to pray. Enable them to realize that we merely seek justice and that we shall never lack in resoluteness.

Endow our President with wisdom. Give him strength to make the determination to seek the right. Help them to use their high position of responsibility in sacrificial and noble service to our country.

And, Father, help us to humble ourselves, and to seek Thy face, and to turn from the ways of wickedness. In turn, fulfill Thy promise to "hear from heaven, forgive our sin and heal our land." We ask in His dear name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 286) entitled "An act to permanently, duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962."

LET US BRING CONGRESS UP TO DATE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, legislative reorganization has been the topic of frequent discussion and debate over the years in this Chamber and, I hope, at long last in the stage of legislative action. The streamlining of Congress is a major issue of concern today throughout the Nation. We are living in the space age yet operating with horse-and-buggy methods. The sixties demand that we take vital and constructive action in this area.

I have prepared testimony for the House Rules Committee on the proposal for legislative reorganization. I am including in the Record today my suggestions covering what I consider a unique change in present practice which I urge the Members to read and study carefully as a basis for serious thought on how we can make representative government in this changing modern world not only more efficient but effective.

My suggestions, I admit, are weighed on the side of the constituent, yet I firmly believe that they would also prove to be ultimately to the best interests of the health and well-being of the Members.

THE LATE HONORABLE KONRAD ADENAUER

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I turned on my TV set and found myself unexpectedly at the funeral of Konrad Adenauer.

It has been a great many years since I have been so deeply moved.

I have had the privilege of meeting him. Since I speak a little German, we had a happy little conference. His handshake was wonderful. His eyes were beyond anything one could imagine.

Yesterday during the mass and during the long procession evidencing such heartfelt respect and such deep feeling by those soldiers of the new Germany I was carried away. I was chairman of the committee, but I did not care. The committee was not so important just then, though I did get there late.

But what that man in his 91 years has given to this is almost unbelievable, raising Germany, as he did, from the depths to a place of respect among the nations. I said a little word in this Chamber about his death, but I could not restrain myself from speaking as I have this morning. I hope some of the rest of you heard and saw that satellite presentation. I hope you are reading the papers, but most of all I hope that as long as you live you will remember that Konrad Adenauer was a man of greatness of soul. We know that never the spirit was born, the spirit shall cease to be never; birthless, deathless, and changeless remaineth the spirit forever. It is my earnest hope, indeed my prayer, that some of his humble magnificence may have been left among us and that we, sometimes arrogant, Americans, may find it in our hearts.

FAVOR KEEPING OUR SPACE TECHNOLOGY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to NASA Administrator James Webb's calls for cooperative efforts between the United States and Russia in manned exploration of space. Mr. Webb is overlooking the fact that the law allows only Congress the right to make such a decision, not the administration, and not any ministerial space administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the loss of the life of the Russian cosmonaut--as I joined Americans in sorrow over the loss of our three astronauts. But I do not believe we can allow emotion to overlook the fact that Russia is our real enemy in Vietnam where far more American lives are being lost than in either country's space efforts. It is Russia that says they should join with Communist China to "defeat the United States in Vietnam."

It is Russia that provides the missiles that attack our fighters and bombers. And, it is Russia that supplies the arms and ammunition in increasing quantities, that are used daily against our American servicemen.

In the space effort it has been the United States that has developed the technology for space exploration, and some of that information is for defensive military purposes. Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept any proposal for sharing that outer space information with a country that is so openly trying to defeat us on the ground.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names: