United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

For the kingdom is the Lord's: and He is the governor among the nations. Psalm 22: 28.

Eternal Father of our spirits, we pause in Thy presence once again to listen to Thy voice and to receive the ministry of Thy grace. Thou art ever calling us to work with Thee to keep justice and freedom and good will alive in our world. May Thy spirit be so real to us that we shall continue to erect in this land a temple of understanding and love to which all nations may turn for healing and for a helping hand.

We pray that all the peoples of this planet may be open to the leadership of Thy spirit. We pray for the President of our United States, for our Speaker, and for these Members of Congress who represent our people on Capitol Hill. Guide them and sustain them and bless them with courage and faith.

We pray for our men and women in Vietnam. For their loyalty to duty, for their response to the call of our country, for their courage in the midst of danger and for their willingness to give themselves we thank Thee. We pray that the offering of their lives may not be in vain. Out of their suffering and sacrifice may there come a better nation and a better world for all mankind. 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. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The message also 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 House to the bill (S. 303) entitled "An act to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND, COMMANDER, U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort our distinguished visitor into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS; the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER; the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RIVERS; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS; and the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. WATSON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort on the part of the Senate the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL; the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. HOLLINGS; the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER; the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. YOUNG; the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH; and the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. THURMOND.

The Doorkeeper announced the Governors of the several States of the Union.

The Governors of the several States of the Union entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Commander, the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure and high privilege of presenting to you Gen. William C. Westmoreland, U.S. Army, Commander, the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

ADDRESS BY GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND, U.S. ARMY, COMMANDER, U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

General WESTMORELAND. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress:

I am deeply honored to address the Congress of the United States. I stand in the shadow of military men who have been here before me, but none of them could have had more pride than mine in representing the gallant American fighting men in Vietnam today.

These servicemen and women are sensitive to their mission and, as the record shows, they are unbeatable in carrying out that mission.

As their commander in the field, I have seen many of you in Vietnam during the last 3 years. Without exception, you gentleman have shown interest, responsibility, and concern for the commitment which we have undertaken, and for the welfare of our troops.

The Republic of Vietnam is fighting to build a strong nation while aggression—organized, directed, and supported from without—attempts to engulf it. This is an unprecedented challenge for a small nation. But it is a challenge which will confront any nation that is marked as a target for the Communist stratagem called war of national liberation.

I can assure you here and now that militarily this strategy will not succeed in Vietnam.

In 3 years of close study and daily observation, I have seen no evidence that this is an internal insurrection. I have seen much evidence to the contrary—documented by the enemy himself—that it is aggression from the north.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Since 1954, when the Geneva accord was signed, the North Vietnamese have been sending leaders, political organizers, technicians, and experts on terrorism and sabotage into the south. Clandestinely directed from the north, they and their Hanoi-trained southern counterparts have controlled the entire course of the attack against the Republic of South Vietnam.

More than 2 years ago, North Vietnamese divisions began to arrive, and the control was no longer clandestine. Since then, the buildup of enemy forces has been formidable. During the last 22 months, the number of enemy combat battalions in the south has increased significantly, and nearly half of them are now North Vietnamese. In the same period, overall enemy strength has nearly doubled in spite of large combat losses.

Enemy commanders are skilled professionals. In general, their troops are indoctrinated, well trained, aggressive, and under tight control.

The enemy's logistic system is primitive in many ways. Forced to transport most of his supplies down through southeastern Laos, he uses a combination of trucks, bicycles, men, and animals. But he does this with surprising effectiveness. In South Vietnam, the system is also well organized. Many of the caches we have found and destroyed have been stocked with enough supplies and equipment to support months of future operations.

The enemy emphasizes what he calls strategic mobility, although his tactics are based on foot mobility, relatively modest firepower, and often primitive means of communication. However, his operational planning is meticulous. He gathers intelligence, makes careful plans, assigns specific objectives in detail, and then rehearses the plan of attack until he believes it cannot fail.

Local peasants are forced to provide food, shelter, and porters to carry supplies and equipment for combat units, and to evacuate the dead and wounded from the battlefield.

When all is ready he moves his large military formations covertly from concealed bases into the operational area. His intent is to launch a surprise attack designed to achieve quick victory by shock action. This tactic has failed because of our courageous men, our firepower, and our spoiling attacks.

For months now we have been successful in destroying a number of main force units. We will continue to seek out the enemy, catch him off guard, and punish him at every opportunity.

But success against his main forces alone is not enough to insure a swift and decisive end to the conflict.

This enemy also uses terror—murder, mutilation, abduction, and the deliberate shelling of innocent men, women, and children—to exercise control through fear. Terror, which he employs daily, is much harder to counter than his best conventional moves.

A typical day in Vietnam was last Sunday. Terrorists near Saigon assassinated a 39-year-old village chief. The same day in the delta they kidnaped 26 civilians, assisting in arranging for local elections. The next day the Vietcong attacked a group of Revolutionary Development workers, killing one and wounding 12 with grenades and machinegun fire in one area, and in another they opened fire on a small civilian bus and killed three and wounded four of its passengers. These are cases of calculated enemy attack on civilians to extend by fear that which they cannot gain by persuasion. One hears little of this brutality here at home. What we do hear about is our own aerial bombing against North Vietnam, and I would like to address this for a moment.

For years the enemy has been blowing bridges, interrupting traffic, cutting roads, sabotaging power stations, blocking canals, and attacking airfields in the south, and he continues to do so. This is a daily occurrence. Bombing in the north has been centered on precisely these same kinds of targets and for the same military purposes—to reduce the supply, interdict the movement, and impair the effectiveness of enemy military forces.

Within his capabilities the enemy in Vietnam is waging total war all day—every day—everywhere. He believes in force, and his intensification of violence is limited only by his resources and not by any moral inhibitions.

To us a cease-fire means "cease-fire." Our observance of past truces has been open and subject to public scrutiny. The enemy permits no such observation in the north or the south. He traditionally has exploited cease-fire periods when the bombing has been suspended to increase his resupply and infiltration activities. This is the enemy—this has been the challenge. The only strategy which can defeat such an organization is one of unrelenting, but discriminating military, political, and psychological pressure on his whole structure—at all levels. From his capabilities and his recent activities, I believe the enemy's probable course of action in the months ahead can be forecast.

In order to carry out his battlefield doctrine I foresee that he will continue his buildup across the demilitarized zone and through Laos, and he will attack when he believes he has a chance for a dramatic blow. He will not return exclusively to guerrilla warfare, although he certainly will continue to intensify his guerrilla activities.

I expect the enemy to continue to increase his mortar, artillery, rocket, and recoilless rifle attacks on our installations. At the same time, he will step up his attacks on villages and district towns to intimidate the people, and to thwart the democratic processes now underway in South Vietnam.

Given the nature of the enemy, it seems to me that the strategy that we are following at this time is the proper one, and that it is producing results. While he obviously is far from quitting, there are signs that his morale and his military structure are beginning to deteriorate. The rate of decline will be in proportion to the pressure directed against him.

Faced with this prospect, it is gratifying to note that our forces and those of the other free world allies have grown in strength and profited from experience. In this connection it is well to remember that Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, and the Philippines all have military forces fighting and working with the Vietnamese and Americans in Vietnam.

It is also worthy of note that 30 other nations are providing noncombat support. All of these free world forces are doing well, whether in combat or in support of nation-building. Their exploits deserve recognition, not only for their direct contribution to the overall effort, but for their symbolic reminder that the whole of free Asia opposes Communist expansion.

As the focal point of this struggle in Asia, the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces merit special mention.

Before 1954 South Vietnam had no armed forces in being. And there was no tradition of military leadership. The requirement to build an army, navy, and air force in the face of enemy attack and subversion seems, in retrospect, an almost impossible task. Yet, in their determination to resist the Communists, the Vietnamese have built an effective military force.

What I see now in Vietnam is a military force that performs with growing professional skill. During the last 6 months, Vietnamese troops have scored repeated successes against some of the best Vietcong and North Vietnamese army units. Perhaps more important in this total effort is the support given by the Vietnamese military to the Government's nation-building, or revolutionary development program. Nearly half of the Vietnamese Army is now engaged in, or training for, this vital program which will improve the lot of the people. This is a difficult role for a military force. Vietnamese soldiers are not only defending villages and hamlets, but with spirit and energy, they have turned to the task of nation-building as well.

In 1952 there were some who doubted that the Republic of Korea would ever have a first-rate fighting force. I wish those doubters could see the Korean units in Vietnam today. They rank with the best fighters and the most effective civic action workers in Vietnam. When I hear criticism of the Vietnamese Armed Forces, I am reminded of that example.

As you know, we are fighting a war with no front lines, since the enemy hides among the people, in the jungles and mountains, and uses covertly border areas of neutral countries. One cannot measure progress by lines on a map. We therefore have to use other means to chart progress. Several indices clearly point to steady and encouraging success. As an example:

Two years ago the Republic of Vietnam had fewer than 30 combat-ready battalions. Today it has 154.

Then there were three jet-capable runways in South Vietnam. Today there are 14.

In April 1965 there were 15 airfields that could take C–130 transport aircraft. We now have 89.

Then there was one deep-water port for sea-going ships. Now there are seven.

In 1965 ships had to wait weeks to unload. We now turn them around in as little as one week.

A year ago there was no long-haul

highway transport. Last month alone 161,000 tons of supplies were moved over the highways. During the last year the mileage of essential highways open for use has risen from about 52 percent to 80 percent.

During 1965 the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces and its allies killed 36,000 of the enemy at a cost of approximately 12,000 friendly killed and 90 percent of these were Vietnamese. During recent months this 3-to-1 ratio in favor of the allies has risen significantly and in some weeks has been as high as 10- or 20-to-1 in our favor.

In 1965, 11,000 Vietcong defected to the side of the Government. In 1966 there were 20,000. In the first 3 months of 1967 there have been nearly 11,000 ralliers, a figure that equals all of 1965 and more than half of all of 1966.

In 1964 and in the first part of 1965 the ratio of weapons captured was 2-to-1 in favor of the enemy. The ratio for 1966 and the first 3 months of this year is 2½-to-1 in favor of the Republic of Vietnam and its allies.

Our President and the representatives of the people of the United States, the Congress, have seen to it that our troops in the field have been well supplied and equipped. When a field commander does not have to look over his shoulder to see whether he is being supported, he can concentrate on the battlefield with much greater assurance of success. I speak for my troops, when I say we are thankful for this unprecedented material support.

As I have said before, in evaluating the enemy strategy it is evident to me that he believes our Achilles' heel is our resolve. Your continued strong support is vital to the success of our mission.

Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coastguardsmen in Vietnam are the finest ever fielded by our Nation. In this assessment I include Americans of all races, creeds, and colors. Your servicemen in Vietnam are intelligent, skilled, dedicated, and courageous. In these qualities no unit, no service, no ethnic group, and no national origin can claim priority.

These men understand the conflict and their complex roles as fighters and as builders. They believe in what they are doing. They are determined to provide the shield of security behind which the Republic of Vietnam can develop and prosper for its own sake and for the future and freedom of all Southeast Asia.

Backed at home by resolve, confidence, patience, determination, and continued support, we will prevail in Vietnam over the Communist aggressor.

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress—I am sure you are as proud to represent our men serving their country and the free world in Vietnam as I am to command them.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m., Gen. William C. Westmoreland, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Governors of the several States of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS TO BE PRINTED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PROPOSED 45-DAY EXTENSION OF THE NO-RAIL-STRIKE PERIOD—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

APRIL 28, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: A rail strike would bring industrial tragedy to America. It would disrupt our commerce, cripple our industries, create shortages of food. It would adversely affect the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country.

Such a strike would be a gross disservice to our valiant men in Vietnam, who are making sacrifices greater than any of us are called upon to make.

The public interest demands that every practical step be taken to avert a strike, now scheduled for 12:01 a.m. May 3.

Since my return from Germany on late Wednesday I have consulted with the bipartisan leadership of the Congress, and with ranking members of the Senate Labor and House Commerce Committees. They join with me today in urging that the Congress extend the no-strike period for an additional 45 days. I am submitting herewith a joint resolution to accomplish this.

This additional period will give the Congress time prudently to consider legislation which will protect the public interest in this case.

I shall recommend such legislation to the Congress within a few days.

An additional 45-day period may enable the parties to press forward with their search for accord and reach an agreement themselves.

I hope and believe that, in the interest of all Americans, the Congress will want to act promptly.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

Mr. RIVERS. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have the great honor and privilege to know Gen. William C. Westmoreland can attest to his integrity, his professional skill, his sincerity, his concern for the welfare of the men he commands, and his dedication to our Nation.

And the other day in New York City, General Westmoreland demonstrated his courage to speak his mind in such a way that no one could misunderstand how he feels with respect to those who wittingly, or unwittingly, give aid and encouragement to an enemy who is ruthlessly killing American boys.

General Westmoreland has pointed out that more than 53,000 South Vietnamese civilians have been kidnaped or killed by the Vietcong.

Will those who decry our efforts in Vietnam raise their voices in protest against this slaughter of civilians by the Communists?

It is amazing to me that General Westmoreland can report to the American people, as he has, that the morale of our troops in Vietnam is the highest that he has ever seen in his military career.

My heart swells with pride when I think that young American boys in the heat and the filth of Vietnam can appreciate why they are there, suffering as they are, and still be tolerant of those in America who would wittingly, or unwittingly, betray them.

Why those boys are not more bitter toward the do-gooders and the critics, who find fault with our defense of democracy, is beyond me.

When the history of this war is finally written, men such as those who have served in Vietnam, and officers such as Gen. William C. Westmoreland, will stand out as the finest that America has to offer. History will remember them for their accomplishments. I hope, but doubt, that history will be kind enough to forget their detractors.

THE STORY OF A FINE YOUNG MAN WHO WAS KILLED IN VIETNAM ON MARCH 21, 1967, WHILE IN THE SERVICE OF HIS COUNTRY

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the story of a fine young man who was killed in Vietnam on March 21, 1967, while in the service of his country.

Sp4c R. Michael Cartwright had served 9 months of his enlistment in Vietnam when he was fatally wounded by an enemy grenade fragment while serving as a machinegunner paratrooper with the 1st Cavalry Division.

Known more widely as "Mike," he was a graduate of Randolph High School in 1964, and a member of the school's championship basketball team. He later starred in the Legion and CYO teams in Randolph. After attending the University of Massachusetts for 1 year, he enlisted in the Army.

Mike had visited my congressional office, and left an unforgettable impression with myself and all of my staff. The sincerity, devotion, and love for his country which he demonstrated should provide a model and inspiration for each of us, and renew our confidence in the less vocal but more patriotic sector of this Nation's youth which is its hope for the future.

We have listened here today to a report from our very able military leader in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland. The conviction and commitment cherished by him and all of our brave men there is upheld by the principle of "freedom" which has guided this Nation through generations of challenge. The significance of this tradition is expressed in a few lines written many years ago by Elizabeth Barrett Browning:

Each of the heroes around us has fought for his land and line,
But *thou* hast fought for a stranger, in hate of a wrong not thine.
Happy are all free peoples too strong to be dispossessed;
But blessed are those among nations who dare to be strong for the rest!

Young Michael Cartwright was a proud and worthy exponent of this tradition, and was held in high personal esteem by his comrades-at-arms. One of the most meaningful testaments which could be paid him is the following letter written to Mike's parents Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Cartwright by his squad leader, Sgt. John S. Scurlock:

Mr. and Mrs. RALPH CARTWRIGHT: I don't know if your son Robert had ever written to you about me but I was his squad leader and friend. My name is Sgt. John L. Scurlock.

I had only known Robert six months but here in Viet-Nam it seems like many years, we have fought in the same fox holes, slept under the same shelter and suffered and struggled through the days.

These are the hardships that brought us closer together, but during all of these times Robert never lost his sense of humor, even up to the last moments when he took his last breath of life.

I am sure you would like to know how it all happened. We were given a mission at 10: a.m. the 21 of March to move off our hill to search and secure a village in the Bhin Phin Providence, as we moved into the village we were ambushed and receiving automatic fire from three sides, Robert spotted where one of the enemy positions was and took it under fire with his machine gun, while doing this he exposed himself to the other enemy position where he was shot from. Mr. & Mrs. Cartwright we did everything we could that day to break out of that encirclement to get Robert to medical attention but we were just too outnumbered.

His last words were, "I just don't think I'm going to make it guys." He said this with the casualness of a person just breaking a dinner date.

I have some things that belong to him and I know you would want them.

Sincerely,

Sgt. JOHN S. SCURLOCK.

P.S.—I only want you all to know we mourn with you at the loss of Robert.

In closing, I would like to include an article from the Holbrook Times of March 30, 1967. I believe that it conveys the feelings of grief and felt by the whole town at the loss of one so well known and loved among them. My staff and I share their grief, and extend our deepest sympathies to the family, I know that I speak for every Member of the Congress in offering our prayers and profound gratitude to this fine young man, Robert Michael Cartwright, who gave to his fellow man his "last full measure of devotion":

SP.4C. R. MICHAEL CARTWRIGHT IS KILLED IN COMBAT WHILE SERVING IN VIETNAM

Spec. 4 Robert Michael Cartwright, 21, son of former State Rep. and Mrs. Ralph W. Cartwright, Jr., of 30 Nelson Dr., was killed Tuesday, March 21, in combat in Vietnam, his family was notified last Thursday. His father is also widely known as a funeral director with Cartwright Funeral Homes in Randolph and Holbrook.

The young soldier was a member of the First Cavalry Division.

Spec. Cartwright, more widely known as "Mike" was a graduate of Randolph High School, Class of 1964, and a member of the school's championship baseball team. He also played on St. Mary's CYO and Legion Post teams in Randolph. He attended the University of Massachusetts for a year before enlisting in the Army and requesting duty in Vietnam.

The soldier, having been recently released from an Army hospital in Vietnam and returned to duty, had only three months remaining of his duty there, having already served in Vietnam for nine months.

Specialist Cartwright was with Company B., First Battalion, Eighth Cavalry, First Cavalry Division. He was fatally wounded by an enemy grenade fragment while fighting as a machine gun paratrooper.

Town officials have directed that flags on all town property be flown at half staff.

Surviving, besides his parents, Ralph W., Jr., and Grace (Giguere) Cartwright, is a sister, Patricia, 15, a student at Thayer Academy; his paternal grandparents Mr. and Mrs. Ralph W. Cartwright, Sr., of 419 North Main St., Randolph, and his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Rose Giguere of Connecticut.

A military funeral was held Wednesday from the Cartwright Funeral Home, 419 North Main street, followed by a Solemn High Mass of Requiem in St. Mary's Church at 10 a.m. Interment was in Central Cemetery.

St. Mary's Church was filled to capacity with many standing during the funeral service with friends, relatives, members of St. Mary's CYO, plus town officials and many state dignitaries. Three priests were at the Communion rail for the many who received Communion and offered their prayers for the deceased.

Rev. D. Vincent McCarthy, a former curate at St. Mary's Church, officiated at the services assisted by Rev. James A. Cosgrove and Rev. Eugene V. Dunn, curates of St. Mary's Church.

All branches of the Armed Forces were present and an Honor Guard of the Green Berets attended.

Following the Mass, Fr. McCarthy addressed those in attendance in paying tribute to the young serviceman in which he said: "Mike paid the supreme sacrifice for us, therefore we here should not be sorrowful, but rejoice because this boy has given his life for us by defending his country and people in Vietnam."

LETTER ON H.R. 4467

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from Mr. Ralph M. Besse, chairman of the Cleveland Inner City Action Committee, concerning my bill, H.R. 4467. Under leave granted, I insert it in the RECORD:

CLEVELAND INNER CITY
ACTION COMMITTEE,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 29, 1967.

Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have recently received copies of H.R. 4467, introduced by you in the House of Representatives, which would amend the Social Security Act to permit a state agency to disregard up to $75 per month of earned income for each dependent child, but not more than a total of $225 per month.

We believe this is a much needed piece of legislation, directed at one of the key problems in the present welfare structure. If passed, it will not only help ease the poverty burden in many families, but will also do much to motivate recipients of public aid to move from welfare rolls onto tax rolls.

This Committee, in a forthcoming report to the public on welfare problem areas in Greater Cleveland, is advocating such legislation. On behalf of the Committee members, I wish to commend you for this bill and assure you of our wholehearted support on it.

Sincerely,

RALPH M. BESSE,
Chairman.

REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR ROBERT MURPHY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at the Harvard Club Dinner last evening the Honorable Robert Murphy, one of the most distinguished of America's Ambassadors, who has had an extraordinarily broad experience during and since the war in the critical areas, and in dealing with the crucial issues of the world, delivered a most thoughtful and significant address in respect to our international position, entitled "Thoughts on our International Position."

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include this able address by

Ambassador Murphy following my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD, and I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues and my countrymen:

THOUGHTS ON OUR INTERNATIONAL POSITION

(Address by Robert Murphy, April 27, 1967)

When your chairman, and your president, Ned Kavanagh and John Grindle, in a carefree moment invited me to speak this evening, as I understand it, the decision, after eighty-five years, to invite the ladies, Radcliffe and non-Radcliffe, had not been taken. I suspect that had it been taken, they would have searched high and low for a very special speaker instead of contenting themselves with a casual. And in that event I could have attended this precedent shattering occasion and actually enjoyed all of it including this part of the evening.

I have long cherished admiration for the distinguished membership of this club. Years ago you let me stray into your midst and say a few words. For me that was pure flattery.

I am especially happy to be here with my dear friends Ambassador Takeuchi and his charming and talented lady. I doubt that any ambassadorial couple have endeared themselves to the American community more successfully than they. It was even so in Japan when I served there, not so many years ago. I like to believe that they have entered into the American mentality to an extraordinary degree. They symbolize so naturally the solid rapproachement between our peoples—a precious dividend of the recent unpleasantness. I want publicly to wish them every possible success and happiness in their future activities.

When I asked Col. Kavanagh whether I could talk about one or two features of our international situation, he said he regarded the suggestion as blatant provocation. If I insisted it would have to be at my own risk. The management would take no responsibility. Col. Kavanagh is both wise and prudent. At any rate it would be safest to take the Senate route—he said that is, stick to foreign relations, on the ground that age would rule me out of the House version, affairs.

With the variety and intensity of world pressures, it is difficult indeed both for our Government and for individual Americans to maintain a consistent position on many fast-moving issues. We are not like the lady who Sir Alec Douglas Home remembered the other day as appearing in a British court. The judge said to her, "You have just told me that you are fifty years old. But I notice from the record before me that you appeared in this court ten years ago, and then gave your age as exactly the same. How is that?" "Certainly, Your Honor," said the lady, "I'm not one of those people who says one thing today and another one tomorrow!"

Yet, maintenance of a position in the conduct of our foreign affairs is one of the greatest problems of American leadership. I know from personal experience in dealing with representatives of several countries that there was an assumption on their part that if the pressure were put on long enough, and hard enough, the United States position would alter. In the open society of ours conflict of opinion in the ebb and flow of public debate on every major issue is a daily experience. Most of us are convinced that this method is not only the essence of democracy, but that it avoids many an error and pitfall, leading usually to wise compromise and measured judgment. I share that view. Of course, we know that there is also a risk in it because of the present curious state of world affairs. If these conflicts and debates were held just among ourselves and represented only American thought and interest or even friendly outside interest, that would be healthy. The chilling factor of course, is the presence of hostile elements, who do not wish us well. There is no blinking the fact of their existence. The airwaves and the pages of publications around the world teem with attack and subversive criticism. Our open society easily lends itself to subtle effort from abroad to stimulate group action and manifestations in our own country designed to sway our people and our Governmen from positions which are taken to protect our national interest. These influences proceed from the conviction that if they stubbornly and tenaciously push the American side hard enough, and long enough, inevitably we yield. They are usually able to find minority groups and individuals who are swayed through emotional appeal or group interest to pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

We perhaps would have no complaint if this worked both ways and we could promote our national interests by employing similar methods in bloc countries. There we are largely barred by closed societies living under dictatorships. We have little means to counter by influencing the public opinion in those areas controlled and isolated as the people are by a ruthless power structure.

A classic current example is the case of Vietnam. Totalitarian leadership in the sweep of organizations controlled, directed or influenced on a worldwide basis are mobilized to use every channel to weaken the determination of our Government to pursue to a successful conclusion a policy on which it is embarked. U.S. Representatives traveling abroad are subjected to the identical type of verbal garbage and disorder whether in Florence, Berlin or London. This certainly suggests a central organization. The technique is the same, whether here or abroad. Thus in this country both subtle and open effort is made to persuade our students, our faculty members, some of the clergy, our business community and labor leaders to weaken our Government's stand and to defeat our aims. There is reason to suspect an organized effort to weaken and divide American domestic opinion and to promote a revolutionary force within the United States by employing minority groups, some of whom are unconscious of what it is all about. North Vietnamese and Vietcong hopes are encouraged by American minority and foreign forces opposing the present policy of our Government. Hanoi wrongly draws an analogy between the defeatism in 1954 of the weakened French colonial power after Dien Bien Phu, and the United States stand against aggression and for the independence of the Vietnamese people. Our opponents hope that the wise crack may be true that the test of statesmanship is the acceptance of the inevitable.

Perhaps we have not concentrated adequately in our public discussion on Vietnam on the question of what should be done about the Hanoi and Vietcong leadership—that is, the handful of men exercising absolute power who are responsible for the ruthless campaign of terror which in turn is the reason for American presence in Vietnam. Why are we there? In essence because this dangerous group of leaders are inflamed with an ambition to dominate all of southeast Asia, an ambition shared with Peking. American forces are there at the instance of Vietnamese who are determined to be independent, to resist domination, and their stand harmonizes with the national security interests of the United States in Eastern Asia. Long range American security in the Pacific is directly involved.

It is in our best interest to see the hostile Hanoi and Vietcong leadership, dependent as it is on mainland China and the Soviet Union, defeated. That leadership is the key to terrorism and guerrilla warfare.

Just a word about negotiations. Senator PERCY has just made a rather impulsive statement that our Government should make a more intensive effort to negotiate with Hanoi. I take the contrary view. We have shown too great eagerness to negotiate. We have talked peace and have wanted peace so avidly that our adversaries believe our public opinion will force our Government to make every concession, to fold up and quit. The reactions of the other side are not necessarily like our own. In our eagerness years ago to negotiate with the Russians who were coy and played hard to catch, we often considered it something of a diplomatic victory merely to get them to come to a conference. We learned by a process of expensive concession that negotiation by the very definition of the word requires a mutual desire to compromise. It is obvious that Hanoi, still inflamed with the myth of victory, is not yet conditioned to do so. It is idle at present to think in terms of negotiations with this group of ambitious and cold-blooded tyrants. Like Hitler during the last year of World War II, Hanoi tenaciously refuses all compromise or negotiation. We all remember the plot of German patriots to destroy Hitler which failed in July, 1944, when the bomb von Stauffenberg carried into Hitler's headquarters exploded but failed by a hair breadth to destroy Hitler. We know too that if it had succeeded, negotiations would have lead to an armistice by September or October, 1944, and the allied world and the Germans would have been spared millions of useless casualties and enormous destruction of property.

Sooner or later the truth of the present situation will dawn on the Vietnamese people, perhaps a lightning glimpse of the obvious, and they will take measures to shelve Ho Chi Minh, and his key associates such as Pham Van Dongh, General Giap and Le Duan, who seem to be the hard core of the terrorists. As Ernie Bevin, one time British Foreign Secretary, said in his inimitable style, it would open a pandora's box and let out the Trojan horses. Ho Chi Minh at his age and with his record is clearly frozen in a position of non-compromise; it is a waste of time to offer him reasonable terms for negotiation. He is the victim of the same manic mystique and belief in absolute victory which dominated Hitler in 1944.

It is curious to remember that France played a role in both instances. Hitler's sensationally easy victory over France in 1940 finds an analogy in Ho Chi Minh and General Giap's victory over the French at Dien Bien Phu. Ho Chi Minh knows that after Dien Bien Phu the French quit because of discouragement in Paris. They believe Washington will react similarly. They try to forget that the United States is not a weak colonial power seeking to maintain a colonial position. They will learn and I believe they are learning that American designs are not colonial, and that there is a vast difference between a weak colonial power and the United States which is completely uninterested in possessing a square inch of Vietnamese territory.

So I would hope that greater effort will be made by Asiatics to ferret out and deprive from power the hard core Hanoi and Vietcong leadership elements who really are responsible for the prolongation of the terrorism and fighting in Vietnam. It is heartbreaking to see thousands of fine young men and women on both sides uselessly slaughtered because of the paranoiac ambitions of a handful of Vietnamese terrorist leaders.

I haven't mentioned the United Nations. Someone said the other day that to criticize the United Nations is like raising the question of sex in the Vicar's living room.

I have also deliberately avoided the word "communism." Of course I am aware of the party apparatus in Asia. When I was ambassador in Tokyo I witnessed its operation at close hand. Its operations in Vietnam are visible for all to see. That being said, I also

see both in Vietnam and mainland China a great deal of old-fashioned power politics and plain expansionism. Just as Hitler used the Nazi movement as a cloak for his brand of geopolitics, we now witness North Vietnamese and Chinese expansionism. On the other hand we can find a reasonable satisfaction in the Sino-Soviet split which restrains, at least temporarily, Peking from aggressive adventures in south Asia. That situation facilitates a settlement of the Vietnamese military action and the foundation of a solid and independent Vietnamese political structure.

In Europe recently I heard considerable discussion of what might be termed the current "in" word "detente." A number of European leaders, not least among them General De Gaulle, seem to bask in a period of pleasant euphoria. As does General De Gaulle, some of them assert a rather disdainful attitude towards what the French President has termed a detestable and ludicrous war in Vietnam, together with a questioning attitude that the United States is losing interest in Europe because of its involvement in Asia. They say that the risk of war with the Soviet Union has become so remote that NATO is really unnecessary. The word detente is seductive. I find in the De Gaulle view of Vietnam something of the psychology of the jilted mistress. It is unbearable I am sure in the general's mind to contemplate that there might be an American success in Vietnam where France failed so miserably. It reminds me again of World War II. I was stationed in French North Africa on the day, June 22, 1941, when Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union. It was the view then of some Frenchmen that since Germany in 1940, in one month defeated France with its great military tradition, Germany would defeat Russia just as quickly. In fact a French admiral in Algiers bet me two to one that would happen; that Russia would be defeated by Germany in thirty days. It is always trying to observe somebody else succeed where one has failed. But it is sad to see the French leader go to the emotional extremes of proceeding to Cambodia to make a speech belittling the United States or rushing into an ill-advised French recognition of Red China at least partially to demonstrate independence from U.S. policy. So far the only dividend from Red China seems to have been the humiliation suffered by French diplomats in Peking at the hands of zealous Red Guards.

Whatever De Gaulle and a few European leaders may believe about the current necessity of NATO, many others believe that American policy supporting the alliance is in the best interest of Western security. Detente is an attractive state. Who could be against it? Like the words "peaceful coexistence" it has a seductive ring, much better than "we shall bury you." But what does it mean? None of us here in this room, I venture to say, is in the confidence of the members of the Politburos either in Moscow or Peking. Our Government does not have access to their secret plans and ambitions, nor does it have complete knowledge of their military structure and striking power. For that matter we don't even have an intimate knowledge of Cuba's plans and equipment and Cuba is only ninety miles from our shores. Some time ago we paid a price for innocence in high places in Washington incident to the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

The other day in discussing atomic weapons I was reminded of a reference attributed to Sam Goldwyn. In his inimitable style, referring to the atomic bomb Goldwyn allegedly said—"Why that's dynamite!"

We hear comfortable words now incident to the non-proliferation treaty that perhaps we could relax and just let the Russians catch up or at least reduce the disparity in our favor. We do know that the Soviet Union since World War II has constructed a gigantic military apparatus; it has in being an enormous land army, an impressive air force in addition to an immense arsenal of ballistic missiles, and I suspect is ahead of us in the field of anti-ballistic missiles. It has become a modern sea power with hundreds of submarines including Polaris type nuclear submarines. In any consideration of American-Soviet relationship, the military power of the Soviet Union should be stressed because that is the platform from which its present diplomatic maneuvering is launched and sustained. We are so prone to repeat those sedative words that the United States is the richest and most powerful country in the world. Having said that, the intimation is that we can coast, and because of a surplus margin of security, we should make concessions and even let the Russians catch up on the theory that if there is an even balance of power that would provide a safeguard against all out nuclear conflict.

The recitation of a few sober realities of the current position does not mean that it is all black. I am an optimist. There are favorable factors. There are good trends both inside the Soviet Union and in eastern Europe. I count on Soviet youth, on the second generation, to make the breakthrough. This will take time. In the present as long as the political system from which Svetlana Stalina has escaped because she could not enjoy freedom of expression, as long as that power structure with its secrecy, its powerful leadership backed by a huge arsenal and military establishment, a context which provides opportunity for an ambitious crusader to embark on adventures—just so long are we obliged to be wary. I am fearful only of our own illusions. I emphasize a need not for stale cold-war philosophy but for an appreciation of elementary security.

I prefer to consider our world situation in terms of power politics rather than ideology. It is misleading to regard the war in Vietnam merely as a fight against communism in the ideological sense. If it were only an instance of a peaceful local move to adopt a Communist form of administration, we would not have troops in Vietnam today. Our troops are not there because we want to be a policeman of the world. I regard communism as a smokescreen for plain, old-fashioned power politics, expansion in a word, and communism cloaks it and fortifies it as an idealistic crusade.

So today in the United States and Europe some people regard the Soviet military threat as diminished and any reference to it as outdated cold-war anachronisms. Their reasons relate to ideas of Soviet intentions rather than knowledgeable estimates of actual Soviet military power. These people point to Chinese defiance of Moscow leadership and say that the Communist bloc is no longer monolithic. They hopefully regard the increased autonomy of some East European states and foreign Communist parties as possibilities for settlements with the Soviet Union. They are less willing to admit that the success of the Atlantic Alliance has forced this evolution of Soviet policy which as far as I can see is a tactical resort to "peaceful coexistence" in Soviet strategy.

We are embarked on a policy of promoting East-West trade; of building bridges. Quite apart from the lure of profits, there is an assumption that establishment of trading relationships will promote or guarantee peace between the Soviet Union and this country. I have no doubt that we should trade with the East but illusions are created—illusions both regarding the importance of the amount of trade and profits, but more especially that this development will guarantee the peace. It should be remembered that in no area were trading relations closer than in Europe, among Germany, the United Kingdom and France. Yet this did not prevent both World Wars, nor did similar close trade relations between Japan and China keep the peace in Asia. So I feel we should trade, but on a caveat emptor basis without illusions, of course anyone who has negotiated with the Soviet Union needs no gratuitous advice. They are probably the world's toughest traders.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, as I see it peaceful coexistence means a period of all-out Soviet diplomatic effort to achieve a more favorable balance of power in the most decisive area—Europe. The revival of Western Europe's economic and political structure which fed a natural desire for a role in international affairs independent of the United States, has provided Soviet diplomacy with wonderful possibilities for political maneuver. The war in Vietnam provided an additional handle. Soviet diplomacy skillfully attacked the most susceptible link, France. Able Soviet diplomats have found in the chauvinism, the pride and ambition of General de Gaulle, the perfect instrument. Their objective remains the disruption of NATO and the encompassing of Germany. The old slogan of Molotov still prevails—as goes Germany so goes Europe. Blandishments are the order of the day—whether a visit to the Vatican or persistent contact with European leadership.

The Soviet Union remains an adversary, not an ally. But we should not think of Russia merely as a military threat. The political and diplomatic problems at this stage must be given more attention. Present Soviet policies now are disruptive of the degree of cooperation with our European allies which is necessary to deal with current problems. Our objective must be an eventual framework for a European settlement which will include the reunification of Germany, the establishment of European security guarantees, and the independence and strengthening of the European economy. If these are achieved in the decades ahead, perhaps, then will the Soviet Union find such a settlement in its own best interest.

I suppose it is not always the wise thing to do to so fully enjoy hospitality as I have done this evening before attempting a speech. You remember the story of the young clergyman who was scheduled to preach a sermon before his bishops. He was understandably nervous and induced the verger to give him a good nip of scotch. He went up and preached his best sermon and when he came out he said to the verger that perhaps it was the best anyone had ever preached. Yes, said the verger, but may I make a suggestion or two against a future occasion. There were ten commandments, not twelve. There were twelve apostles, not ten, and David slew Goliath with a pebble, not by a bloody great rock.

I am grateful to you for your hospitality.

"MAGNIFICENT, GENERAL, MAGNIFICENT"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, everyone of us who today saw and heard General Westmoreland felt more assurance upon the favorable outcome of the war in Vietnam and a deeper conviction that what we are fighting for in Vietnam is worth all the tragedy, travail, and cost of the struggle.

I could not refrain from shaking General Westmoreland's hand as he passed out of the Chamber and saying with deep sincerity of his address: "Magnificent, General, magnificent." That, I believe,

is how everyone who saw and heard this great American felt when he had spoken—we felt that we were a little better Americans after this towering American had spoken to us.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the schedule for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the legislative business for this week, and I shall ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday, upon the announcement of the program for next week, which is as follows:

Monday will be the call of the Consent Calendar.

There are four suspensions also listed for consideration on Monday. Those suspensions are as follows:

First. House Joint Resolution 543: To extend period for making no change of conditions under section 10 of Railway Labor Act.

Second. H.R. 6133: Authorizing appropriations for the saline water conservation program.

Third. H.R. 8553: Extending Post Office Department 30-year-lease authority.

Fourth. H.R. 5894: Removing promotion restrictions for women officers in Armed Forces.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Wednesday we have scheduled for consideration the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1967.

For Thursday, we have scheduled H.R. 158, the Maritime Administration authorization, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, I yield to the distinguished majority leader for that purpose.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I have received reports to the effect that the certificate of election of Adam Clayton Powell may arrive next week.

Mr. Speaker, if that is true, could the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma give to the Members of the House any information with respect to the disposition of this matter?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am unable to advise the gentleman from Iowa in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma assure us that there will be ample notification to the Members of the House, before there is any consideration, or whether there may be consideration of this certificate of election?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma can assure the gentleman from Iowa that insofar as the gentleman from Oklahoma is concerned, that assurance will be given, and that was given several weeks ago.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished majority leader in saying that I am sure he will do everything he can to protect all Members if and when the certificate of election appears, so no one will be taken by surprise.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me on his reservation of objection?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is rather difficult while I am in the chair to participate in the colloquy that takes place on the floor of the House, which I know every Member respects.

I believe the gentleman's inquiry is one that also calls for an expression on my part. The gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Michigan and I, I can assure the gentleman, have been in conference constantly so that every consideration will be extended to protect the Members in any action taken, whether initiated by the leadership or otherwise. I can say to the gentleman that from the leadership's angle my present impression is that the next move is up to Mr. Powell.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the distinguished Speaker of the House for his remarks on this subject. I appreciate it very much. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the House go over until Monday next, when the House adjourns today.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with any business that may be in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WE ARE FIGHTING FOR A JUST CAUSE IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state to the House at this time that, as a father and as a Congressman, I will have two boys heading for Vietnam within the next 60 days, one within the next week. I want to tell this House and also my constituency and all mothers and fathers in the First District of Nebraska, and all mothers and fathers throughout the United States, that I feel much more confident and more at ease as a father and as a citizen to know that a man like Gen. William C. Westmoreland is the commander in chief of our forces out in Vietnam.

I am positive that for myself and for my sons our cause is right and just in Vietnam.

THREE-STAR GRUNT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, our fighting men have never been engaged in a conflict in which winning the support of the civilian population was as important to our ultimate success as it is in Vietnam today. Successful leadership there must be attuned to this fact. One of the commanders who has demonstrated his awareness of the importance of civic action as well as military is the commanding general of the Third Marine Amphibious Force and senior adviser to I Corps, Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt.

The current issue of Leatherneck magazine carries a report of General Walt's efforts in Vietnam and the spirit he has created among the marines serving there with him. I include this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

THREE-STAR GRUNT

Lieutenant General Lewis William Walt leaned forward in his leathered swivel-chair.

Lines furrowed his forehead. He spoke slowly. "I can only say that if I didn't believe in what we're doing here, with all my heart, I wouldn't be able to live with the lives that have been taken and the effort that has been expended."

As Commanding General of the Third Marine Amphibious Force and Senior Adviser to I Corps, the northern five provinces in South Vietnam, Walt has seen a lot of lives taken and a lot of effort expended since arriving in that country in June 1965. He has also seen a lot of progress.

He cautions about thinking the war will end tomorrow, or the next day, but there's no doubt in his mind that it *will* end, and that the world will be better because it has been fought.

"It doesn't take a Marine long to find out what we're doing here," he said. "The contrast of communist rule with democracy is very clear to him. And, I think he feels as I do; that if we don't stop communist aggression here, and now, our next generation is going to be fighting a much tougher enemy, much closer to home."

But, more than his belief in the war itself, is his belief in his men, the men fighting the war. Few generals have shared the comradeship that exists between command post and foxhole. To the officer, he's a general's general. To the enlisted, he's a peon's peon, a three-star grunt.

Three years ago, only a handful of Marines could have told you who Walt was. Stars fell on him like they fell on Alabama, but the seven rows of ribbons he wears on his dress uniform stand as mute testimony to an outstanding career. Two Navy Cross Medals, one Silver Star, one Bronze Star with Combat "V", the Legion of Merit with Combat "V", and a Purple Heart record his service since his appointment as a second lieutenant on July 6, 1936.

Walt snapped to his first attention at the age of 16, when he signed up with the Colorado National Guard. He went through the ranks from private to first sergeant. At Colorado State University he majored in chemistry and graduated as honor student in his department with a Bachelor of Science degree. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army Field Artillery Reserve upon graduation, but resigned that commission to accept an appointment in the Marine Corps. He had never heard of the Corps before being offered that commission, and a military career was the farthest thing from his mind. His career plans lay in the field of chemistry.

World War II changed all that, for by the time the Japanese surrendered in Tokyo Bay in 1945, Walt was a lieutenant colonel with enough ribbons above his left breast pocket to stock an exchange.

He received his first star in July 1961. The second followed in May 1965, and less than a year later, in March 1966, Walt was promoted to lieutenant general.

Walt's link with the enlisted men in his command defies the age-old "If the old man wants it done, I guess I'd better get it done," type of military thinking. Today's Marine in Vietnam looks at Walt as a father, and the "Yes, sir" reply to an order comes out of respect and not because it's the required answer.

Lieutenant General Victor H. Krulak, Commanding General of the Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Walt's immediate superior, brought this out. "Marines have a tendency to inbreed, to act like a family, whether it's a platoon or a division. Walt emphasizes the family idea."

Walt has a tremendous faith in the grunt, and the grunt knows it. "I think the individual Marine, the man who carries the rifle, throws a grenade and uses a bayonet, is the most important man in the Marine Corps," he says. "He's the man who determines how well his unit attacks or defends on any battlefield.

"I am sure that every officer feels very deeply about his men," he continues. "I know that when I ask a man to go into combat he is depending on me to give him all the support I can bring to bear to enable him to come out of that fight alive and unwounded and still accomplish the mission.

"If I'm a fighter down there in the rear ranks; if I'm a private or a corporal, I've got to know that I'm getting the support needed. This is morale. This is esprit de corps. This is confidence.

"What I'm really talking about here is teamwork, the essence of which is our air/ground team in Vietnam. It is the responsibility of the commanding general to have this teamwork developed and executed every hour of the day and night. I have never witnessed closer teamwork than we have here in Vietnam and I have never witnessed a more proficient and effective performance of duty, in all ranks, in both air and ground units, than we have here in III MAF."

More than the teamwork within III MAF is the joint effort of the Marines, the Army, Navy, Air Force and Vietnamese fighting forces. Walt lauds this effort, for while the war is individualistic in nature, it's a culmination of individual effort that's getting the job done.

It's a dirty war in Vietnam. When the dust isn't biting into your nostrils, the mud is sucking at your boots. When the sun isn't cooking your head inside your steel helmet, the rain is turning you into something akin to a piece of soggy bread. And, the guerrilla—he never lets up. In a situation like this, morale of the troops is of prime consideration.

Seldom does a week go by that Walt isn't out in the field with his Marines, shaking hands, advising, cautioning, listening, asking, answering and thanking.

"Are you getting enough food?" he asks one.

"Yes, sir. I'm not gaining any weight, but, I'm not losing any either."

He spots a Marine preparing a foxhole. "Are you going to reinforce the top?"

"Yes, sir."

"That's good," Walt says. "They're probably going to hit you one of these nights and the right planning now will save a lot of lives."

A radioman gets the next question.

"How are your batteries holding up?"

"Fine, General. I've got enough for two more days and we have some on order."

"What are you doing, Marine?" he asks a man neck-deep in a mud hole.

"Diggin' a crapper, sir."

More questions. More answers. He tells them all they're doing a fine job, and before leaving, he turns to the lieutenant colonel in charge and says, "I'd change jobs with you any day."

The officer opens his mouth as if to say, "It's a deal!" but instead he replies, "We need you where you are, sir."

Walt smiles and climbs into his helicopter. "This is the Marine Corps," he says to a distinguished guest making the tour with him. "This is where the war is being fought."

Walt would much rather make his command decisions from a foxhole on the front lines than from his office in Da Nang, but the dictates of war prevent this. His area of responsibility encompasses some two and a half million Vietnamese civilians, on the advisory level, and he has operational control over nearly 3,000 square miles of terrain.

Just visiting the scattering of command posts is a job in itself, a job Walt accomplishes as often as possible. In this venture, he averages around 100,000 air miles traveled each year.

On one such helicopter flight, a VC sniper sent a round through the nose of the general's HU1E. Both he and the pilot escaped serious injury (Walt was hit by fragments) and the chopper was able to continue to its destination.

Perhaps, however, the closest Walt has come to becoming a statistic in Vietnam's minus column was during the political upheaval in Da Nang last year. The only bridge linking downtown Da Nang with the Marines' Marble Mountain airfield had been captured and no traffic was being allowed to pass. The bridge had been mined, and the Marines were told that any attempts to cross it would result in it being blown up. Walt needed that bridge.

Backed up by a team of engineers, he walked to the bridge. When he reached it he told the engineers to disconnect the explosives. He didn't stop. He continued walking toward the center, where a Vietnamese lieutenant stood.

The lieutenant asked Walt to go back.

Walt said he was going to walk it by himself or fight his way across with a company of Marines.

"All right, General," the lieutenant said, "we die together." With that, he brought his arm down as a signal to detonate the explosives. Fortunately, the Marine engineers had disconnected them in time, but Walt had no way of knowing this. He had placed his life in the hands of his men.

At command briefings concerning the activities of I Corps, Walt listens carefully. He understands, perhaps better than most, the implications of a sudden increase in Viet Cong activity in one area. He has been attending these briefings for the past 22 months, and the mind of the chemist he once was, analyzes the situation quickly and responds with the decision of the general he is today.

He chews butts when he sees something he doesn't like and he commends that which he does like.

"The most difficult decisions," he says, "are those having to do with the lives of my men. When I commit them to combat I know that some of them are going to be killed or wounded. A commanding general must look at all facets having to do with the operation. He must evaluate and decide which course of action will be the most effective. He must consider carefully the risks he is taking, as far as his men are concerned, and determine his every means of support in that action.

"The decision is, 'Do I commit them, or do I not? Do I take some other means of accomplishing the objective?' "

This careful weighing of the alternatives accounted for 11,500 VC dead during Walt's first 16 months on the job. But, dead VC alone do not tell the story of the war.

Civic Action programs are doing a wealth of good in bringing the war to an end. More than a million civilians have received medical attention. Another 39,500 have received dental care. More than two million pounds of food has been distributed, along with 220,000 pounds of clothing.

Schools, office buildings, wells, bridges and homes have been built. School supplies and trade goods have been handed out. Working hand in hand with CARE, Marines have distributed more than $67,000 worth of useful items aimed at increasing educational standards, job skills, and in general, a way of life that, in some areas, has remained stagnant for thousands of years.

For the most part, Walt is responsible for the birth of Civic Action as well as its success. He is behind it one hundred percent, but he knows that it alone will not win the war.

"You have to compare the effectiveness of Civic Action and the military," he says. "You can't have Civic Action without military protection. Yet, certainly without both, you can't win this war. One is just as vital as the other."

Walt believes that the guerrilla, the farmer by day and the VC by night, is the biggest detriment to a speedy conclusion of the war.

"If we don't win this battle with the guerrilla this could go on for years," he says. "He's a damned hard man to replace as compared with the NVA (North Vietnamese Army). The guerrilla has a stranglehold on the people. They collect the taxes for the VC. They collect rice for the main forces and the NVA, recruit for the main forces and the NVA, furnish intelligence to the main forces and the NVA, and provide them with working parties. They are also extremely difficult to corner. First, we must find him, then identify him, and then drag him out of his hole."

Winning the support of the civilian population is mandatory in routing out the VC element in the villages and hamlets. One giant step forward in that direction was taken with the birth of Civic Action. The next step, equally as important, was the creation of Combined Action Companies throughout I Corps.

These companies incorporate small units of Marines and Vietnamese Popular Forces personnel. They eat, sleep and fight together. And, the man in charge is a Marine enlisted man, still another example of Walt's faith in the individual Marine.

Working side by side with the people of the villages they live in, these Combined Action Companies, or CAC, for short, are proving more valuable as time goes by. They help protect the villages' rice, prevent taxation by the local VC and, in turn, information on Viet Cong activity in the area is beginning to filter in.

In time, the Marines will leave the Popular Forces units and return to their parent organizations. Their mission will have been accomplished; that is, they will have instilled a confidence in the Vietnamese civilian-soldiers and will have trained them to such a degree that they could fight alongside anyone in the country.

Yet, another part of winning the war is the rehabilitation program for the VC defectors. In I Corps, some of these ralliers are being used as scouts, Kit Carson scouts, as Walt calls them affectionately. (This program was initiated by Major General Herman Nickerson, CG, First Marine Division.) Knowing the country as they do, they are able to caution against possible mine fields and booby traps as well as identify areas used frequently by the enemy.

It's a big undertaking that the United States has set about to accomplish in Vietnam, but slowly, day by day, the effort is beginning to pay off.

"By fighting here now," Walt says, "we're freeing an oppressed people; a country that 10 or 15 years from now, because of its great potential in natural resources, and the people themselves, is going to be the cornerstone of the Free World in Southeast Asia."

Many men have died and many more lives will be taken before that cornerstone is set firmly in place. Meanwhile, Lieutenant General Lewis William Walt will continue to make the decisions and he will continue to weigh each one carefully.

Paramount in his mind will be the safety of his men in the field, his grunts, and his men in the air, his zoomies and mechs. He'll wonder how many lives will be lost on the next operation and he'll think about those lives that have already been lost.

"They didn't die in vain," he'll say. "They died for the cause of freedom just like men died in World War II."

That's Walt. A compassionate man. A man sensitive to the needs of his men. A man who has been described as one of the best tacticians who ever wore a uniform. A man who, despite a college degree and a knack for holding conversations with senators and other dignitaries, will always be remembered as a three-star grunt to the men who served under him in Vietnam.

FORETASTE OF 1984?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is the tendency among some to view Federal participation as the panacea of all our earthly troubles. Somehow, with Federal money and know-how, they contend, difficulties will be resolved forthwith. Forgotten is the well-known inefficiency of the Government which devours tax dollars in its relentless operation. Ignored is the age-old fact that relinquishing individual responsibility can turn government from servant to master. Gone is the healthy supervision which demands an adequate return for tax moneys spent.

Unfortunately the following experience is far from the exception in government-sponsored operations. The author of the account, William Henry Chamberlin, is a long-established writer of distinction with an impressive background in governmental and current affairs. His clash with the Federal Goliath as recounted in National Review of April 18, 1967, should suggest to one and all a wariness of oversimplified solutions through recourse to Federal moneys and programs.

I request that the article, "Foretaste of 1984," be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

FORETASTE OF 1984?

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

My wife and I have been engaged in an eight-month tussle, so far futile, with the Cambridge, Massachusetts office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to obtain the certificates for Medicare to which we are entitled by age, and by the heavy contributions levied by the Social Security system. We hope that no illness, in which Medicare may or may not aid us, will cause as much mental anguish and frustration as the mare's nest of obstructive bureaucracy we have encountered.

I have always been opposed to Medicare and would have voted against it had I been a member of Congress. Twelve years of residence in the Soviet Union, a briefer closeup of socialized medicine in Great Britain ("subsidized hypochondria," a caustic British friend calls it) and various brushes with the ever-expanding brands of United States bureaucracy have implanted in me one firm conviction. That is that, whatever government may undertake, it will be done more incompetently, more wastefully, and more expensively than private initiative attempting to solve the same problem. I would have leaped at the chance to contract out of social security. But of course I had no such option. Medicare had become the law of the land, as everyone knew who received a salary check and noted the much larger bite for Social Security. To acquire Medicare seemed deceptively easy. Everyone who had passed the age of 65 was entitled to its benefits. So in March 1966 we duly applied for it.

In our innocence we thought the only further step would be reasonable presentation of proof of age. We were never more mistaken in our lives. The first hint of troubles to come was the arrival of two bulging envelopes, with what we came to view as the dire initials HEW. These contained enormously long questionnaires, full of impertinent and irrelevant inquiries about income and other subjects which had no bearing on our eligibility. We filled out the questionnaires and waited for something to happen. Nothing did.

Finally, on the eve of leaving for a European trip at the end of July, my wife, knowing my low boiling point in dealing with bureaucrats, decided to beard the HEW dragons in their den. This proved to be a handsome new building, staffed with a horde of witless bureaucrats maintained at taxpayers' expense but apparently regarding as their first duty to obstruct, delay, harass and torment these same taxpayers in connection with their applications for Medicare.

HOW PROVE ONE'S AGE?

Neither my wife nor I had birth certificates handy. In fact my wife's was hopelessly lost, as she was born in Elizavetgrad, Russia before the Revolution. And, like most Americans, I suspect, especially those who have often changed residence, mine had been lost, if I ever possessed one. However, my wife took with her full proof of our ages, to any reasonable mind: sworn statements inscribed on our passports. She had not reckoned with the stonewall obstructionism she was to meet. A female bureaucrat (Desk 5) brushed aside the passports, also the equally convincing evidence that we had proofs of graduation, I from Haverford College, she from Hunter College, at dates which clearly placed us in the over-65 group. No, we must write to the Board of Elections to ascertain when we first voted in Cambridge. What this had to do with our ages was obscure, but we did as we were bid and left for Europe.

We returned to find no Medicare, but three or four more bulging envelopes with repetitious questionnaires. Evidently the HEW motto is: When in doubt, mail a questionnaire or, better, two or three. Wearily and weeks later my wife went again to HEW, to run up against a male bureaucrat (Desk 10). He immediately repudiated everything Desk 5 had told her. He demanded that I produce a certificate from the Board of Health in Brooklyn and that my wife get some document from Washington Irving High School, from which she was graduated.

A letter to the Board of Health produced another questionnaire, and a prospect of indefinite further delay. Then came the cream of the bureaucratic jest. When both of us had been caught in the flypaper of outside red tape I received a form letter under the signature of the District Manager of HEW with the ominous warning:

"If we do not hear from you within ten days we will send your claim to the payment center with a recommendation that it be disallowed." Eight months of inexcusable delay by HEW; then a threat to disallow a claim that had been entangled deeper and deeper in bureaucratic red tape. Some heated representations over the telephone brought a grudging repudiation of the letter, with the admission that the District Manager did not know what was being sent out over his signature.

By a miracle the Board of Health produced a certified copy of my birth certificate with a delay of only two weeks. As for my wife, she is still in a bureaucratic "dark tarn of Auber, in the ghoul-haunted woodland of Weir." Do I now hold a Medicare certificate? Yes. I received it exactly ten months after I first made application for it.

To end on a constructive note, I would briefly suggest the following simple procedural changes, which would make an application for Medicare less of a prelude to 1984 than it is at present.

1) Make a huge bonfire of the questionnaires and form letters that must have made a heavy drain on the nation's paper supply.

2) Substitute for the staggering array of useless questions a simple request for reasonable proof of age.

3) Insist, on pain of disciplinary sanctions,

that every application be settled within a reasonable time.

4) Instill in employees of the Department, if possible, a higher sense of intelligence and compassion.

ARE THERE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PRESENT ESCALATION?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to join, today, with my colleagues of the Congress and our other distinguished visitors, in extending a hearty welcome to Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commanding officer of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam, and to listen to his factual, down-to-earth report of the military situation now pertaining there.

I first met General Westmoreland several years ago, when he was Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and I was most favorably impressed by him, then—by his personality, by his self-evident capabilities, and by his obvious sense of devotion to duty, to honor, and to country—and his appearance here in this Chamber today has only served to strengthen that first impression.

General Westmoreland is an outstanding military leader, cast in the mold of those other great professional soldiers of the past who have emerged, at other times of national need, to serve at the head of those of our citizens who have been called upon to fight in defense of our country, or to advance its policies in pursuit of freedom for others abroad. As he stood before us today, it seemed to me that he well typified the courage and loyalty of all those other Americans who have served, or are still serving, in Vietnam—men to whom, though mostly unknown and unsung, this Nation owes an eternal debt of gratitude, and of whom all of us can be justly proud.

This is why I regret, as I am sure so many do, the small storm of protest that preceded his appearance here. As I see it, he had a responsibility to report to us—and to the Nation—and to give us his well-considered views on the military progress we have been making in Vietnam and his analysis of the military and related problems that still lie ahead of us there. I accept those views, coming as they do from undoubtedly the most highly qualified military source we have available to us, and I would point out to those who—objecting to our involvement in Vietnam—have objected to General Westmoreland's appearance here at all, that he is not responsible for the fact that we are at war in Vietnam. That responsibility rests in other hands—and partly in ours, no matter how much some of us may question the wisdom of the policy that brought on that war—and one does not have to fully agree with that policy to understand and sympathize with General Westmoreland's eagerness to bring this tragic conflict to an end.

All of us, Mr. Speaker, share that same eagerness—that same desire to "bring our boys home" as soon as possible.

Thus, as all our efforts to induce negotiations that might bring about a cease-fire and, eventually, a peaceful solution to the problems of the Vietnamese, have come to naught, and as the war drags on and on in an ever more costly state of stalmate, it is again understandable that the President—who can hardly be unaware of his own growing political problems arising out of this stalemate—has decided to gradually increase the military pressure by air and sea on North Vietnam in order to physically limit the amount of aid Hanoi can supply the Communists in the south, and to persuade the Hanoi leadership that the game is no longer worth the candle. And it is equally understandable that General Westmoreland, a professional soldier, both supports and approves such a gradual escalation of the conflict as being necessary and appropriate under the circumstances.

However, Mr. Speaker, not many days ago Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, speaking in Hartford, and commenting on what he termed "a visible groundswell of impatience leading to a mood of 'let's get it over with; let's crush them once and for all,'" suggested that "This simplistic reaction is tempting but wrong."

Governor Romney, in what I thought were carefully chosen words of wisdom, explained that such a reaction was "wrong" because, in his words:

First, by actions approaching devastation of a non-white Asian people, we would play into the hands of the Communists. They would use this effectively to paint us in their propaganda as ruthless oppressors and militarists—the very opposite of our true role in the world.

Second, from the point of view of stopping the expansion of Communism, we must remember that a devastated Vietnam would not be a buffer; it would be a vacuum, (and)

Third, we must never forget that substantial escalation is still possible on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I have similarly grave misgivings about the possible consequences of the kind of escalation we are now seeing on both sides of the conflict in Vietnam—misgivings that impel me to speak out even on a day such as this.

I do so as one who has always supported an American presence in Vietnam, and who has always voted for the requisite appropriations to maintain that presence. But I also do so as one who has become increasingly concerned over the turn of events there in recent weeks that leads me to wonder if we still "seek no wider war" there—as the President has so often put it—and if, behind the scenes, perhaps we are still pursuing peace as vigorously as we are now obviously pursuing some sort of "victory."

The best evidence of the current magnitude of that latter effort is provided by the fact that, in March, American planes dropped 77,000 tons of bombs on North and South Vietnam, a total just barely short of the 80,000 tons dropped on Europe during the average month of the peak year of bombing in World War II. Just think of that, if you will, for a moment, and you will understand why Secretary of Defense McNamara—who, until recently has not been an outstanding proponent of the effectiveness of such bombing—has said that the magnitude of our air operations in southeast Asia is "just unbelievable" and "fantastic in size against any previous standards."

Well, Mr. Speaker, in order not to belabor the point, the real question is: Is there still an alternative to so carrying the war to the north?

Probably there are several such, but the one that most appeals to me—and the one I have been suggesting for some time—is the possibility of cutting a swath across the narrow neck of Vietnam, near the so-called demilitarized zone, and running on into Laos a sufficient distance so as to effectively cut the now-familiar Ho Chi Minh Trail and to stop—in a way in which continued bombing apparently has not—the infiltration of men and supplies from the north to the Vietcong in the south.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this idea has great merit; that it is possible of execution, though probably costly; that it would avoid, in that it is basically a defensive measure, the hazards implicit in attempting to put such offensive pressures on Ho Chi Minh, himself, to get him to the bargaining table, that we inadvertently go beyond whatever cutoff point China has set for herself insofar as her active participation in the war is concerned; and, finally, that such a move on our part, with the assistance of our allies, would gradually bring about the end of guerrilla activities in South Vietnam, and the acts of terrorism of which General Westmoreland spoke, that have so far prevented faster progress toward pacification of the South Vietnamese countryside and the development of viable political institutions in the rural areas of that war-weary country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that this is a constructive suggestion. I offer it again with all due respect for the opinions of those who are more knowledgeable than I concerning its strategic and engineering feasibility, and I include at this point an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for April 26, 1967, making—as such newspaper has editorially before—the same suggestion:

SWATH VERSUS RAIDS

The United States air raid on two North Vietnamese fighter-plane bases is what many Americans have been demanding, what many others have feared, but what has been long foreshadowed in the Washington policy of slowly but steadily upping the military pressure on the Communists.

It is a clear signal to Hanoi, to Moscow, and Peking, in short to all concerned with the war, that this pressure will almost certainly rise and rise until the North agrees to lift its hand from the South. A similar message was contained in recent raids within Hanoi's and Haiphong's city limits, a step thought to have more diplomatic than military overtones.

The difficulty is, of course, that as yet this policy has not brought the North to withdraw. Hanoi's aggression against the South continues unabated. And, despite the very sharp rise in Communist casualties as well as Communist desertions, no end to the war is in sight.

Thus an already overcharged debate will grow still stronger. How greatly does this increase the danger of a broadened conflict?

Won't this purposefully limited raid inevitably be followed by heavier raids of the same kind? How will the Soviet Union react once the United States begins destroying MIGs on the ground as well as in the sky? Will Hanoi now be tempted to seek airfields across the border in China—and will Washington agree to such a "sanctuary" for enemy craft?

Each of these questions is immediately, and each reflects the continuing peril which the war in Vietnam holds for all. Thus the overriding challenge remains: to find some means of bringing this war to an end which will be consistent with justice and equity, while carefully weighing each step which broadens the fighting.

Periodically, for the past year-and-a-half, we have urged Washington to give greater consideration to the creation of a fortified, mined and garrisoned open swath from the sea right across Vietnam and as far into Laos as is necessary to snip the Ho Chi Minh Trail. If successful, such a swath could end the need to bomb the North; it would permit a more defensive type of action against the North, and it would let both the American and the South Vietnamese get on with the main job—that of pacifying the Southern countryside.

GEN. WILLIAM WESTMORELAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many, many years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote:

> Great men, great nations, have not been boosters or buffoons, but perceivers of the terror of life, and have manned themselves to face it.

Gen. William Westmoreland, in his message to Congress today, epitomized the man of great strength who has the wisdom to temper the power available to him and, thus, give his life meaning and significance.

The United States could not have a better, more able or conscientious man serving in the field. General Westmoreland is both soldier and patriot, the one indistinguishable from the other. With the enormous technical resources at his command, he could issue a war cry that would thunder around the world. He does not, and he will not, for he is a man of peace.

How fortunate we are to have such a man who speaks from a deep belief in the need for restraint, control, self-discipline.

His message to Congress and to his countrymen urged our resolve to hold on, in measured control, until the North Vietnamese are convinced at least we seek no wider territory, nor will we be thrown out of southeast Asia until there are guarantees for the safety of the independent South Vietnamese Government.

The general's presence and his obvious commitment to the causes of the United States are an inspiration to all of us.

In July of last year, I visited South Vietnam and the battlefields with several of my colleagues. We had an opportunity to talk at length with General Westmoreland. I was immediately impressed with his candor and his complete devotion to the cause of bringing the fighting to an end, to securing a negotiated settlement, and to sending American men home again.

In reporting to the President upon our return to Washington after this trip last summer, I urged the President to give serious thought to bringing General Westmoreland home so that the American people could have the privilege of hearing him speak.

Our fellow Americans, in cities and small towns across this vast continent, have had that privilege today. I doubt if any one of us can remain unmoved by the sincerity and firmness of this great man. Gen. William Westmoreland speaks for, as well as to, our Nation. I trust our allies, as well as those who wish us ill, will pay close attention to his words.

SECRETARY GARDNER SPEAKS OUT AGAINST THE QUIE AMENDMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I was privileged to speak in defense of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—one of the truly landmark programs begun by President Lyndon Johnson. This program is now threatened by a blatant Republican attempt to wreck the hard work and sound accomplishments of this Democratic administration.

On the same day, our distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, issued a statement on this Republican proposal that should end all reasonable doubts about its disastrous effects on American education, as a whole. For as the Secretary rightly noted, the Quie amendment would take away Federal assistance from States which most need the aid because of their low economic capabilities and high concentration of educationally deprived children.

I urge all of my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to give the Secretary's brilliant and concise statement the closest attention.

If they do, I am convinced that the Quie amendment will be soundly rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this statement by Secretary Gardner:

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

The substitute that Representative Albert Quie has proposed for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 could, if enacted, undermine and destroy much that the Congress and the Administration have jointly achieved in recent educational legislation.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which is now bringing new skills and opportunities to eight million disadvantaged children and new hope and potentialities to every school district in the Nation, would be wiped out.

The proposal by Mr. Quie which threatens to produce this disastrous result has never been considered in Committee, has never been made the subject of hearings, and has been hastily revised three or four times within the past three weeks.

In place of the carefully considered, broad categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—categories which the Congress deems to be in the national interest—the Quie substitute would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs. In the guise of conferring greater freedom on American education, it would scatter Federal financial assistance in such a manner that the American taxpayer would likely receive little for his money.

It would take away Federal assistance from States which most need the aid because of their low economic capabilities and high concentration of educationally deprived children. The Southern and border States would lose $371 million, while the great states of New York, California and Illinois would also suffer substantial cuts in Federal assistance.

Carefully defined and selected targets for educational improvement, now specified as beneficiaries of the ESEA, would suffer. Programs for the children of migrant workers, for foster children, for children in institutions for the handicapped, neglected or delinquent, children in the Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools, and children in the Territories of the United States would all suffer.

The Quie substitute cannot guarantee that Federal aid will be concentrated in places and in amounts necessary to do the job, rather than merely be dissipated in wide areas and for a wide variety of second-priority activities. It cannot guarantee, for example, that the cities, so sorely in need of Federal assistance, will receive their fair share of aid.

And it is a very unsure instrument for dealing with the gravest problem facing our nation today—the adequate education of children of the slums and rural depressed areas.

Even more serious is the fact that the Quie substitute poses a grave threat to the consensus that was put together with such difficulty in 1965 when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act came into being. For years all forward-looking Americans had known that the Federal Government must eventually provide large-scale support for education—but for years, literally decades, the accomplishment was frustrated by dissension over several key issues, chief among them the Church-State question.

The Quie substitute strikes at the very heart of that consensus, and we are already hearing the return of the old dissension and divisiveness. If it bursts out in full fury, we shall have neither the present Act nor the Quie substitute. We'll find ourselves right back where we were two years ago.

Some proponents of the Quie substitute say it offers flexibility and freedom of decision to the States in place of the narrow categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is misleading in the extreme. The categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are anything but narrow. They are very broad and flexible. Its major titles contain the broadest and most permissive authorizations in American legislative history to strengthen the State departments of education, to stimulate educational expansion and innovation, to acquire the latest and best instructional materials, and, especially, to focus on the problems of educationally disadvantaged children, wherever they may be found, but particularly in our great urban complexes and sparsely populated rural counties.

No one in the Executive Branch or in the Congress has spoken or worked more con-

sistently than I for helping the States to achieve greater flexibility and initiative in administering Federal programs. In the Partnership for Health legislation which we proposed and the Congress passed last year we combined 15 narrow categorical aid programs. In our Education Professions Development bill this year we would replace numerous fragmented training authorities with one comprehensive and flexible training program.

At the same time, I believe that Federal dollars should in broad terms be directed to targets selected by the elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States. They speak for the States and they judge the needs of the States against a background of national priorities.

While we must do everything within our power to strengthen the States—and no Administration has done more than this one to build strength in the State departments of education—I believe that as long as Federal resources in the field of education are limited, they should be used primarily for the elimination of those educational problems which the Congress identifies as the greatest obstacle to the growth and development of our Nation.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND

Mr. PRYOR. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I regret that Gen. William Westmoreland has been making public statements in the United States on questions going far beyond his area of responsibility and expertise. As I said on Wednesday, I particularly deplore his condemnation of dissent and debate and his declared opposition to "cease-fire proposals," without indicating any recognition of the fact that a cease-fire may lead to negotiations and a peaceful settlement.

I do not believe that General Westmoreland should have been invited to address a joint session of the Congress. If it had been thought desirable for the Congress to pay its respect to the commander of our forces in Vietnam, this could have been arranged in a brief ceremony as has been the case with returning astronauts. If it had been thought that the general had information to impart, that should have been done in the usual way by having him testify before the appropriate committees. But to invite him to make a full-scale address to a joint session in a manner usually reserved for the President himself or for other heads of state is, in my judgment, to give the impression that the military view of the situation in Vietnam has now become predominant in our Government.

To my mind, there has never been a conflict in which it was more important to maintain civilian supremacy, because this is a conflict in which the long-range political and psychological factors will determine the final outcome. Military successes cannot alone attain the goals we seek in southeast Asia.

In spite of my feelings, I did not absent myself from the Chamber when the general was speaking. I attended, purely and simply as a gesture of respect for the Americans who are fighting in Vietnam, and particularly for those who die there daily.

In announcing this decision, I want to make it clear that I intend no criticism of those of my colleagues who may have decided, for one reason or another, not to attend the joint session. I am sure not one of them intended any disrespect for General Westmoreland or our fighting forces in Vietnam.

AMERICA SUPPORTS OUR ARMED FORCES IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, speaking for Third District Georgians, one-half million strong, may I commend and uphold our gallant military, from our most able General Westmoreland to every basic private whose lives are subject to stand in the balance.

There is no uncertainty among us as to our direction in Vietnam; there is no hesitancy among us as to when to begin. We are ready.

Our objective, Mr. Speaker, is victory and we say with General MacArthur that there is no substitute for victory.

Toward that end may we all resolve to afford every assistance, in word and deed, toward the support and protection of our Americans everywhere and particularly in Vietnam.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR OF MEXICO

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, many of us who serve here in Washington have had the pleasure of becoming acquainted and becoming friends with the very able Ambassador of Mexico, the Honorable Hugo B. Margain.

I wish to share with you and my colleagues an address made by Ambassador Margain at Tufts University on April 6 which gives us a brief, but compact and highly interesting, history lesson as well as several special insights about Mexico:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY HUGO B. MARGAIN, AMBASSADOR OF MEXICO TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AT THE TUFTS UNIVERSITY, MEDFORD, MASS., APRIL 6, 1967

As a starting point I would like to refer briefly to the amazing world of our aboriginal ancestors. The vigorous personality of modern Mexico, its unquestionable artistic originality, are largely the result of deep roots in the good earth of ancient Middle America, and its remarkable Indian past.

The great pre-Columbian civilization that flourished on our land is undoubtedly the most important of this continent and the archaeological sites of Mexico are among the most numerous and impressive in the whole world.

The Mayas have been characterized as "the Greeks of America" and there is ample evidence that they were great builders in Sylvanus S. Morley's definitive book on the subject entitled "The Ancient Mayas". The great American scholar identified about 120 different archaeological sites, 5 great metropolises, 19 cities of the first rank, 39 of medium category and 54 of lesser importance. And this does not include all that remains to be uncovered in Honduras, Guatemala, Chiapas, Tabasco and Quintana Roo.

Many examples of the archaeological splendor of Mexico can be viewed in our great National Museum of Anthropology in Mexico City which was inaugurated in 1964. This Museum has been regarded by visiting scholars as a veritable jewel of world culture. It houses, among other treasures, the great "Stone of the Sun", better known as Aztec Calendar, which illustrates the progress achieved by the ancient inhabitants of Mexico in the field of mathematics and astronomy. Another notable evidence of the importance of Mexico's past is the "Tumba de los Años"—Tomb of the Years—where time was buried. According to our Nahuatl ancestors, time is perishable, but the soul is immortal. The objective of life is what really mattered and the death of time, perishable and mortal, meant the triumph of the spirit.

Two extraordinary scholars, Padre Angel Maria Garibay Kintana and Dr. Miguel Leon-Portilla, have made remarkable translations of Nahuatl philosophical and poetic texts. I only wish to mention at this time to the respect for education reflected in reference to teachers and learning. Knowledge was described as "a light that guides and admonishes, a living, smokeless torch."

Our archaeological riches are countless. Among the treasured reminders of our ancient civilization exhibited in the National Museum of Anthropology, mention must be made of Coatlicue, the Aztec goddess of earth and mother of the stars, the moon and the sun. The monumental Olmec heads are also most impressive.

One of the most important of our archaeological cities is San Juan Teotihuacán, whose monuments rival the Egyptian Pyramids. In Tula, one is amazed by the famous Atlantes carved out of stone of colossal proportions. Monte Albán has attracted world-wide attention for its magnificent collection of Mixtec-Zapotec jewels. The Pyramid of Tajín, is a testimony of our Asiatic roots while that of Kukulcán or Castle at Chichén-Itzá is perhaps the one whose dimensions are most beautifully proportioned.

It is a well-known fact that the Greeks planned the dimensions of their beautiful temples in such a way as to give a desirable optical impression. Mayan architects were equally gifted in this respect. In the Castle of Chichén-Itzá, they corrected the perspective of the stairs which permit the ascent to the temple on the top. This was achieved by making the highest steps wider than those below in such a way that the visitor standing before the pyramid gets the impression of a perfect parallel.

The Pyramid of Xochicalco, near Cuernavaca, records the outcome of a scientific congress that took place in the early period of the Christian Era. Corrections were introduced in the method of measuring time in order to mark on the calendar the exact duration of the revolution of the earth in its orbit round the sun. It is generally recognized that the aboriginal calendar was very exact and superior, in that respect, to the European calendar. We must remember that it was not until the year 1603 that the

Gregorian reformation of the calendar was fully completed.

There is reason to believe that some European men of science knew about the exactitude of our aboriginal calendar since the early XVI Century. This fact permits us to say that as far as astronomy is concerned, our pre-Columbian scientists had perhaps reached a higher level of development than that achieved in Europe during the same period.

Quetzalcoatl, known among the Mayas as Kukulcán, is one of the major and truly symbolic figures in the aboriginal civilization of Mexico. He represents the dualism of human life, the double nature of man. The material side, perishable and mundane, is represented by a serpent—a plumed serpent which also symbolizes the detachment of the soul from the earth as it flies into infinite space. The spiritual values are represented by the feathers.

Even in our national coat-of-arms one can observe the dual concept of human destiny. It represents the culmination of a search for a place where the Mexicas, a nomadic tribe, might find a permanent home and build a city. According to the legend, the gods ordered that the founding of Tenochtitlán should take place wherever the weary migrants should discover an eagle perched upon a cactus plant, on a jutting rock, in the middle of a body of water and in the process of devouring a serpent. The great capital of the Aztec empire was built on the site where the eagle and the serpent were found after a pilgrimage that lasted many centuries.

According to some traditions our national coat-of-arms is also a symbol of human destiny. The cactus plant and its thorns represent the harshness of life on earth, and the serpent, as in Biblical symbolism, is the image of evil. The spirit is represented by the eagle which will be free to fly into space after exterminating evil.

A historian, Fernando de Alva Ixtlixóchitl quotes some excerpts of Otomí poetry in which in terms that recall the Spanish classic Calderón, the native poet deplores the apparent and perishable quality of world success:

"Los gustos de esta vida, sus riquezas y mandos, son prestados; son substancia fingida, en apariencia sólo matizados." [1]

This poem, translated into English by William H. Prescott, reads as follows:

"The pleasures which our lives present, its sceptres, and its wealth, are lent, are shadows fleeting by; appearance colors all our bliss."

Another poem is a commentary on the fleeting quality of life:

"Es acaso verdad que se vive en la tierra?
No para siempre en la tierra: tan sólo un breve instante
Si es esmeralda, se rompe,
o si oro, se quiebra,
o si plumaje de quetzal, se rasga,
No para siempre en la tierra: tan sólo un breve instante."

Which translated into English reads as follows:

"Do we really live on earth?
We are not forever on earth: it is only an instant!
If it is emerald, it breaks,
If gold, it turns into dust,
If a quetbal's feather, it tears.
We are not forever on earth: it is only an instant]" [2]

These examples, taken at random, give a glimpse of the ideological content of a civilization that reached the highest manifestations in the realm of thought. It is evident that the "smokeless torch" had a high and honored place in our pre-Columbian civilization.

In the site which is known to-day as the Plaza de las tres Culturas and for centuries as Santiago Tlaltelolco, took place the last battle between the invading conquistadores led by Cortés and the brave defenders of the proud Great Tenochtitlán, commanded by young Cuauhtemoc, the last of the Aztec emperors. A plate commemorating this heroic defense and its profound impact contains an eloquent inscription which reads as follows in the English version:

"On the 13th of August, 1521
Heroically defended by Cuauhtemoc
Tlatelolco fell in the hands of Hernán Cortés
It was neither a victory nor a defeat
But only the painful birth of a Mestizo nation.
Which is the Mexico of to-day."

During Colonial times it was customary to keep native personal names adding to them those given by the Spaniards. Thus Santiago Tlaltelolco acquired the name of the Holy Patron of the Spanish army plus its aboriginal designation. Even to-day it is very common to find in Mexico place names incorporating the Spanish and the aboriginal designations such as San Andrés Totoltepec, San Miguel de Nepantla, San Juan Teotihuacán. They symbolize the union of the Spanish and the Indian, a fusion of their blood and culture. Another example: the great historian Fernando de Alva Ixtlixóxhitl has the name of a Spanish nobleman and that of the King of Texcoco.

Two paragraphs taken from May 6, 1966 issue of "The Cambridge Review" summarize some of the thought that I have tried to express concerning one of the most important characteristics of our Nation: a great reverence and respect for our historic heritage that goes hand in hand with an unshakable faith in our present and future. The first is a statement made by Gillian Jondorff, a scholarly British visitor: "One of the most exhilarating things about Mexico is that this is a country which cherishes its past without refusing its present." The second is a quotation from one of our young and vigorous writers, the novelist Carlos Fuentes: "The coexistence of all the historical levels is but an outward sign of a subconscious decision which one feels so strongly in the people of this land: All time must be maintained." And so it is. We are profoundly devoted to our yesterday, to our to-day, to our tomorrow.

It is inspiring to think that in 1536, only 15 years after the Conquest, one of the first centers for the education of the Indians, the "Colegio de Santa Cruz Tlaltelolco" was established precisely where a battle put an end to the Aztec empire. Educators of the stature of the famous chronicler of the Conquest, Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, who became rector of the young institution, taught Latin, rhetoric, aboriginal medicine, music, philosophy, etc., to eager Indian youths. As Mexico's Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Licenciado Antonio Carrillo Flores remarked in his address at the inaugural ceremony of the new building of our Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, numerous Indians educated in this College mastered three languages: Nahutal, Latin and Spanish—and were capable of teaching the Spanish language to the children born in New Spain of Spanish parents. Thus there were Indian graduates of Colonial schools who were able to teach the language of the Golden Age of Spanish literature and culture, to the Spaniards born in Mexico.

Don José Sarmiento y Valladares, Count of Moctezuma and Tula, Viceroy from 1695 to 1701, was a descendant of Emperor Moctezuma and at the same time was related to one of the most illustrious families of Spain. In the history of Empires there are a few examples like this that shows the rank that could be attained by a Mestizo in a Colonial society.

With this precedent in mind, it is easy to understand why the only differences that we recognize in Mexico are based only on education, never on blood or race. But I must admit that, unfortunately among those of our people who have not yet enjoyed the benefits of education, the aborigines are in the majority. But once they receive an education, there is no one in Mexico who will dare discriminate against them solely on account of their racial origin. And this is an attitude that has characterized our Mestizo society since its beginning in the XVI Century.

I have cited examples taken from the pages of Colonial history. Since we became a Republic, we have also produced towering Indian figures, like Benito Juárez, a full blooded Zapotect who achieved international reputation for his relentless struggle in the defense of our Republican institutions threatened by foreign invasion and civil war. In public service, as well as in literature, the arts, science the Church and the Army, and numerous other fields, no Mexican has been prevented from advancing to the highest positions because of his race.

Many lectures could be devoted to the unquestionable benefits that we derived from the Spanish Colonial system. I have barely mentioned some of the principal fields in which the Colonial authorities showed considerable vision and statesmanship. But in order to interpret later stages in our history, I must refer to two important aspects of the Spanish regime which continued to set back our institutional life even after we gained our independence. I refer to the political and economic monopolies that were characteristic of the period and had their origin in theories that were as erroneous as widespread at the time.

The political monopoly was enforced in the most despotic manner during the three centuries of the Spanish Colonial administration. The native inhabitants of New Spain were not permitted any participation in the government. This prohibition affected not only the aborigines, but also the Mestizos and even the Criollos, that is, persons who were born in what is now Mexico but whose parents had come directly from Spain. All government positions were assigned in Spain to "Peninsulares"—Spanish subjects from Spain itself. This situation created such resentment that it became the principal cause of the movement that culminated in independence. But even more serious as a cause of unrest was the absolute lack of political democratic institutions. The people were neither consulted nor given the opportunity to choose their rulers, or any member of the government no matter how low in rank.

The general policies and trends of the Colonial government were determined without taking into consideration the wishes and aspirations of the people. Obviously, this system of government left Mexico hardly prepared to adopt and operate the democratic institutions that gained so much prestige in the early XIX Century when we won our Independence. In connection with this important situation, our history textbooks often quote a famous proclamation issued by the Marqués de Croix, who was Viceroy at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits (1767). This event gave rise to disturbances and political unrest because of public expressions of discontent. The Viceroy addressed the people in the following terms: "Once for all, I must remind you that it is necessary for the people to know that they were born to keep silence and to obey, not to express opinions on important governmental affairs." The people protested against such an unjust attitude and demanded freedom from the Spanish rule.

[1] Angel María Garibay.—Historia de la Literatura Náhuatl. 1953, volume I, p. 256.

[2] Angel Maria Garibay.—Historia de la Literatura Náhuatl. 1953. Volume I. p. 245.

After 11 years of bitter struggle our political independence was won in 1821.

As to the economic monopoly, the architects of the Spanish economy of the Colonial period based their blueprints for economic progress on the accumulation of riches, particularly precious metals. According to their theories, the country that had the most gold was the most prosperous. Moreover, they considered that the establishment of industries in the colonies constituted a danger for such production in Spain itself. Thus, in line with a policy that was both oversimplified and erroneous, industrial activities that might have permitted the transformation of raw materials obtained in our country into industrial products were strictly prohibited.

As a result of the determination of the Crown to spare no effort in order to extract the greatest volume of precious metals from the sub-soil, there was organized in Mexico an important mining industry, and one of the most significant institutions for the study of mineralogy and allied sciences was established in 1792. The first director of this notable scientific institution was Don Fausto de Elhuyar y de Zubice, a man of international reputation in European scientific circles, who four years before had arrived in New Spain to head all activities pertaining to the promotion of mining in the country. As Director of the Royal Corps of Mining and a professional in his field, it was natural that he should have planned a center for the training of experts in all aspects of the mining industry.

The importance of the Colegio de Mineria—College of Mines—founded by Elhuyar, may be gauged by the fact that it was there that Baron Von Humboldt gave lectures, talked with scholars such as Elhuyar and Del Rio, and found one of the most dependable sources of information for his famous "Political Essay on New Spain". And it could not be otherwise, for Elhuyar, who in cooperation with his brother had discovered in 1783 a new metal called "Wolframite", the chief ore of tungsten, had succeeded in attracting to the Colegio scientists of the stature of Don Andres Manuel del Rio, who had studied in Germany, where he became a personal friend of Baron Alexander Von Humboldt. Del Rio's name figures in the annals of science as the finder, in 1801, of a mineral called by him "eritrone", which was re-discovered in Sweden in 1830, and named "Vanadium".

Another famous name in the history of mining in Mexico is that of Bartolome Medina who landed on our shores in 1554 and invented a method of processing silver that greatly facilitated and stimulated the production of that metal not only in Mexico but also in Peru. This occurred at a time when chemistry in Europe was just beginning to emerge as a science free from alchemical limitations.

A great impulse was given to mining by the Spanish Crown, but the same cannot be said of other types of industrial development which, as a whole, was not permitted. The promotion of the mining industry was considered indispensable because it served to provide the metropolis with the rich metals which were considered the basic elements of its economy. The Colonies were obliged to send their raw materials to Spain where they were processed. Some of them returned to America in the shape of consumers' goods of various types. Also prohibited was the production in the Colonies of any articles that might compete with those exported by the metropolis. In the Spanish colonies it was not permitted to cultivate the grapevine, the white mulberry tree, and the olive tree, for fear that the wine, silk and oil industries of Spain might be harmed through competition. Such a limitation was a serious impediment to the industrial advancement of New Spain.

After the consummation of its political independence, Mexico was obliged to come to grips with two tremendous problems: the political reorganization and the economic development of a young and inexperienced Republic. Even more important than these gigantic tasks was that of meeting a serious social problem consisting of class differences based upon one of the most unjust systems of land distribution ever devised. Later generations were faced with the necessity of setting the foundations for a modern, democratic state: economic integration of the country and social development for the direct benefit of the people.

These challenges have been met. The liberal Revolution of 1857, established the federal form of government and the most suited to our needs and purposes and brought about the separation of Church and State. In our own time, the social Revolution of 1910 set the firm bases of the economic and industrial development of the country, and opened the way for a social transformation favorable to the people because it declared war on ignorance, poverty and disease as enemies of our land.

Contemporary history of Mexico cannot disassociate itself from three revolutionary movements: The Revolution of Independence (1810–1821), the liberal Revolution (1857–1867) and the socioeconomic Revolution (1910 to this date).

The Independence gave us political liberty with a sense of equality and underlined the unjust bases of the existing social structure. As a reaction against Colonial centralism, the liberal movement definitively instituted the Federal Republic and, in the political order, established the separation between Church and State together with the nationalization of ecclesiastical properties.

The socioeconomic Revolution of 1910 endeavoured to reach industrial integration of the country, to exploit in the benefit of Mexico its natural wealth, with the purpose of offering to all Mexicans a level of education, a social well-being and an economic income in keeping with human dignity, so as to eliminate old injustice. This is the most ambitious and most necessary aspiration of contemporary Mexico.

In the economic order, one of the outstanding reforms has doubtless been the agrarian policy of Mexico. More than 50 years ago began in my country what is now known as the Land Reform. The Revolution of 1910 had a predominantly agrarian tone. The peasants, pigeonholed and lacking in liberty had borne from generation to generation the burdens of accumulating debts due to the system of "tiendas de raya" (Hacienda stores); they were handled by the landlord as mere instruments of slavery and they were nevertheless the social class that made the Revolution and that suffered the greatest losses in the battlefield.

By virtue of the Law of January 6, 1915, even before the promulgation of the Constitution of 1917, the first legal outlines were drafted for the destruction of the feudal large landholdings. The slogan of the oppressed people is clearly revealed by their shout: "land and liberty". It was indispensable for them to have the opportunity to work a piece of rural land property, that would allow them to breathe the air of freedom. In our agrarian centers of the Republic such slogans as: "exploit land and not man", may be read. They represent popular aspirations. The primary economic aspiration: "bread for all" expresses another of the Revolutionary doctrines.

Since 1915, amidst full armed struggle and in the middle of a torment of protests both from within and without the country, agrarian distribution was started in favor of the triumphant peasant. In Mexico, the large landholders united their efforts against the agrarian policy of the Revolution. Abroad, with an incredible unanimity we were condemned by the countries of all continents. Within an anguishing atmosphere of internal and international struggle, Mexico—not without stumble—began its most important and profound social and economic transformation in its history. The burdens of centuries of servitude hung heavily upon the Revolution, a servitude through which our peasant was considered as mere merchandise on the international medium, the remaining fruit of the individual selfishness of the XIX Century, when the redeeming sense of land reform—so much in vogue today—was not yet understood.

Each day that passes more merit is acknowledged to the Mexican agrarian policy. Five years ago, at Punta del Este, land reform for the good of the people was established as the basis for economic development and as one of the instruments for redistribution of wealth in Latin America, there where everything has been concentration in the hands of a few. At that time, Mexico had already lived half a century of land distribution.

This subject is even now a passionate one. On May 1966, Senator Robert Kennedy presented a study of Latin America before the Senate, entitled "The Alliance for Progress: Symbol and Substance." In the third chapter of his document, "Land Reform", while inviting the Latin American countries to study the convenience of an agrarian policy in favor of the distribution of land among their peasants, Senator Kennedy made only one very unfortunate reference to Mexico that does not correspond to the truth. In fact, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 8, page 10094, he states: ". . . It would be tragic if we were now to repeat the history of land reform in Mexico, where much land distributed in the 1920's was sold off to large holders within 20 years."

While presenting his study in the Senate, Senator Kennedy was interrupted by various comments. In one of them, Senator Proxmire, supporting the wrong statement of Senator Kennedy, said: "I believe it is most helpful that the Senator referred to what happened in Mexico. There was land distribution, but in a few years the land was repurchased by large estates." (As recorded in the text of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 8, p. 10096.) That was all that was mentioned about the agrarian reform of my country. It is entirely contrary to the truth.

If you only consider the following official statistics you will be able to note the error committed by Senators Kennedy and Proxmire. From 1915 to 1920, President Venustiano Carranza distributed 132,000 hectares;[3] Adolfo de la Huerta, President from May to November 1920, distributed 34,000; Alvaro Obregón (1920–1924), 971,000; Plutarco Elias-Calles (1924–1928), 3.088,000; Emilio Portes-Gil (1928–1930), 1.173,000; Pascual Ortiz-Rubio (1930–1932), 1.469,000; Abelardo Rodríguez (1932–1934), 799,000; Lázaro Cárdenas (1934–1940), distributed more than twice the surface partitioned to that date, handing over to the peasants 17.890,000 hectares; in the regime of Manuel Avila-Camacho (1940–1946), 5.519,000 hectares were distributed; President Miguel Alemán-Valdés (1946–1952), 3.845,000 hectares; Adolfo Ruiz-Cortines (1952–1958), 3.119,000; Adolfo López-Mateos (1958–1964), 16.004,000. In all, up to 1964, 54.123,000 hectares have been distributed.[4]

These data are irrefutable. At the beginning of the Revolution, Mexican arable land was in the hands of 830 families. Ninety seven per cent of the land belonged to the "Hacienda" (large landholdings), two per cent comprised small properties and only

[3] 1 hectare equals 2.471 acres.

[4] Source: Nacional Financiera, S.A.—"La Economía Mexicana en Cifras", 1965, page 49.

one per cent belonged to the people. There were three and a half million farm workers and farmers.

With the Revolution, the latifundia was abolished. Since 1915 to 1964, 54.000,000 hectares have been distributed benefiting 2.300,000 heads of family in the *ejidos*, and there are more than a million small proprietors. Thus, old farm workers of large landholdings are now proprietors. It is not then legitimate to assure that what was distributed in the 1920's has come back to large landholdings and that there is no agrarian reform in Mexico.

Permit me to underline the following fact: arable land at the beginning of the Mexican Revolution was only 10% of the total Mexican territory. Thanks to dams and to irrigation and ground-water recovery projects, that surface has been increased to 19%.

Let us examine some of the examples of field productivity that constitute the principal proof and clear justification of the agrarian policy of Mexico.

From 1901 to 1910, 2.300,000 tons of corn were produced annually, as an average. From 1961 to 1965 that same average production rose to 6.750,000 tons. Beans: the average yearly production from 1901 to 1910 was 165,000 tons. From 1961 to 1965 the yearly average production for this grain rose to 700,000 tons. While during the first ten years of this century we produced only an average of 230,000 bales of cotton, from 1961 to 1965 that same average production rose to 2.200,000 bales. Wheat increased from 300,000 tons a year during the first ten years of this century to 1.555,000 tons, from 1961 to 1965. From 106,000 tons yearly average production from 1901 to 1910 sugar increased to 1.700,000 tons from 1961 to 1965. In coffee, before the Revolution, we produced some 50,000 tons; we now produce 130,000 tons. Tomato: before the Revolution we produced 8,600 tons, and now the production is 452,000 tons. From 1961 to 1965, Mexico was the second cotton exporter with an export of 1.6 million bales as a yearly average. In the 1965–1966 season Mexico exported 2.118,000 bales and the United States, the first cotton exporter 2.942,000 bales. These increases have been due to the combined efforts of the *ejidatarios* and small proprietors, made possible through Government land investments and by the undisputable triumph of the Revolution of 1910.

Agrarian reform is not merely attained by the distribution of land. Education of the peasant is indispensable as are the use of fertilizers, insecticides, and other modern means of land exploitation that require modern machinery and, naturally, a source of credit.

In a new experiment and for the first time in this continent, funds from the BID and AID in favor of the *ejidatarios* and small proprietors are being employed in Mexico with success. Recent information from the Bank of Mexico on the "Warranty Development Fund for Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Cattle Rising and Aviculture", is as follows: during the operation of this fund, from 1956–1966, loans have been made in the amount of 2.686.700,000 pesos. Through these loans 21,376 *ejidatarios* and 56,575 small proprietors have been benefited.

From the total amount of the above mentioned loans, 2.104.400,000 pesos came from national resources, 450.100,000 pesos from the Alliance for Progress and 131.600,000 pesos from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The money has been employed to increase productivity for the construction of irrigation projects, on land leveling operations, on the creation of pasture grounds, and for the purchase of machinery, better livestock, etc.

It is convenient to underline here the fact that the program of the Alliance for Progress is dedicated to ejidatarios and small producers of modest income. Frequently, several of them form a group in order to receive credits destined to a project of common use.

Money from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is loaned to peasants with a greater economic capacity. Technical counsel given in virtue of these financial operations is very important.

In spite of the obstacles that the Mexican agrarian policy may have had to face, the information on the results obtained is eloquently in favor of the economic and social transformation sought.

This agrarian policy lives on in the President Diaz-Ordaz regime, supported by the following information: in 21 months of his government, 1,000 presidential resolutions have been taken; 9,157 peasants have been benefited and 4.022,110 hectares have been distributed.

Selling the land, as is supposed by Senator Kennedy, is an act contrary to law and, therefore, is mandatorily null and void under the law. Whoever has bought *ejidos* does not hold a legal title. On the other hand, the distribution of great landholdings is an obvious fact, known to all.

Thanks to the Mexican agrarian policy, the economic progress of the country has been attained. Political organization of the peasants in Mexico is very strong. They have Senators and Representatives in the National Congress. One of the Ministries of the Government is in charge of continuing the agrarian policy of the Revolution.

The World Bank, in a recent publication "The World Bank Group in Mexico", January 1967, states:

"Mexico's farms produce 95% of its food requirements and more than half the value of its exports, while they absorbed only 52% of the labor force in 1964 compared with 58% in 1950."

"These results must be viewed against the background of a high population growth rate, a rising level of per capita food consumption, and the fact that only 16%"—(I believe it to be 19%)—, "of the country's land area is suitable for farming and much of it lacks adequate water. The key has been an intensive investment program which doubled the irrigated area between 1950 and 1962 and embraced a total of 10 million irrigated acres by 1966. In recent years, the government has also been giving emphasis to the rehabilitation and expansion of existing irrigation systems."

It describes the general situation in my country as follows:

"In two decades, Mexico has more than tripled its output of goods and services and raised the real per capita income of its people by three quarters, despite one of the world's highest rates of population increase."

"With political and financial stability and effectively administered investment programs in the principal sectiors of the economy and in education, Mexico has maintained a high and relatively steady rate of economic growth throughout most of the postwar period."

It is regrettable that in Senator Kennedy's document the only reference to the Mexican agrarian reform should have been so unfortunate. The information mentioned above proves the existence of an altogether different situation that that which he presented with the support of Senator Proxmire. It is to be hoped that, as a result of the real information concerning Mexican agrarian policy, the document of Senator Kennedy will be corrected so as to convey a clear idea of what has actually happened in Mexico concerning this matter.

The XIX International Olympic Games will take place in Mexico City in the fall of 1968. Once again, all the nations of the world, irrespective of race, religion, or political orientation, will compete for victory on the basis of strict equality. It will be an occasion for the rekindling of the spirit of friendship and understanding among all peoples.

At that time we will remember the enthusiasm of the athletes that met in Japan and the good fellowship that was generated by the Olympic gathering among the participating nations. On occasions such as this, humanity enjoys a moment of peace and man proves that he is prepared to live in a peaceful and orderly manner. Thus, each athletic victory is marked by sincere recognition of the effort displayed by the winner as well as by mutual respect. Old differences are forgotten and angry disputes, bitter problems, and the controversies that cast a shadow on the world of our time, are set aside.

The Olympic Games are, once more, a symbol of the unity of mankind and of a common hope for a peaceful co-existence. The truth is that our generation, unlike any other in the past, must learn how to live side by side on peaceful terms with all peoples. Modern systems of communications have done away with distance and in a world inhabited by peoples representing different cultural tradition and ways of life, it is essential to know how to co-exist in order to assure the survival of the human race.

The basis of co-existence is firmly rooted in the indispensable principle of mutual respect. It is necessary to realize and accept the fact that the peoples of different parts of the world are not alike, and thus the principle of mutual respect places us under obligation to also respect the principle of self-determination. Every human being has the inalienable right to determine the direction of his life within the framework of reciprocal respect with his fellow-men.

Taking advantage of a historic opportunity, Mexico is making a determined effort to organize the Olympic Games along the lines which characterized them in modern times and will also, as was the case in ancient Greece, enrich the program with a series of major cultural events. Accordingly, all participating countries will be invited to exhibit the most magnificent examples of their art, including the work of contemporary folk artists. The outstanding composers, folk musicians, singers and dancers, will have equal opportunity to add lustre and enchantment to a fascinating meeting of exponents of cultural contributions of the peoples from all the corners of the globe. Thus, the noble cultural tradition of the Olympic Games will be restored, and Mexico will offer the double attraction of athletic and cultural events.

The lighted ancestral Olympic torch, carried all the way from Athens, will be placed on top of the majestic Pyramid of the Sun in San Juan Teotihuacán. Gathered in the magnificent "Valley of the Gods", near Mexico City, visitors and public from all parts of the world will witness the arrival of the torch which will burn during the Olympic Games.

It is well to recall that in pre-Hispanic times, on a site not far from the Pyramid of the Sun known as the Cerro de la Estrella (Hill of the Star), took place the most impressive ceremony of antiquity: the revival of the Sacred Fire. Every 52 years,—a century according to the Aztec Calendar—fires were extinguished in all dwellings. The people congregated around the hill, and at midnight, when the priests observed that the Seven Pleaiades did not interrupt their course, they considered that life was assured for at least another cycle of 52 years. According to ancestral beliefs, the end of the world was sure to come when on one of those occasions, the Pleaiades would not proceed on their course.

The solemnity of such outlook imposed the necessity of reflection and penance before the rekindling of the Sacred Fire. Fire is a symbol of life and in the Valley of Mexico, at midnight, on the Cerro de la Estrella, it

was revived every fifty two years. With flint and touchwood it was lighted in the most complete darkness and absolute silence. The rekindling fire multiplied itself, and there were thousands of fantastic lights to brighten the darkness, as each inhabitant carried home his torch. The beauty of the ceremony and its profound significance marked it as one of the most important events in the pre-Columbian world.

In our time, in the same Valley of Mexico, in the archaeological city of San Juan Teotihuacán, atop the Pyramid of the Sun, next year we will witness the arrival of the symbol of Greek culture: the Fire of Athens, where the Olympic Games originated as a symbol of peace.

Let us hope that the revival of the Olympic Torch on the Pyramid of the Sun will symbolize peace among men and survival of mankind.

EDUCATION BILLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues are about to try one of the fastest end runs in recent legislative history. On the surface their education bill, H.R. 8983, seems to provide for a general kind of aid to education which the Congress has, heretofore, not legislated. But the simplicity of their approach covers up some far-reaching effects on educational capabilities of local educational agencies. And we ought to look at those effects, because in my opinion they would be disastrous for educational advancement in this country.

The disparities between the fiscal year 1969 amounts under H.R. 8983 and those under the committee bill, H.R. 7819, are shocking. For example, using authorization figures for both bills, New York State gets $122 million less under the Republican substitute than it would under H.R. 7819. Mississippi's allocation decreases under the Quie substitute, from $99.6 million to $52 million. Most southern and border States, in fact, receive much greater amounts under the committee bill than under the proposed Republican alternative.

North Carolina would get $101 million under the Republican bill, but $150 million under the committee bill.

Alabama would receive $75 million under the Quie substitute and $107 million under the committee bill.

Arkansas would obtain $39 million under H.R. 8983 and $66 million under the committee bill.

Georgia would increase from $88 million under the Republican bill to $118 million under the committee bill.

Kentucky would receive only $63 million under the Republican measure, but $87 million under the committee bill.

Similar decreases under the Quie substitute are found in Louisiana, a loss of $19 million; South Carolina, down $33 million; Tennessee, $29 million; Virginia, $13 million; and the District of Columbia, a loss of $6 million. In my own State of Oklahoma there will be a loss of $7.5 million.

These are the States with the greatest need for financial assistance in education. Yet the Republican bill would deny them these resources. The effect of the Republican formula is directly contrary, in fact, to the gentleman from Minnesota's own amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last year. That amendment would have provided for use of the national per pupil expenditure by those States that fell below the average.

In addition, the Republican formula does not guarantee that within each State, school districts with low fiscal capacity will receive a greater than average share of funds. More importantly, the Republican proposal fails to assure that the funds will be used to meet the extra costs associated with the education of children of poverty.

This amendment marks the end of the national priority which the Congress has established in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—to meet the special needs of poor children in our midst who have been deprived of equal educational opportunities. In turning away from this fundamental principle, we shall be turning away from those deprived children who represent a great national source of human potential.

Mr. Speaker, last week Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner released a comprehensive statement on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I include Secretary Gardner's statement in the RECORD at this point:

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

The substitute that Representative Albert Quie has proposed for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 could, if enacted, undermine and destroy much that the Congress and the Administration have jointly achieved in recent educational legislation.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which is now bringing new skills and opportunities to eight million disadvantaged children and new hope and potentialities to every school district in the Nation, would be wiped out.

The proposal by Mr. Quie which threatens to produce this disastrous result has never been considered in Committee, has never been made the subject of hearings, and has been hastily revised three or four times within the past three weeks.

In place of the carefully considered, broad categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—categories which the Congress deems to be in the national interest—the Quie substitute would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs. In the guise of conferring greater freedom on American education, it would scatter Federal financial assistance in such a manner that the American taxpayer would likely receive little for his money.

It would take away Federal assistance from States which most need the aid because of their low economic capabilities and high concentration of educationally deprived children. The Southern and border States would lose $371 million, while the great cities of New York, California and Illinois would also suffer substantial cuts in Federal assistance.

Carefully defined and selected targets for educational improvement, now specified as beneficiaries of the ESEA, would suffer. Programs for the children of migrant workers, for foster children, for children in institutions for the handicapped, neglected or delinquent, children in the Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools, and children in the Territories of the United States would all suffer.

The Quie substitute cannot guarantee that Federal aid will be concentrated in places and in amounts necessary to do the job, rather than merely be dissipated in wide areas and for a wide variety of second-priority activities. It cannot guarantee, for example, that the cities, so sorely in need of Federal assistance, will receive their fair share of aid.

And it is a very unsure instrument for dealing with the gravest problem facing our nation today—the adequate education of children of the slums and rural depressed areas.

Even more serious is the fact that the Quie substitute poses a grave threat to the consensus that was put together with such difficulty in 1965 when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act came into being. For years all forward-looking Americans had known that the Federal Government must eventually provide large-scale support for education—but for years, literally decades, the accomplishment was frustrated by dissension over several key issues, chief among them the Church-State question.

The Quie substitute strikes at the very heart of that consensus, and we are already hearing the return of the old dissension and divisiveness. If it bursts out in full fury, we shall have neither the present Act nor the Quie substitute. We'll find ourselves right back where we were two years ago.

Some proponents of the Quie substitute say it offers flexibility and freedom of decision to the States in place of the narrow categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is misleading in the extreme. The categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are anything but narrow. They are very broad and flexible. Its major titles contain the broadest and most permissive authorizations in American legislative history to strengthen the State departments of education, to stimulate educational expansion and innovation, to acquire the latest and best instructional materials, and, especially, to focus on the problems of educationally disadvantaged children, wherever they may be found, but particularly in our great urban complexes and sparsely populated rural counties.

No one in the Executive Branch or in the Congress has spoken or worked more consistently than I for helping the States to achieve greater flexibility and initiative in administering Federal programs. In the Partnership for Health legislation which we proposed and the Congress passed last year we combined 15 narrow categorical aid programs. In our Education Professions Development bill this year we would replace numerous fragmented training authorities with one comprehensive and flexible training program.

At the same time, I believe that Federal dollars should in broad terms be directed to targets selected by the elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States. They speak for the States and they judge the needs of the States against a background of national priorities.

While we must do everything within our power to strengthen the States—and no Administration has done more than this one to build strength in the State departments of education—I believe that as long as Federal resources in the field of education are limited, they should be used primarily for the elimination of those educational problems which the Congress identifies as the greatest obstacle to the growth and development of our Nation.

COORDINATED BARGAINING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, America's trade unions initiated a new kind of collective bargaining last year—coordinated bargaining. Eleven AFL–CIO unions, in an effort to sit down at the bargaining table on a more equal basis with two of the Nation's largest corporations, General Electric and Westinghouse, joined together in working out and presenting their wage and benefit demands.

This historic effort ended a long period in which the huge companies were able to play off one union against the other. The 11 unions which joined together in this new unity were the Auto Workers, the Carpenters, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Flint Glass Workers, Allied Industrial Workers, the Machinists, the Plumbers and Pipe Fitters, Sheet Metal Workers, Steelworkers, and the Technical Engineers.

David Lasser, assistant to the president of one of the unions, the International Union of Electrical Workers, wrote a report on this new American labor development, entitled "A Victory for Coordinated Bargaining," for the American Federationist, monthly magazine published by the AFL–CIO. Mr. Lasser was chairman of the steering committee of the 11-union committee on collective bargaining.

For the information of all of us, I include Mr. Lasser's article in the RECORD at this point:

A VICTORY FOR COORDINATED BARGAINING

(By David Lasser)

When negotiations were concluded between 11 AFL–CIO unions and General Electric and Westinghouse, the first phase of labor's most ambitious effort at coordinated bargaining was completed.

Involving nearly 200,000 employees of these two companies, this effort has had a great impact upon coordinated bargaining developments and may influence the future character of labor-management relations in the United States.

The mainspring for the 1966 developments lay in the background and experiences of the 11 unions in the electrical manufacturing industry over the past decade.

There is no other major industry where bargaining rights are fragmented among so many unions. GE boasts, in fact, that it deals with "100-odd unions." Further, the majority of the bargaining units deal on a local basis with the local managements.

The International Union of Electrical Workers has about 120,000, or 60 percent, of the coordinated 11-union membership. The other 10 unions have about 80,000. There are small AFL–CIO units in these companies which are not in the 11-union group, while other small units are outside the AFL–CIO.

This situation was made to order for corporations intent upon "divide and rule."

GE's policy was to keep the unions weak, divided and discredited. "One and only one offer" was made simultaneously to all unions (and to non-union employes). Relentless drives were made to secure acceptances by the weakest of the bargaining units and then to undermine the resistance of any holdouts.

This company policy was aided by staggered expiration dates of various contracts, which had the effect of preventing a massing of inter-union strength.

While not pursuing its policy in such a blatant manner, Westinghouse faithfully followed the GE bargaining programs and main techniques.

Previous efforts had been made, at least by the larger unions, to coordinate bargaining goals and strategy. But the management forces defeated them all, making concessions on some key local issues to break away important units, while maintaining constant pressure on the rest.

GE in particular took every opportunity to exploit old suspicions and divisions among the unions and even within them. Company negotiators in one city often gave false reports on the actions of another local in a city far away. Too often these reports were believed, for there was no easy way to check them.

The results for GE-Westinghouse workers were disastrous. Yearly wage increases and a cost-of-living escalator were lost in 1960 negotiations. Three years later, already-weak arbitration clauses were further emasculated. Intensive company campaigns were pressed for the downward reclassification of job rates, an end to incentive bonuses and institution of speedups. Strikes over unsettled grievances were frequent.

The total six-year wage gain from 1960 was only 10 to 12 percent, although living costs alone rose 9½ percent over the same period. Package gains—wages and fringes combined—amounted to only 6.6 cents an hour each year in GE and a mere 5.6 cents in Westinghouse. In comparable industries, the annual hourly increase was nearly double—10 to 14 cents an hour.

Meanwhile, manhour productivity rose better than 5 percent a year and GE and Westinghouse profits nearly doubled.

The transformation that took place in 1966, resulting in vastly improved contracts, was achieved in a single year of successful coordinated bargaining. But a number of major problems, some of them unique, first had to be met and overcome.

1. BUILDING THE STRUCTURE

There was sober recognition by the participating unions that their undertaking involved a challenge to one of the major citadels of anti-union activity in the United States—General Electric.

This company had loudly proclaimed "victories" over the unions in the past 10 years and had berated other companies for yielding to: "inflationary" and "unsound" settlements.

A new failure would not only fix GE and Westinghouse more firmly on their course, but could lead to defeatism among the employes. And this could have repercussions elsewhere in the labor-management field.

It was also recognized that an adequate organizational apparatus and the full support of the labor movement were essential.

Accordingly, AFL–CIO President George Meany and the presidents of the coordinating unions created a Committee on Collective Bargaining to act on major policies and to coordinate the commitment of the full strength of the trade union movement.

A Steering Committee, composed of leaders of each union, was set up as the administrative arm of the CCB. The Steering Committee, in turn, created a series of subcommittees on economics, collective bargaining programs, pensions and insurance, publicity and education and on law.

Members of the Steering Committee acted as chairmen of the subcommittees. About 50 union officials were involved in these committees. They had a mission and a timetable.

This placed heavy demands on some unions whose interests in GE and Westinghouse were marginal to their whole range of activities. For example, only about 5,000 of the Auto Workers' 1.3 million members are employed by GE. While the percentage of GE and Westinghouse membership is larger for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the Machinists, their major collective bargaining concerns lie elsewhere. For the other eight unions—except the American Federation of Technical Engineers—the proportion of membership was even less.

Yet, by providing staff and resources for the many activities, these unions made a contribution well beyond their direct interest. They made it because they recognized fully the urgent need to challenge these companies to carry on their bargaining in good faith.

No votes were taken in committees since unanimous agreement on all major activities was required. Where differences inevitably arose, they were thrashed out until a consensus developed.

This policy, freely publicized, was used by GE to try to alarm IUE members that other unions might "lock them" into positions not in accord with their interest. In turn, it warned the other unions that the "dominance" of IUE would jeopardize their ability to reach agreements based on their local needs. This strategy failed because the CCB was prepared to meet it.

Meany acted as chairman of the CCB and gave the movement his active support, participating as a major speaker at national conferences, signing statements and securing the enthusiastic endorsement of the AFL–CIO Executive Council and the AFL–CIO convention.

A member of the AFL–CIO public relations staff was assigned to the CCB and the full resources of AFL–CIO departments were made available.

At the first coordinated national conference on March 15, 1966, Many said:

"What you are doing here is very simple and very sensible . . . you are banding together to cooperate with each other for your mutual aims.

"I not only see nothing wrong with that, I see everything right with it. And I believe that the community will see nothing wrong with it. And corporations who mean to bargain in good faith should see nothing wrong with it, either."

Meany appeared again at the critical September 28 conference a few days before the GE deadline and reiterated full support should a crisis occur. He threw labor's weight against the effort of government officials to move on October 1 for a general Taft-Hartley injunction and later chaired the CCB meeting that approved the GE national settlement.

A further practical demonstration of this support came in the offer to IUE of an $8 million loan, with more funds available if needed.

The 1965 convention of the Industrial Union Department also pledged full support and gave unstintingly of technical aid and other assistance.

Thus it became clear that this was no mere ritualistic procedure but a deep commitment, laying on the line the prestige and resources of the entire labor movement.

2. DEVELOPING A BARGAINING PROGRAM

Bargaining with GE and Westinghouse is actually carried on at three levels. IUE, having national agreements with both companies, and the IBEW, with a national agreement for part of its membership in Westinghouse, bargain on national issues. Additional bargaining is carried on by locals on supplements.

The local units of the rest of the unions (and most of the IBEW) bargain out local agreements covering the same issues as both the local and national bargaining where chainwide agreements exist.

To cope with this complex structure, the CCB decided to adopt "national bargaining goals," consisting of the major economic items and a number of non-economic issues where most of the contracts were uniform.

By concentrating on these goals, leaving each union free to pursue additional aims, there could be a focus around which coordination could take place.

Such a program was developed, approved on March 15 and widely circulated to the membership and the public. It called basically for a return to annual wage increases to reflect the increases in productivity; restoration of a cost-of-living escalator; action to eliminate area wage differentials; improvements in pensions, insurance, holidays, and vacations; a better layoff income plan; improved employment security provisions; and action on a number of key contract areas such as arbitration, union shop and subcontracting.

These were matters that had been the subject of previous negotiations, had developed the keenest interest on the part of the membership and were likely to create the firmest support in dealing with the companies.

It is significant that both companies, when they finally made offers, stressed that the terms were in response to the proposals put forward by the unions.

3. RALLYING THE MEMBERSHIP

The General Electric bargaining strategy was based on winning over the union membership.

GE has always looked on bargaining committees as only a legal mechanism to make offers and receive acceptances. Massive propaganda campaigns are mounted to swamp the communities and smash opposition to its "one and only one offer."

Thus, unless the membership could be convinced that the programs of the coordinated group were worthy of full support, labor unity could fall apart in a crisis.

The first step called on the 200 local unions to send delegates to the national conference in Washington March 15 to develop and to ratify the national bargaining goals.

Some 300 delegates attended. From them came a deep and fervent enthusiasm that astounded even the national leadership.

The dozens of local union officers who spoke made clear that—in their view—they at last had an instrument to challenge the arrogance of the companies.

The national bargaining goals and a resolution on unity, adopted at the conference, set the sights for the future.

The unity resolution pledged: "Today, we intend to confront the company-wide policies with a union-wide program." The delegates "pledged to each other our mutual cooperation, our mutual understanding, our mutual support. It is our conviction that if we do stand together, the managers of these corporations will recognize that their best policy is to bargain in good faith toward a just and adequate settlement."

These were words. There was now the job of involving the rank and file members and their families.

A newspaper, Unity, was published monthly and sent directly to the members. Distributed also were thousands of copies of the program, the unity statement, economic material justifying the union demands and suggestions on countering company propaganda.

Seventeen inter-union meetings were held during May and June in cities across the country to bring the issues to the grass roots and involve the local stewards. These meetings required each union to supply skilled staff to arrange programs, develop attendance, participate, handle the meetings, develop publicity and carry out other tasks.

Nearly 3,000 local officials attended these meetings and confirmed the conviction that there existed a powerful determination to stand together for real collective bargaining and an adequate contract in 1966.

One of the major requests raised in the grass roots meetings was for a rapid exchange of information on developments at the hundreds of bargaining tables. All too frequently in the past, the companies utilized their network of teletype machines to spread false and misleading stories on bargaining developments. This led not only to confusion but also, at times, to dismay.

Seventeen regional coordinators were, therefore, appointed from the unions to work on a full-time basis, with teletypes linking them with coordinating headquarters in Washington and the key national negotiation centers (New York for GE and Pittsburgh for Westinghouse). Bargaining developments, company statements, local union actions, were gathered by the coordinators, fed into Washington, then digested and disseminated back to the coordinators and through them to locals.

The complicated nature of the negotiations made this system essential—and the system worked. False rumors were scotched and misleading statements were corrected. News was distributed as fast—or faster—than GE could do it. Above all, the membership had confidence that they now had information to match that put out by the companies. In fact, so efficient and so accurate was the CCB system that some local company officials relied on our news reports for a correct picture of what was taking place.

Another question raised at the grass roots meetings was this: "Are we going to stick together?" Here again, the communications network helped provide the answer.

Naturally, the decision on each settlement lay in the hands of the responsible unions. What was done in concert could be only the result of voluntary decisions. But with respect to local negotiations there were no secrets, either.

The communications network was well established by the time GE, in mid-September, finally announced its "one and only one offer."

Regional coordinators, and through them the local membership, swiftly learned not only the terms of the offer, but how it compared with the national bargaining goals, step by step.

A special issue of Unity was produced and distributed.

One fact was immediately apparent and another became clear very soon.

First, the GE offer was vastly better than the company had predicted six months earlier. Not only was the wage offer in excess of the then-current "guidelines" (which GE had earlier described as too generous), but it also included substantial improvements in pensions, insurance and other fringe terms which legally were not open for bargaining until 1968. There is not the slightest doubt that the unbroken front of the CCB unions was responsible.

Second, in making this much better but still inadequate offer, GE's apparent objective was to preserve its "one and one only" tradition. This offer was intended as its only offer.

As the termination date of most GE contracts neared, CCB decided to call another national conference. Each bargaining unit was asked to poll its own membership on the crucial questions—to accept GE's offer, to authorize a strike or simply to continue bargaining. Each was requested to report to the conference on September 28.

Meanwhile, a revised set of national goals, whittled down to eight issues, was prepared for submission to the conference. These represented an earnest effort to react realistically to the GE offer.

The second conference was even more successful than the first. A unanimous conference statement said:

"We want a settlement, not a strike. But we want to make it clear to GE that the offer now before us is not acceptable; and that we do not accept the Boulware philosophy that it cannot be improved.

"It must be improved—by midnight, October 2."

The conference also authorized a special "action committee" of the CCB "to evaluate any responsible and responsive offers made by GE in the next four days and to make appropriate recommendations."

Thus was created a unanimous determination by the membership of 11 unions to stand firm. If no acceptable agreement was reached by October 2, chainwide strikes would shut down 90 percent of the GE plants.

4. COORDINATION OF BARGAINING

Preceding sections have brought the story up to the October 2 deadline. Now let's go back about six months and see what was going on at the bargaining table.

One of the basic aims of the coalition was to secure coordination at the bargaining table itself. After all, on most major issues the contracts were similar. Company offers were generally identical on economic issues and most important contract matters.

Early in 1966, several opportunities were offered to try out the coordinated approach.

For example, both companies were utilizing the 1965 Social Security Act changes to reduce pensions to many employes. The passage of Medicare had raised problems concerning the benefits of retired employes.

A second opportunity arose from an offer by GE to each bargaining group to join management representatives in prenegotiation subcommittees to discuss some of the important bargaining issues of 1966.

The Steering Committee requested meetings to discuss both these matters. Both requests were rejected by the companies.

A third opportunity arose from GE's attitude toward coalition itself.

GE at first had scorned the united effort, predicting it would surely fail, like others before it.

As it ruefully said later: "Until recently, the coalition seemed to be just so much playacting on a far off stage."

However, as coalition gained momentum, GE raised cries of alarm that labor was "intent on crisis bargaining to force a strike in the hope of getting the settlement dictated in Washington."

Both companies stated their determination to adhere to the traditional bargaining, dealing only with the usual national or local units.

Following the March 15 conference, a letter to the president of each company, signed by the presidents of the coordinating unions, requested an informal meeting to stop the drift toward crisis.

This request was also rejected.

Since joint meetings were clearly not possible, IUE wrote to GE on April 13, saying it would abandon any further requests.

The letter proposed a meeting with GE to attempt to resolve the overhanging dispute over GE's projected subcommittees and determine if adequate ground rules could be negotiated.

The company had insisted that these meetings consider only a few of the economic issues at stake in 1966 and that both parties be free to publicize any discussions. The unions wanted to discuss all issues and prohibit any statements during such discussions from being used for propaganda. The company charged this was a move for "secrecy" and that by insisting upon ground rules in advance, the unions were "torpedoing" the idea. Actually, GE's anxiety to preserve the

"Boulware" approach, even on this question, ran counter to its desire to get the meetings under way.

Ultimately, a meeting for May 4 was arranged between the IUE negotiating committee and GE.

The IUE negotiating committee that appeared on May 4 included representatives of the other 10 unions. The IUE committee believed that in this way it could utilize the experience of the other unions not only in dealing with GE, but with other companies also.

This procedure had been sanctioned in previous NLRB decisions and upheld by court reviews on the premise that a union could name its own bargaining representatives.

However, GE walked out of the May 4 meeting and a legal battle ensued which has gone to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The NLRB filed charges against GE for refusal to bargain. GE, in turn, filed counter-charges that the 11 unions and the Steering Committee were engaged in an illegal conspiracy to force it to bargain jointly with them. GE further charged that the unions had "locked themselves" into a pact, depriving themselves of the freedom to bargain.

The NLRB dismissed GE's complaints and its general counsel sought a federal court injunction to compel GE to recognize the IUE committee.

This type of injunction, while rarely used, is an important part of the NLRB arsenal when normal board procedures would be too slow and failure to bargain might cause a strike.

On August 18, federal Judge Marvin Frankel granted the injunction.

GE testimony, Judge Frankel declared, showed clearly that "The company offers to the many unions turn out to be substantially uniform in their basic provisions. And the substantial uniformity appears to extend to the agreements eventually concluded."

The court added that, while GE "takes pains to coordinate its own dealings with the many bargaining units, it foresees a danger of national strikes from all approach to similar coordination on the other side of the bargaining table . . ."

Judge Frankel suggested the company should go to the bargaining table and "test the possibility of agreement and the good faith of the IUE."

This was the first injunction issued by a court to compel a company to meet with a union committee which included representatives from other unions.

While GE declared it would appeal the decision, it temporarily accepted the injunction order. When negotiations opened on August 23, the IUE committee included representatives of the other 10 unions and they were accepted.

Some days later, a Court of Appeals panel reversed Judge Frankel. An Alice in Wonderland period set in, during which members of other unions sat as IUE representatives while GE bargainers studiously ignored them.

Supreme Court Justice Harlan then reinstated the Frankel order. With the contract expiration date approaching, GE abandoned its resistance and dealt with the committee from then on.

The NLRB has completed its hearings on the basic case. However, the injunction is still before the courts. The CCB still functions and the Steering Committee has developed a program of activities on contract administration and wage goals on a permanent basis. The Supreme Court has referred back to Judge Frankel the NLRB and IUE requests that the injunction be continued.

When bargaining with Westinghouse began, the company issued a statement of legal objection but did not try to prevent the presence of representatives of other unions.

This practice spread even into local bargaining, adding further cement to interunion unity.

Discussions also were held with non-AFL-CIO unions to develop plans for cooperation. Talks with the UE leadership failed, but those with the Federation of Westinghouse Salaried Employes were more fruitful.

5. HANDLING GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

The 1966 negotiations brought government intervention, with some ominous overtones.

During the weekend of October 1–2, as the deadline with GE approached, the unions learned that the Administration would request a Taft-Hartley injunction, if necessary, to prevent interruption of GE's defense production.

There was a strong implication that the proposed injunction might cover the entire chain.

Only a few months before, the Department of Defense had expressed no interest in a long strike at IUE's Lynn, Mass., plant, one of those cited as vital to the defense work.

Under an injunction, strikes would be prohibited for 80 days in a number of decisive GE plants, or all of them, with the employes working under the old agreement. A vote on the company's last offer would be taken at the end of 60 days, or in December, with the 80-day injunction expiring just before Christmas.

While GE had insisted the unions would cry for public intervention, it had, nevertheless, assured its customers that Taft-Hartley injunctions might be relied upon to prevent strikes.

While recognizing the need for continued production for Viet Nam, vigorous protests were made by President Meany against the one-sided character of the proposed injunction.

The result was a request by President Johnson that strike action be deferred for 14 days. A presidential panel, consisting of the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce and Labor, would assist the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in arriving at an agreement.

The unions and GE accepted the President's request, negotiations were shifted to Washington and an intensive series of meetings ensued under the guidance of the presidential panel.

GE's bargaining position had been stated categorically on July 20:

"Thus employes—and union officials, too—can be assured that General Electric's initial offer to unions will be full measure and that nothing will be held back for release only when a strike is threatened.

"They can also know that a strike—no matter how long and complicated by intervention—will not change our firm determination to not undermine the long-range interests of the business and the jobs our employes depend on."

GE's first offer had been for a 36-month agreement. Its second proposal was a "rearrangement" for a 38-month agreement with some enlarged benefits but, in the view of the unions, this was less favorable than the original proposal. A third proposal was for a 42-month contract, again in the union's view not as good as the original.

In Washington, the union spokesmen argued that there was a burden upon the panel to secure concessions from GE that might make a settlement possible.

No question was raised openly concerning the presence in panel meetings of the representatives of all the unions. It was recognized that it would be impossible to secure agreements within the 14-day period without their presence. It would not have been possible for the presidential panel to meet with each union separately, nor would it have been acceptable to deal with IUE representatives alone.

The unions told the panel frankly that, in addition to the national bargaining goals, local issues must be solved before agreements could be reached. They stressed the urgent need for GE to move on local bargaining to prevent strikes when the 14-day period ended.

It must be said that the panel worked diligently at its task, meeting with each party, with both parties and holding long sessions itself.

The 14-day period was almost at an end before agreement was reached on October 16. Ahead was the certainty that, unless there was a settlement, the Taft-Hartley injunction request definitely would be renewed.

Even though the IUE agreement was signed and the national bargaining goals issue resolved, the local negotiations of the other unions continued. Many involved local wage rates, unsettled grievances, seniority problems and so on.

As had been warned, strikes involving some 25,000 employes broke out. Their settlement resulted in some substantial gains on the local issues.

Schenectady, one of GE's largest plants, was shut down for 13 weeks by jointly coordinated strikes of IUE, AFTE, Plumbers and Teamsters, and no return to work took place until all agreements had been settled. In Fort Smith, Arkansas, a UAW strike won substantial improvements in badly substandard wages. The Flint Glass Workers in Logan, Ohio, also gained important concessions, as did AFTE in Pittsfield, Massachusetts.

While a Taft-Hartley injunction prohibited the IAM and UAW from striking the jet engine facility at Evandale, Ohio, later negotiations produced local gains in wages and working conditions.

Meanwhile, negotiations had been at a standstill at Westinghouse. While the IUE contract and those of some of the other groups expired October 17, the company had refused to act pending a GE settlement. The government mediation officials made clear that, if necessary, a number of plants heavily engaged in defense work might well be the subject of a presidential request for a Taft-Hartley injunction.

Agreement with IUE and several other unions on national issues, pretty much on the GE pattern, was reached October 26. However, when locals of the IBEW and FGW struck in order to improve their local agreements, the coordinating unions offered their full support to these strikes.

Greatly improved benefits were secured in almost all instances.

RESULTS OF INTERUNION COORDINATION

1. The 1966 agreements were better than the total of the two preceding contracts, covering 1960–1966. Important benefits lost in 1960 were restored. The annual wage increase was won on a more adequate level, a partial cost-of-living escalator was established and inequity adjustments for day, skilled and salaried workers were negotiated. As noted, the pension, insurance and vacation agreements, closed until 1968, were not only reopened but substantially improved.

2. Equally important was that the GE philosophy of "one and only one offer" was shattered. The final agreement for 36 months and 3 weeks increased the value of the earlier offers by 5 to 7 cents an hour.

The "wage guideline" that GE had said was "too high" was effectively destroyed.

3. The most far-reaching result was membership recognition that coordinated bargaining, in spite of its complexities and difficulties, has completely proved itself and must continue as a permanent feature of GE and Westinghouse negotiations. This led to the cooperation, already mentioned, between unions on strike at a given plant; and the support given by nonstriking to striking locals of various unions where companies tried to move production from one plant to another.

While there was only one year to prepare for 1966 negotiations, there are nearly three years to prepare for 1969. With what has been learned, with harmonious inter-union

relations and stronger membership support, a much better job can be done.

Among the problems of coordinated bargaining that need continuing study are the following:

Meshing together better the national and local bargaining of the various unions so that more inter-union support can be rallied for local bargaining.

Closer cooperation among the unions dealing with GE and Westinghouse, giving as much attention to coordination in Westinghouse as in GE.

Extending the coordination to cover all unions in AFL–CIO that deal with these companies and working out possible cooperation with unions not in the AFL–CIO.

Further unification of expiration dates. One great advance was made when IBEW secured a Westinghouse expiration date the same as IUE. However, Westinghouse dates are still two weeks behind that of GE.

Meeting the problems arising from threats of Taft-Hartley injunctions.

Intensifying the coordination, begun in 1966, between the International Metalworkers Federation unions representing GE and Westinghouse workers abroad and those in the United States.

Inter-union coordination, meanwhile, is not awaiting 1969. A program on contract administration has been developed, including cooperation in the handling of grievances that the companies refuse to arbitrate; coordinated action area wage differentials, on problems of unemployment and so on. Studies will be made to determine whether cooperative action is possible to organize the non-union plants of these two companies.

With the great wave of mergers and absorption of companies with different union bargaining representatives, there is a vast field for coordinated bargaining which will increasingly influence labor-management relations of the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TENZER, for Monday, May 1 and Tuesday, May 2, on account of observance of religious holiday.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. GROSS), for 60 minutes, on May 3; to revise and extend his remarks and include 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:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LAIRD.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PHILBIN.

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. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 303. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 1, 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:

703. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 90–10 by striking out "prior to 12:01 a.m. of May 3, 1967" and inserting "prior to 12:01 a.m. June 19, 1967" (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

704. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

705. A letter from the De Facto Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 22–B, *The Mescalero Apache, et al., Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, and docket No. 22–G, *The Mescalero Apache Tribe, et al., Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9481. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 9467. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 9468. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code by making it clear that the tax exemption of a civic league or organization exclusively for the promotion of social welfare shall not be affected because of income, including subscription and advertising income, derived from carrying on any publication, such as a journal, which is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9469. A bill to prohibit misuse or exportation of the flag of the United States in certain instances and to prohibit public display of the flag of a foreign government engaging the United States in war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9470. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9471. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9472. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 9473. A bill to amend provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a carrier to refund a portion of the freight charges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9474. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restriction on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9475. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9476. A bill to permit a compact or agreement between the several States relating to taxation of multistate taxpayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9477. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9478. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide legal defense for employees of the Veterans' Administration who are sued for acts or omissions within the scope of their employment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9479. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish the position of Inspector General in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 9480. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to correct an inequity with respect to the application of postage rates to publications admitted as second-class mail having original entry at independent cities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 9481. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 334. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct a study on means of providing for earlier availability of funds for educational assistance programs and of information relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Res. 456. Resolution to condemn persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

162. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, relative to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Federal grants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

163. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the intrusion by the U.S. Justice Department into the operations of the voter-registrar's offices in the parishes of Caddo, Bossier, and De Soto, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

164. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to cooperation by the Secretary of Agriculture with State officials on State laws regulating the grain shipping industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1967

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

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Blessed and eternal God, from whom we come, by whom we are sustained, and to whom we shall return, look upon us with Thy favor.

To Thee we turn from an unquiet Nation and world. We come with sins that need to be confessed, hopes that need to be renewed, better purposes to be strengthened, and lives to be redirected and reconsecrated.

Remold and remake us in a world where poverty is more prevalent than sufficient needs, where war engulfs us instead of peace, where hope is sought in hopeless strivings.

Grant Thy blessing upon the President and the Congress. Give wisdom and strength to world leaders of righteous conviction and authority. Through these leaders and the peoples, advance the common good for all mankind.

We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 27, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H.R. 2508. An act to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9029. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 286) to permit duty-free treatment pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 of dicyandiamide and of limestone when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2508. An act to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9029. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, despite the previous unanimous-consent request, that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, to expire at not later than 8 minutes after 12 o'clock, and that 2 minutes be allotted to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 8 minutes after 12 o'clock a quorum call be had, and that when the Senate stands in recess beginning at 12:10 p.m., it stand in recess until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

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

MORATORIUM ON DISCONTINUANCE OF RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE AND CANCELLATION OF RAILWAY MAIL CONTRACTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on April 17 I announced my intention of introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Interstate Commerce Commission should declare a moratorium on the discontinuance of railroad passenger service, and that the Post Office Department declare a moratorium on the cancellation of railway mail contracts pending the results of a study, which this resolution calls for, by the new Department of Transportation on the future potential needs for rail passenger and mail service. I rise for that purpose today.

The announcement of my intention to introduce this resolution has resulted in widespread interest, not only in my own State of Colorado—my mail is nearly unanimous in support of the idea—but from many other parts of the Nation as well. The list of cosponsors, which I will announce at the conclusion of these brief remarks, is ample evidence that people from one end of the Nation to the other are most concerned about this problem.

The more I examine this question, the more I am convinced that we must take another look at the long haul and commuter railroad situation as a whole. Passenger train cars in use on class 1 railroads in this Nation have decreased from 43,372 in 1950 to less than 23,000 at present. Passenger train miles have been reduced from 357.5 million in 1950 to about 175 million at present.

As the railroads have been engaged in the rapid process, for various reasons, of getting themselves out of the passenger business, many communities, especially smaller ones, have suffered from the loss of service. Let me emphasize again that I am in no way suggesting that railroads be expected to continue uneconomical passenger operations indefinitely. I am now and always have been an advocate of our free enterprise system. What I am saying is, however, that the time has come for us to examine where we are and what we are doing in light of our future needs for both defense and population mobility.

There is little question that the key issue involved in this controversy centers around our present-day concept of what should be required of private corporations in the public interest. When railroads were almost the only form of long-distance transportation, we required them to provide service commensurate with necessity in the public interest. Sometimes that service was not operated profitably.

Since the emergence of private automobiles and airlines as more dominant means of transportation, the Federal Government, through its policies, has actually encouraged their use, to the detriment of the railroads. I am not judging this policy to be right or wrong. I am merely pointing it out as one of the factors which has caused the posture of the

railroad passenger service to be a matter of concern today.

Mr. President, I have drawn no firm conclusions on this matter in my own mind. There is a distinct lack of facts available from which to draw a proper conclusion. It is for precisely that reason that my resolution calls for the Department of Transportation to conduct this in-depth national survey of the situation. Only when we know whether surface rail transportation will be relevant to the developing megalopolis, only when we know if high-speed service with attractive equipment and convenient schedules can attract passengers back to the railroads, only when we are sure that innovations are being tried to keep passenger service in operation, only when the Post Office Department tells us whether or not the time may come when railway post office operations will again be necessary, only when the successful European innovations in equipment and electrification are seriously considered, and only then, Mr. President, will we have the necessary answers from which to make prudent and proper decisions on this vital subject.

Some have suggested that railroad passenger service obviously is not needed because ridership is declining. On the surface that argument appears to be valid. However, I would point out that many urban areas which abandoned their local rapid transit lines no less than 10 or 20 years ago are now busily planning their reconstruction. A careful study, at the time, of the future needs of these urban areas, would have saved millions of dollars and prevented much confusion and congestion.

In addition, I am not at all convinced that present ridership decline is an accurate barometer of the public's acceptance of "good," and I emphasize the word "good," rail transportation. Let me give you an example in just one area. A recent survey by Trains magazine, under the headline "It's True: Steam Pulled Passengers Faster 30 Years Ago," revealed some interesting but seldom heard facts. In 1936, a passenger could travel from Chicago to Denver in 16 hours. Today, 30 years later, with all of our advances in technology, the same passenger must be on the train 16 hours and 45 minutes to make the identical trip. No new stops have been added that would slow the train down. Yet such a fact just does not make sense. Railroads were moving passengers faster 30 years ago than they are today. Something must be wrong. The survey went on to compare additional train times in intercity service between New York and Montreal, New York and Cincinnati, Washington and Cincinnati, Detroit and Chicago, and so forth. In each case the passenger must spend more time aboard the train today than he did in 1936. The report stressed that the survey included the "best intercity train times," so we are comparing apples with apples. I could continue on and on to cite current difficulties with reservations, scheduling, equipment, and the like. But the problem is obvious.

As I stated in my earlier remarks on the subject, I believe that the moratorium by the ICC and the Post Office Department is necessary to the conduct of this study.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators AIKEN, CANNON, CASE, COOPER, DOMINICK, FANNIN, HANSEN, HATFIELD, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, INOUYE, JAVITS, KUCHEL, MILLER, METCALF, MUNDT, PROUTY, SCOTT, SPARKMAN, TYDINGS, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I send this concurrent resolution to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 25

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That for the purpose of relieving the ever increasing congestion on the Nation's highways, promoting the spread of population throughout the Nation, and providing relief to an overburdened mail service, it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Transportation should make a full and complete investigation and study of the potential of rail transportation, particularly over existing lines and rights-of-way, for passenger and mail transportation in the United States. Such investigation and study should include—

(1) a determination of the possible future use of high speed passenger trains in the various corridor cities or megalopolis areas of the Nation;

(2) a determination of the possible future use of auto carrier passenger trains for long distance high speed rail transportation;

(3) a determination of the possibilities of developing economical means to continue and provide additional rail service to small communities not located in areas of dense population;

(4) a determination of the possible use of electricity for high speed rail transportation;

(5) in consultation with the Postmaster General, a determination of the possible use of high speed rail transportation for post office operations;

(6) a review of all existing research and development in rail transportation and a determination of areas where future research and development should be concentrated; and

(7) such other matters as would promote such purpose.

SEC. 2. It is also the sense of the Congress that pending the completion of such investigation and study by the Secretary of Transportation—

(1) the Interstate Commerce Commission should exercise such authority as it has under law to prevent any further discontinuance or abandonment of railroad passenger service; and

(2) the Postmaster General should continue all existing arrangements for railroad mail transportation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief 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 (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO 3 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 3 o'clock p.m. today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 3 o'clock p.m., the same day.

At 3 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 27, 1967, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) to designate April 28–29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1968, FOR TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1968, in the amount of $1,361,000, for the Treasury Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES (S. DOC. NO. 22)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed additional appropriations, in the amount of $6,159,000, for the fiscal year 1967, and $12,685,000, for the fiscal year 1968, for various departments and agencies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claims of *The Mescalero Apache et al.* v. *The United States of America*, Docket No. 22–B, and *The Mescalero Apache Tribe et al.* v. *The United States of America*, Docket No. 22–G (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION I-1

A concurrent resolution applying to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to apportionment.

Be it Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned only according to population; and

Whereas, for 175 years the people of the various states have had the freedom to apportion their legislatures in the manner they felt best reflected the best interests of the people, recognizing that a system of apportionment that might be best for one state might not necessarily accommodate the needs of another state, but that each should be free to make its own selection;

Now, therefore, be it Resolved that this Legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of submitting a Constitutional Amendment to the States which will secure to the people the right of some choice in the method of apportionment of one house of a state legislature on a basis other than population alone; and

Be it further Resolved that this resolution is rescinded if the Congress itself proposes such a plan to the states for ratification; and

Be it further Resolved that a duly attested copy of this Resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

GORDON S. AAMOTH,
Speaker of the House.
G. R. GILBREATH,
Chief Clerk of the House.
CHARLES TIGHE,
President of the Senate.
LEO LEIDHOLM,
Secretary of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted, until midnight tonight, to file reports, together with minority, individual, or supplemental views, if desired.

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

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 617. A bill to authorize the State of Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for schools and other public institutions (Rept. No. 198).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 889. A bill to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California (Rept. No. 199); and

S. 1098. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1950, authorizing the Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands (Rept. No. 200).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1652. A bill for the relief of Anastasia D. Mpatzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1653. A bill for the relief of Duk Hwa Kim and his wife, Kyi Bok Han Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 1654. A bill to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1655. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to authorize user charges for certain services performed thereunder by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; and

S. 1656. A bill to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MORSE:

S.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above joint resolution when reported by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY TO DETERMINE THE POTENTIAL OF RAILROAD PASSENGER AND MAIL TRANSPORTATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota), submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ALLOTT, which appears under a separate heading.)

ALASKA OIL PROGRESS REPORT: NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 4

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this year is the centennial celebration of Alaska's acquisition by the United States. Much has taken place during the past 100 years in Alaska, but when compared with the promise of the future, it seems truly infinitesimal. We have a great and wonderful State, and we look forward to the challenge of the future. The flag of Alaska most symbolically shows the Big Dipper and the North Star—the star to guide us into the future and the dipper to sustain us, a dipper filled with the treasures that are Alaska's: its forests, its clear and abundant streams, its wildlife, its buried diches, and most of all, its people.

We Alaskans feel we have a lot to brag about, and sometimes we do brag a little—we are the biggest, we are the farthest north, we are the farthest west, we have the longest shoreline, the highest mountain, the largest bears, and so on—but, generally, we do not brag at all. I think we know how good Alaska is, but we also know we can make it better. Careful but imaginative exploitation of our natural treasures is one way Alaskans are working to make their State better.

The face of Alaska is showing the marks of technological change. Where once the environment denied man access, he is now able to survive; and where man formerly went on foot, he is now able to take limited amounts of heavy equipment. Change is the order of the day, and change we will, for we realize our future depends on the recovery and utilization of our natural resources—and the margin of profit is the balance between efficient modern methods and the stern environment.

We have barely begun to develop our resource industries. Untapped reservoirs of gas and oil await the driller's bit; veins of precious and semiprecious ore lie hidden below the surface; great forests stand silent and unproductive; and our waters abound with an immeasurable harvest. More than half the land is farther than 100 miles from the inadequate, defense-oriented system of highways—and the terrain is unaccommodating.

Despite the formidable obstacles that must be overcome, some of our industries are growing at a healthy rate, Mr. President, and one of the fastest growing is the petroleum industry. I would like to take this opportunity to describe that growth so that all Senators will better appreciate the problems that confront us and the great strides we are making in Alaska. This industry is typical of many in the State, and it demonstrates both the drive that is necessary to gain success and the economic benefits that result.

The oil industry is not new to Alaska. The presence of oil seepage has been known for centuries, and native Alaskans understood its importance despite their inability to render it very useful. Oil was found in the Arctic tundra, along the peninsula, in the Cook Inlet area, at Nome, and east of Prince William

Sound at Katalla. "Katalla," in fact, is the Indian word for oil.

The first serious attempts to drill for oil were made at the beginning of this century, but the crudeness of equipment and the limited knowledge available doomed the ventures to failure. Other attempts were made periodically until the 1930's when limited success was achieved in the Katalla area. There, 37 wells were drilled, of which 18 were producers of a high-quality, paraffin-base oil. The operation would be called a "shoestring operation" by most of us today. The difficulties and hardships endured were so great that a fire in the refinery was sufficient to end all work in 1933.

Little more was done until the latter part of World War II when a massive attempt was mounted in the Arctic by the Navy in the hope of locating oil reserves which could sustain the Nation in the event of a long drawn-out war. From a base established at Point Barrow, geophysical exploration teams searched the entire North Slope between the Brooks Range and the Arctic Ocean. This area consisted of 23.6 million acres set aside by President Harding in 1923 as Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4—PET-4—and an adjoining 25.8 million acres set aside in 1943 to insure Government ownership of deposits thought to extend beyond the boundaries of the original reserve.

The exploration and test drilling conducted by the Navy continued until 1953 when, despite promise of major finds, a Government economy drive brought all operations to a halt. Following this decision, the 25.8 million acres adjoining PET-4 were returned to the public domain in 1958.

It is interesting to note that although huge deposits were indicated by the exploratory operations—it is estimated that 57 million barrels of oil can be produced at the Umiat structure alone—at the cessation of operations only a small amount of oil from test wells had been produced. In fact the only actual use of energy from PET-4 has been the supplying of natural gas to Government installations and the village of Barrow under the terms of an act which I sponsored in the 87th Congress.

In 1957, the petroleum industry was reborn in Alaska in the vicinity of Cook Inlet, and this time the infant thrived and is going to reach maturity. The Swanson River on the Kenai Peninsula was the scene of the first major discovery, and the success of this find encouraged a flurry of exploration and drilling that has snowballed into an oil boom.

In 1958 the return of Navy-held land adjacent to PET-4 on the Arctic Slope to the public domain caused feverish speculation and exploration despite the remoteness of the area.

Although exploration and test drilling continued each year with some success, it was not until 1964 that the industry received its second shot in the arm—the one that insured the permanency of the oil industry in Alaska. In that year the tremendous potential of the Middle Ground Shoal in Cook Inlet was discovered. The enthusiasm that greeted that find was summed up by Randolph Yost, president of the Pan American Petroleum Corp., one of the many oil companies established to develop the Alaskan fields, when he described the Middle Ground Shoal structure as "comparable to those found in the Middle East, one of the most prolific oil-producing areas in the world."

Since 1964, the drilling of new wells and the production of oil in the Cook Inlet and Kenai Peninsula areas have been most successful.

Hand in hand with the discovery of oil has been the discovery of gas fields. At the end of 1964 Alaska already had 12 fields, nine of which were in the Cook Inlet-Kenai area. Four of the fields are in continuous production, supplying a high grade of natural gas to consumers in Alaska and soon to supply overseas markets.

Mr. President, the success of the oil industry in Alaska is phenomenal in the light of the difficulties that have had to be overcome. Modern techniques and equipment have accounted for much of the breakthrough, but a large percentage of the credit must be given to the determination of the men involved and the inherent drive of our American free enterprise system. Free enterprise is at its best when vast areas with untapped resources are opened up to production and the local economy benefits from the lifeblood of sustained employment.

Picture, if you will, Mr. President, the Arctic North Slope with its ice and snow and, in the short summer, mile after mile of spongy wet tundra and thousands of lakes and ponds. There tests have shown the presence of gas and oil in huge quantities. The amount at Umiat alone is valued at $150 million, almost three times the total amount spent by the Government on exploration in PET-4. But the lack of suitable transportation from Fairbanks, 500 miles to the south, precludes a wholesale assault on the known reserves. Transportation of equipment to drill one well would cost $1.5 million under present conditions. One industry study estimated a road from Fairbanks would cost $50 million and would reduce the cost of transporting such equipment to $300,000, but still we would need oil and gas collection centers, pipelines and other supporting facilities and access roads. Under these conditions it is extraordinary for private enterprise to keep plugging away in their search for oil. And yet they do. It is ample testimony of their expectation to find rich new fields and their faith in the future growth of Alaska.

Picture, also, the disillusionment that would stem from two unsuccessful wildcat wells, the reward of a handful of valiant, hopeful men after the backbreaking herculean task of trucking heavy drilling equipment across 65 miles of thawing tundra on the roadless Alaska Peninsula. This attempt in 1959 is being matched again by other crews on the peninsula with the same hope—and perhaps this time with more assurance.

The Cook Inlet area, our most productive area, is not without its constant threats from the environment. Platforms like the familiar Texas towers of the Gulf of Mexico have been modified to withstand the barrage of the elements: subzero temperatures; tides rising and falling 30 feet; tidal currents of 5 knots washing away the bottom around the platforms' footings and hurling huge ice cakes against the structures with the fury of runaway boxcars. The life of men on the platforms is no less perilous in the winter as they carry on their work in blizzards driven by winds up to 40 knots. Indeed, the very presence of these undertakings in such an uncompromising environment is a measure of Alaska's potential.

Mr. President, the growth of the petroleum industry in Alaska is most meaningful to the economy of the entire United States as well as of Alaska. As has been stated by the Secretary of the Interior, the United States will use more petroleum energy between 1966–80 than has been used in the entire history of the industry since 1859. But our national discovery picture is not bright; the total wells drilled by our domestic industry declined 29 percent from 1956 to 1965, and the estimated total wells in 1966 was 11 percent below 1965. This will cause an "energy gap" if allowed to continue.

According to the Secretary of the Interior, to maintain our present ratio of reserves versus production and to meet future natural gas needs, we must find 30 trillion cubic feet of new gas between now and 1980. Alaska's contribution is significant when we realize that the average rate since 1955 will provide only 20 trillion cubic feet by that date. In the case of oil reserves, the quantity found in 1965 was encouraging, but in view of the fact that oil production exceeded new reserves found in 3 of the last 6 years, considerable importance must be given to the efforts waged in Alaska.

The direct Federal benefit from the petroleum industry in Alaska is not easily measured; however, in the Point Barrow vicinity alone, Federal installations have used gas from the South Barrow gas field since 1949 at a real saving to the U.S. taxpayer of $9 million. In the years ahead, the military undoubtedly will receive substantial benefits from a major American-owned Alaska oil field lying directly on the great circle air route to Asia and the Orient.

For the State the rewards of our growing petroleum industry have been many. The construction of refineries, pipelines, tank farms, access roads, shipping terminals, and whole communities to support the industry has provided steady, gainful employment for thousands of persons and has introduced hundreds of thousands of dollars into local communities. Direct revenues realized by the State from 1959 to 1964 amounted to nearly $100 million. The income from competitive bids for oil lands is significant despite its variability. Reflecting a new interest in the Middleton Island area of the Gulf of Alaska, last year's 16th competitive sale amounted to more than $7 million.

In addition, isolated communities such as Barrow and Tyonek are now able to benefit from the abundant supplies of natural gas which had been unused below the surface for centuries while the natives fought against the cold for their very survival. Aside from the immediate benefit of the energy itself, secondary benefits to the villages have

been far reaching. The very fact that gas is potentially hazardous has prompted modernization programs to lay out streets and rebuild homes and buildings in well-planned, safe, and efficient communities. Tyonek's benefits have been spectacular. Lease of oil land within the Tyonek reservation has brought $12 million to the natives who have shown great wisdom in their use of the money. Investments as well as community projects have been sound and rewarding.

Historically, petroleum prices have been high, too high, in Alaska. They are still too high. However, the cost of petroleum products to Alaskans has decreased in some cases, reflecting the availability of local petroleum sources. The wholesale price of furnace oil and regular gas in Fairbanks, for example, decreased about 3 cents per gallon from 1959 to 1965, despite rising costs of employee wages and benefits which totaled about 10 percent. During the same period, Federal and State taxes rose 4 cents per gallon.

The future of the industry in Alaska is exceedingly bright. The known and predicted reserves are fabulously large. In the Cook Inlet-Kenai area alone the estimated reserves of oil and gas are 1 billion barrels and 4 trillion cubic feet, respectively. As the industry expands and as its products become more widely available, Alaska's other major industries will benefit. The fishing industry, lumbering and forest products industries, and the mining industry will all find increasing use of Alaska's petroleum products, and by mutual stimulation all will benefit.

The development of an overseas market is certain. Already several large contracts have been awarded. In one, the Tokyo Gas Co. will purchase an estimated $25 million of natural gas per year under a long-term contract. This will require the construction of a multimillion-dollar liquefaction processing plant in the vicinity of Kenai. Contracts also have been awarded for two other natural gas processing plants on the Kenai Peninsula. One, the largest of its kind on the west coast, will produce 530,000 tons of ammonia per year; the other, the largest of its kind in the world, will produce 350,000 tons of prilled urea per year. Products from both plants will be marketed throughout North America and the Pacific basin.

As the needs of the State become more complex, and as the transportation system expands in keeping with the demands of a thriving and growing population, the fruits of today's exploration and wildcatting will be harvested, and Alaska's oil production—which has jumped 16 percent since the first of last year to a record 35,000 barrels per day—will multiply manifold.

Mr. President, as evidenced by the number of companies operating in Alaska, prospecting and drilling is continuing at an accelerated pace. In the Cook Inlet Basin alone during July 1966, nine major companies were wildcatting 19 wells—about 50 percent of which could be expected to be productive if Alaska's high batting average prevailed. In addition, in the vicinity of wells already producing, four development and extension wells were being drilled. Geophysical surveys at that time were being conducted near Nome, in Bristol Bay, along the Alaska Peninsula, in the Gulf of Alaska, and in the Cook Inlet Basin.

Even a partial list of companies active in the State is impressive: Atlantic Richfield Co., Hunt Oil Co., Great Basins Petroleum Corp., Pan American Petroleum Corp., Shell Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of Calif., Texaco Inc., Trinity Canadian Drilling Co., Union Oil Co. of Calif., El Paso Natural Gas Co., Mobil Oil Co., Signal Oil & Gas Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Marathon Oil Co., Skelly Oil Co., Sinclair Oil & Gas Co., and Gulf Oil Co.

The industry's contribution since the Swanson River oil discovery in 1957 represents an investment of $500,000,000 and a gross value of oil and gas produced of about $125 million. For the Cook Inlet-Kenai area, the only area of commercial production to date, the cumulative production statistics to March 1, 1966, are interesting.

Field	Number of wells	Oil (barrels)	Gas (thousand cubic feet)
Swanson River	53	52,056,467	42,978,131
Middle Ground Shoal	3	178,523	73,866
Kenai	9		18,143,190
Sterling	1		280,221
North Fork (testing)	2		101,985

Mr. President, my purpose today has been to increase the awareness of my fellow Senators to the progress we are making in Alaska. We still have much to do to catch up with the dimensions of our State. I intend to keep doing what I can for my fellow Alaskans by pointing out and submitting legislation for such needs as are the proper concern of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, in this regard I have introduced today legislation to return Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 to the public domain so that it can be opened up for commercial development. The present policy of maintaining "reserves in the ground" is out of tune with the times. In no conceivable way could such reserves as the undeveloped potential of PET-4 be of use during a national emergency. The only practical, realistic reserve is one which has been thoroughly developed and is immediately available as a source of energy. The opening up of PET-4 with its known resources would further stimulate exploration in adjacent areas which have been inadequately explored. Many agree with me that commercial development of the Arctic North Slope would be attractive and feasible under this arrangement.

Legislation is needed, but of course, the greatest role to be played in the development and growth of the State will fall to the people themselves. That is a tall order for only a quarter of a million people—even for Alaskans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have introduced be printed in the RECORD at this point and also a sectional analysis of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1654) to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserve, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1654

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, located in the State of Alaska, as defined and established by Executive Order Numbered 3797-A dated February 27, 1923, as amended by public land order 289 dated July 20, 1945, shall be, and the same is hereby, abolished and terminated, and the Executive order creating it is hereby revoked, effective as of thirty days following the date of approval of this Act.

SEC. 2. Jurisdiction over all lands of the United States and over leases, licenses, permits, or other agreements covering such lands within the boundaries of such naval petroleum reserve issued by the Department of the Navy, shall be vested in the Secretary of the Interior effective as of thirty days following the date of approval of this Act, and all original records of all leases, permits, licenses, agreements, all files, letters, documents, maps, records, and all surplus property, building, structures, books of account and improvements relating and pertaining to said reserve shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior on or before such effective date.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the validity of any lease, license, permit, transfer, or agreement issued or made under authority of legislation relating to the naval petroleum reserves (10 U.S.C. 7421-7438), or any other Act, and in existence at the time this Act becomes effective, or impair any rights or privileges which have accrued under such leases, licenses, permits, transfers, or agreements.

SEC. 4. Deposits of oil and gas underlying lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, after the effective date of this Act, shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided in the Act of Congress approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), entitled "An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain", as amended: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may lease by competitive bidding, under general regulations to be issued by him, the oil and gas deposits in any area within the present boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4 whenever he believes that knowledge of the area gained through exploration conducted by the United States could redound to the benefit of a holder of an oil and gas lease in that area.

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to continue present operations in the South Barrow gas field including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) to furnish gas therefrom without charge to the other federal agencies that now or hereafter occupy land at or near Point Barrow, Alaska

(2) to furnish gas therefrom for sale to the village of Barrow, and other communities at or near Point Barrow, Alaska

(3) to explore and develop the gas resources of any portion of the South Barrow

field which is not subject to a lease under the Mineral Leasing Act after notifying the Secretary of the Interior of his proposed action. Any such exploration will be limited to the need for reserves to continue the activities authorized under this subsection.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall not lease under the Mineral Leasing Act, without consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, acting on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, any portion of the South Barrow gas field.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. BARTLETT is as follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF S. 1654

Section 1 terminates Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska and the executive order creating it 30 days from enactment of the bill.

Section 2 orders transfer of the jurisdiction of reserve and all records pertaining to reserve to the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 3 protests valid existing rights created under any act in existence when S. 1654 is enacted.

Section 4 makes land within the reserve subject to disposition under federal mineral leasing laws with the proviso that the Secretary of the Interior may lease by competitive bidding any land in the reserve when he believes that federal exploration of the land has resulted in information which could benefit the holder of a lease.

Section 5(a) authorizes the Secretary of Defense to continue such activities in the South Barrow Gas Field as:

(1) Supplying free gas to government agencies.

(2) Selling gas to Barrow community.

Section 5(b) provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall not lease any land in South Barrow Gas Field without consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, acting on behalf of the Secretary of Defense.

HEARING ON S. 1028—SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will hold a public hearing on S. 1028 at 2 p.m., May 4, 1967.

The bill, introduced by the chairman of the full committee, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, would provide for salary adjustment and credit for service for employees of county offices of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service who are appointed to positions in the Department of Agriculture.

Persons wishing to testify on the bill may arrange to do so by contacting the committee at telephone No. 225-5451.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 612, the Dairy Import Act of 1967, at its next printing.

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1308

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 4, and Friday, May 5, 1967, beginning at 9:30 a.m., the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will hold hearings on S. 1308, relating to equal opportunity in employment, in room 4232, New Senate Office Building.

Persons wishing to testify or to submit written statements should contact the subcommittee staff.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF EXPORTS BY THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Select Committee on Small Business and its chairman, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] have asked me to announce that the committee will conduct a series of public hearings at principle seaports across the country, beginning on the Pacific coast in Portland, Oreg., on May 19 and 20. Other sessions will follow at New Orleans and Mobile on the gulf, the Port of New York on the Atlantic coast, and Milwaukee on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The sessions "in the field" will be chaired by Senators from these areas. Dates, locations, and witness lists will be released when final arrangements have been made.

The public proceedings are part of an intensive study by the committee of the potentials and problems of expanding American exports and U.S. maritime commerce.

This country has had a persistent balance-of-payments problem since 1958. One authority after another has stated that U.S. exports are the key factor in trying to solve this problem.[1] As a consequence, the executive branch of the Federal Government has adopted some widely heralded programs aimed at expanding overseas sales by American business.

When it comes to results, however, these efforts seem to be something less than a resounding success.

Trade statistics for 1966 indicate that the United States has not fared well in international trade over the past 2 years. While exports grew by 4 percent in 1965 and 10 percent in 1966, imports climbed by 14½ percent in 1965 and 20 percent in 1966. As a result, our trade surplus in 1966 fell $1.5 billion to about $3.8 billion. This was almost 50 percent below the $6.7 billion peak surplus of 1964, and was the lowest trade balance since 1959.[2] Depending upon how certain transactions are treated, the 1966 trade surplus could be even narrower.[3] The overall U.S. balance of payments, of course, continued to be in deficit by over a billion dollars,[4] and it is anticipated that it will be "substantially larger" in 1967.[5]

For the past several years, the Small Business Committee has repeatedly pointed out that in terms of percentage of gross national products exported, this Nation compares unfavorably to other industrialized nations. Other countries with similar economies, sell from three to six times as much as their production abroad. This is illustrated by the following table:

Export trade as percentage of gross national product, 1963 (table includes goods and services; native currency in millions)[1]

	Gross national product	Exports	Exports as a percentage of GNP
Belgium	BF608,000	BF208,000	34
Canada	$43,000	$6,800	31
United Kingdom	£25,000	£5,114	20
France	Fr285,000	Fr43,000	15
United States	$585,000	$30,700	5.24

[1] See, for instance, "Expansion of Beef Exports," S. Rep. 939, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Oct. 22, 1965.

Another factor in the balance-of-payments totals which bears watching is the inflow of capital in response to the higher rates of interest which have prevailed in the United States during the past year. Although, according to Robert Roosa,[6] these are "clocked through the established machinery as if they were lasting investment gains," they are actually quite temporary.

Mr. Roosa noted:

The gap which tight money alone did not and could not close in 1966—will come out in the open. And as last year's inflows (of from $2 billion to $3 billion in short-term capital) should be reversed the statistics deficit may be inflated next year in the same way it was deducted last year.

As a result of these and other international developments, the gold reserves of the United States have declined from $17.8 billion, or about 44 percent of the world's supply in 1960, to $13.2 billion or about 31 percent at the end of 1966.[7] During January and February 1967, these reserves declined further, by $33 million and $41 million respectively.[8]

Under the law, as it now stands, the dollar is defined in terms of the value of gold,[9] the reserves of the Federal Reserve Banks are in the form of certificates representing gold,[10] and the legal basis of our money and credit sys-

[1] See, for instance, "Exports in Balance," the London Economist, June 12, 1965, page 1230:1, which commented that "(the U.S. merchandise export account) is the rock on which attempts to right the balance of international payments must be built (over the long term)."

[2] "Alternatives to Tight Money Policy for 1967," Congressional Record, Feb. 3, 1967, pp. 2538-2543.

[3] "U.S. Trade Balance Off During 1966," Journal of Commerce, March 30, 1967, page 1:7.

[4] "The Balance of Payments, Fourth Quarter 1966," by W. Lederer and E. M. Parrish, Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, March 1967, pages 14-18.

[5] "Business in Brief" the Chase National Bank, April, 1967.

[6] "Closing the Payments Gap" remarks by Robert V. Roosa, Waldorf Astoria, Jan. 18, 1967.

[7] "Gold Reserves of Central Banks and Governments," Federal Reserve Bulletin, March 1967, page 472.

[8] "Fed Reports Increased Gold Drain," Journal of Commerce, March 30, 1967, page 1:8.

[9] Gold Reserve Act of 1934, 31 U.S.C. 444 (definition): 31 USC 821 (power of President to alter); 31 C.F.R. 55 (most recent modification by Pres. F. D. Roosevelt).

[10] 31 U.S.C. 408.

tem in this country is thus the size of our stock of gold.[11] With a 25-percent gold backing requirement for our currency—the same percentage, incidentally, which the U.S.S.R. maintains—about $11 billion of the $13.2 gold reserve is presently committed to backing our domestic currency, leaving a little more than $2 billion free for international transfers.[12]

It has also been pointed out that trade provides employment for about 3½ million American workers, about 4½ percent of the labor force.[13]

The course of international trade and payments is, therefore, intimately connected with our economy, particularly in the coastal areas such as my State of Oregon, where domestic companies are automatically engaged in world trade by virtue of competition from foreign imports.

If the present trends continue, the Congress will be required to take action with respect to these issues for domestic, as well as international, reasons.

This has been understood by the recent pronouncements of two U.S. banks which are experienced in international matters.

The Chase Manhattan Bank, in its bimonthly publication, "Business in Brief" for April 1967 made a fine analysis of the present role of gold in international finance. The publication also observed that the present system has led the United States toward increasing controls and restrictions on capital movements. The continuation or intensification of these controls, as the ranking Republican member of the Small Business Committee, Senator JAVITS, pointed out,[14] "have only one predictable effect: Declining returns on U.S. investment abroad and a lessening role for the United States as world banker."

The president of the Bank of America, Mr. Peterson, expressed somewhat similar thoughts before the New York Chamber of Commerce.[15]

I believe these comments acccurately reflect the mounting concern in the U.S. banking community and on Capitol Hill on these matters. As a consequence of all of these factors, our committee felt that a full investigation of the subject was called for.

All too often these statistics and public comment on overseas activities of U.S. firms are based to a substantial degree upon the operations of what might be called the "Fortune 500." These are the large international corporations which have a tendency to show to foreign countries a picture of the "private enterprise system" which is actually "large-scale corporate enterprise," and which is frequently out of proportion to local needs, the capacity of local businessmen, and the scale of host economies.

Another aspect of holding these hearings before the Committee on Small Business is to emphasize the potential benefits to foreign lands as well as our own of the U.S. firms entering international trade. In numbers, small business constitutes about 90 percent of U.S. manufacturers, and virtually 100 percent of farmers, ranchers, and other agricultural producers and processors. It is my impression that the totality of small firms possesses a great potential that has only been partially tapped in the U.S. effort to improve our exports and the U.S. balance of payments. Further, the enterprise of this small business community can add flexibility and growth to the economics of our trading partners, as well as our own. At the same time, we would be projecting to these countries a more representative view of our society. As Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler commented to the Small Business Committee during his appearance on March 22:[16]

> I can see unqualifiedly that . . . the most vital aspect of our whole international balance of payments problem is the development and maintenance of a healthy trade surplus. And that the role of the small business enterprises in this country . . . ought to continue to be one of the most important aspects of our international program.
>
> It would be interesting to know just how many of the products that we take for granted in the United States . . . are actually available in the markets of the world. I would suspect that a great many are not. And these are not necessarily products that are produced by the large enterprises . . . I think we can and must do a great deal more in pressing forward on this point.
>
> I think it is a very real frontier that ought to be pushed.

Another frontier for this Nation is the vast rimlands of the Pacific Ocean. In Asia alone the population is about 2 billion, and when this is added to the other trade areas such as Oceana and western South America, which are accessible from our west coast, the total approaches two-thirds of the human race. Furthermore, the Pacific Ocean area is a region of profound economic need and accelerating development. Our country should recognize these factors and be preparing for the future in relation to these likely markets.

Our committee will be asking witnesses what roles and actions they believe are appropriate on the part of the Federal Government as well as State and local government and private associations to coordinate our enormous and varied public and private resources in order to build export markets for American business. In the committee's view, the country needs to look ahead and plan ahead for the next 5 to 10 years and needs to rebuild its export balance on solid foundations that will make possible enduring expansion of trade.

The committee—and particularly Senator HATFIELD and myself who will be conducting the first sessions—will be looking forward to having a rigorous analysis and constructive discussion of our trade problems and potentials, and what can be done to increase participation by small- and medium-sized businesses.

During the course of the hearings nationwide, the committee hopes to receive testimony as to current and future trade patterns, and their impact on American businesses.

We will be seeking guidance on problems and possibilities arising from emerging trade blocs, developing country trade, the interrelationships between aid, export trade, investment, and foreign U.S. production—including the extent to which foreign production by U.S. multinational companies and affiliates may be contributing to and/or displacing U.S. exports, and even generating imports back into this country.

We will want to evaluate the techniques that have been tried to increase our exports in the past, and to encourage suggestions that may be helpful in the future. We will want to review the history of our trade promotion programs for the lessons they can teach us for the years ahead.

By placing foreign trade in this broad perspective, the committee hopes that Federal, State, and local governments, as well as businesses, labor, and the rest of our private institutions, will be assisting each other in realistic forward planning in the export area. We hope also to hear how all of these bodies can best work together in this cause.

In my February remarks, I stated:

> (Our committee) will be pleased to make (the results of its hearings) available to the Administration. We shall be pleased to cooperate in every way in strengthening (our country's trade) program, in order that the resources in both governmental and business can be fully mobilized in the mutual interest of both.

The President has proclaimed the week of May 21 as World Trade Week. This will come at the time of National Maritime Day, as well as of our Portland hearings.

I hope and invite all concerned to make the most of the opportunities presented by this season of attention to our national trade needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the President in issuing his Trade Week proclamation be included in the RECORD following my remarks to provide for further information.

Associations and organizations wanting to make a contribution to the hearings in Portland and elsewhere, and others wishing to submit material, are invited to contact the Senate Small Business Committee, at room 424, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

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

PROCLAMATION 3771, MARCH 24, 1967

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation

World trade joins the United States with other nations in a creative partnership that

---

[11] See "The Federal Reserve System, purposes and functions," the Federal Reserve System, 1963, page 166.

[12] "Challenge, the Magazine of Economic Affairs," March/April 1967, page 4.

[13] Remarks by the President of the United States in connection with issuance of Proclamation 3771, "World Trade Week, 1967," weekly compilation of presidential Documents, March 27, 1967, page 529.

[14] "Gold and the Balance of Payments," Remarks by Senator Javits, Congressional Record, April 15, 1967, pages 9676–9678.

[15] Congressional Record, loc. cit. page 9678.

[16] The Status and Future Small Business in the Economy, hearings before Select Committee on Small Business, March 22, 1967, Transcript, page 1018.

supports the growth of our free enterprise economy and advances the well-being of all our citizens.

Last year, total trade among the noncommunist countries amounted to about $180 billion. Since 1960, this trade has grown by more than $67 billion, or an annual rate of more than 8 percent. Trade among the nations of the free world should reach the astounding annual rate of $200 billion in the year ahead.

The exchange of goods and services builds a foundation for mutual trust among nations. It sustains our hopes for the attainment of a better world, in which all peoples may live in peace.

Expanding trade with nations around the world accelerates the pace of economic progress at home and abroad.

It enlarges the opportunities for United States businessmen to sell more products and services in world markets. Since 1960, U.S. exports of merchandise have risen by 50 percent. In 1966, they exceeded $29 billion, close to $3 billion more than the year before.

It provides employment for more American workers. About three and a half million Americans are engaged, directly or indirectly, in the production, transport and marketing of our exports. The growth of this trade will create jobs for many more workers in both rural and urban areas throughout the United States.

It widens the range of materials and consumer goods available at competitive prices in the domestic marketplace.

It helps the developing countries make fuller use of their energies and resources.

It encourages the international exchange of ideas, knowledge, and experience.

Vigorous expansion of our export volume is essential. We have succeeded in reducing the deficit in our balance of payments, but we must make still further improvement.

The United States will continue to support the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers to stimulate the flow of international commerce. To this purpose, an early and successful completion of the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations is especially important. There are only a few weeks remaining; by April 30, major issues must be settled and a balance of concessions achieved. The final agreement must be signed by June 30. An historic opportunity to broaden vastly the world's trade horizons is within reach. This opportunity must not be lost.

We are negotiating with other nations on the improvement of the international monetary system. International agreement that will assure an adequate growth of world reserves is a key to the future expansion of world trade.

We believe that trade also offers a means of achieving fruitful cooperation with the Soviet Union and other Eastern European nations. In 1966, U.S. exports to Eastern Europe totalled only $200 million while other non-communist countries sold Eastern Europe goods worth over $6 billion. U.S. ratification of a consular agreement with the U.S.S.R., our various trade missions to Eastern Europe, and our participation in the 1967 food processing fair in Moscow illustrate our effort to build bridges through trade. We must continue to pursue lasting peace by seeking out every possible course to healthy economic and cultural relations with these countries.

The principal objective of our foreign trade policy is to promote the increase of peaceful, profitable commerce among our Nation and others.

World Trade Week reaffirms and supports this objective.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning May 21, 1967, as World Trade Week; and I request the appropriate Federal, State, and local officials to cooperate in the observance of that week.

I also urge business, labor, agricultural, educational, professional, and civic groups, as well as the people of the United States generally, to observe World Trade Week with gatherings, discussions, exhibits, ceremonies, and other appropriate activities designed to promote continuing awareness of the importance of world trade to our economy and our relations with other nations.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-fourth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred [SEAL] and sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-first.

By the President:

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

NOTE.—Proclamation 3771 was not filed with the Office of the Federal Register before the cutoff time of this issue. As printed above, it follows the text of the White House press release.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 28, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be set aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1039.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) 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.

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO PLAN FOR PREVENTION OF OIL POLLUTION OF OCEAN WATERS AND SHORES IS DESIRABLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the deep concern of the people of the United States that pollution of our waters be controlled has been expressed by the enactment during the last Congress of landmark legislation providing for stronger measures by responsible agencies to clean up our waterways than have been available before.

The recent tragic breakup of the *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England and newspaper accounts of serious and increasing ravages of oil pollution of our Atlantic coasts in New Jersey and New England reminded us of the particularly destructive characteristics of oil waste pollution. The careless and uncontrolled release of oil, sludge, and petroleum wastes by vessels plying the seas off our coastline results in relentlessly increasing destruction of wildlife, recreation resources, and fisheries we cannot afford to allow to continue. We find waterfowl incapacitated by oceanborne deposits of oil waste; our lovely beaches dirtied and befouled; waters that should be a source of refreshment impossible to enjoy because of the slime and muck of oil waste; and valuable fishery resources destroyed.

Valiant efforts to control this and other forms of water pollution have been made and are continuing. Our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], whom I am glad to see on the floor at this time, has been a leader in this important field, and we salute his steadfast efforts. Enactment of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 during the last Congress demonstrated the particular interest of Congress in the control of pollution resulting from deposits of oil wastes. The act includes special provisions designed to deal with this particular form of pollution, giving Federal authorities stronger measures of control and prevention than have ever been available before.

However, American legislation to control American pollution can do nothing to meet the international pollution problem so dramatically illustrated by the breakup of the *Torrey Canyon* and the resulting destruction of wildlife, recreational resources, and fisheries in England and in France. While the matter of the *Torrey Canyon* was a spectacular example of the potential disaster of oil pollution, it is, unhappily, true that the shorelines of the world are constantly subject to the onslaughts of oil waste and other pollutants discharged by vessels of many nations sailing under many flags.

As any realistic control of this problem must be international in scope, I have addressed identical letters to the Secretary of State and to the Secretary of the Interior urging that an international convention on water pollution control be convened to devise measures enforceable throughout the world which will protect all nations from the ravages of pollution. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to the Secretary of State be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial on this subject entitled "Tarfoot," which appeared in the April 29, 1967, issue of the New Republic.

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

APRIL 28, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the last Congress and, again, in this Congress, a subject of major concern is that of control and prevention of water pollution. The 89th Congress enacted land mark legislation designed to strengthen powers of the U.S. Government to control pollution in our country. "The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966" is of special significance for its inclusion of provisions to control the discharge of fuel oil, sludge and oil refuse at such times and places as create conditions deleterious to health, marine life, or constituting a menace

to navigation. Enactment of this legislation recognizes the serious threat to persons and property represented by uncontrolled discharge of oil waste by vessels operated in American waters.

The dramatic breakup of the "Torrey Canyon" off the shore of England recently called world attention to the potential immensity of the destruction of shores and beaches of the world. This tragic accident, which has resulted in such terrible loss, spotlights the international nature of the problem of oil pollution of our waters. The "Torrey Canyon" was built in Japan, owned in Bermuda, registered in Liberia, sailed under an Italian master and crew, was on charter to a British corporation, and had been contracted for salvage to a Dutch company. Clearly, this illustrates the necessity that any attempt to control pollution of our beaches and shorelines must be an international effort.

While less dramatic than the "Torrey Canyon" breakup, the seemingly relentless ruination of America's shorelines by oil deposits of ships of many nations goes on. No beach front property and no part of our coastline is now safe from the ravages of waste discharged from ships plying international waters. Not only oil pollution but other waste discharges are a threat of irreparable damage to wildlife, recreational resources and valuable fisheries.

Unless drastic action is taken this pollution will continue to increase unless the inevitable proliferation of population of the world can somehow be halted. The world may expect the transportation of oil cargo and other shipments to be accomplished by ever larger vessels in the future. We may now, realistically, expect the use of tankers with capacities of 200,000 to 500,000 tons of oil, dwarfing the average tanker which now carries cargo in the capacity of 15,000 tons. Other ships of every description may be expected to increase in size commensurately as will the quantity of cargo be magnified.

This traffic will be international in character and the prevention of the pollution it may cause will be a matter of concern for all nations of the world. While the United States may act to protect its shores so far as the writ of our government runs, we are helpless to enforce controls on the trade of foreign nations. This is an international problem and one of concern to all the world.

Therefore, I call upon the good offices of the Department of State and the Department of the Interior to convene an international convention to devise internationally acceptable procedures for preventing the needless pollution of our shores.

With best wishes, I remain

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

[From the New Republic, Apr. 29, 1967]

TARFOOT

As the *Torrey Canyon* slowly split in two on the Seven Stones, staining British beaches with 120,000 tons of crude oil, many could recall milder forms of pollution on ocean beaches—the oil and tar on bare feet and bathing suits. Each year this contamination increases. What would have been the result had a tanker the size of *Torrey Canyon* been stranded on the shoals of Cape Cod, Long Island or Hatteras? We had a foretaste of that in 1951 when the *Pendleton* was wrecked on Cape Cod. But what greater catastrophes are in store from future megaton oil tankers with capacities of 200,000, 300,000 or even 500,000 tons? (As recently as the last war, a standard tanker carried 15,000 tons.) The *Torrey Canyon* was built in Japan, owned in Bermuda, registered in Liberia, sailed under an Italian master and crew, was on charter to a British corporation, and had been contracted for salvage to a Dutch company. Only international action will meet such a situation.

As the oil drifted onto 100 miles of Cornish beaches and spread toward the West Country and then across the channel to France, it was the waterfowl and marine life that were the first victims. Efforts to lessen the destruction by large-scale use of detergents proved futile; fish and shellfish were further menaced. Oil-soaked birds could not fly. Rescue operations could assist only a few of these, and end the torment of others. Some species were threatened with extinction. French children and teachers tried to rescue stricken birds in sanctuaries on the Brittany coast.

The effect of even small amounts of crude oil upon sea birds is well known. The oil spreads widely upon the water in a thin film that is long lasting. Small amounts are sufficient to mat the feathers and reduce their insulating protection against the cold. Birds are poisoned by oil when attempting to clean themselves.

American eyes were opened to what has long been accepted as routine destruction of waterfowl along our own coasts. In southern New Jersey recently migrating scoters were beached in oil-soaked thousands, to be given first aid by Coast Guardsmen and conservation groups, who reported spending an hour on each duck to get it clean, and the birds were still seriously handicapped when released. Last week, Cape Cod beaches too were hit by a large oil slick.

The disaster has evoked other fears of runaway technology, the pollution of detergents foaming out of sewage disposal plants onto streams and lakes, of chemical pesticides poisoning birds and marine life to say nothing of milk and agricultural products, of sonic booms, clattering helicopters and roaring jets, of power failures and blackouts. The lack of information on the ecological effects of oil and of detergents shocks public confidence. Worst of all is the growing realization of our technological unpreparedness to deal with pollution threats of this size, even by such relatively advanced methods as floating booms or devices to skim surface pollution, and the failure to invoke them promptly.

As criticism of their government's efforts mounted, the British public was dismayed, once the picturesque Admiralty law had been penetrated, to realize how obsolescent and feeble were its powers. No one damaged by the negligence of the *Torrey Canyon* is likely to receive compensation. When the town of Southport in 1954 sued the oil tanker *Inverpool* for damages, the House of Lords reversed the finding of lower courts that shipping could be liable for discharging oil and damaging the shore. Parliament has failed to act on the court's suggestions that further legislation might be especially desirable for the protection of the public in such cases.

In this country, Congress last November passed the Clean Rivers Restoration Act, considerably broadening earlier legislation, and for the first time placing the responsibility for enforcement in the Interior Department. Aided by the Coast Guard, the Corps of Engineers and other agencies, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration can act to prevent pollution, impose criminal penalties on individuals and on vessels, and where beaches have been polluted take the necessary steps to clean them and recover the cost of such work from those who caused the damage. In principle, the federal government acts for any state or local government that may suffer damage. No occasion to test these new powers has as yet arisen, but there could hardly be a better time to start.

An earlier Oil Pollution Act of 1961 prohibits any dumping of oil within 50 miles from shore lines. This is a nice, round lawyer's figure which might be extended further or revised to reflect some facts of nature.

Led by Shell, Standard of New Jersey and British Petroleum new methods are being used to concentrate oily wastes aboard and dispose of them after landing. Accelerating the adoption of such methods might be an object of public attention. Beyond this, however, what is needed is a stricter supervision of the movement of shipping, especially that with potentially hazardous cargo, and reasonable limits should be imposed on the size of tankers. Such controls will have to be international, but the United States has a clear interest and responsibility to lead. The International Convention of Prevention of Oil Pollution of the Sea is not adequate to disasters like the *Torrey Canyon*, and the machinery of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization is too cumbersome.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, who has been put in charge of our principal oceanographic activities as chairman of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, was in Great Britain during the *Torrey Canyon* disaster and could see at firsthand the anguish of a nation which cares deeply about its natural environment, its recreation areas and its wildlife. It is an appropriate time for him to initiate an international effort to control the creeping pollution of our beaches, and the continuing threat of other marine catastrophes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MUSKIE. 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 (Mr. BAKER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AN APPEAL TO DESIST AIDING THE ENEMY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, General Westmoreland, our commander in Vietnam, today, before a joint session of the House and Senate, made this statement:

> Backed at home by resolve, confidence, patience, determination, and continued support, we will prevail in Vietnam over Communist aggression.

I commend the General on his statement before the Members of the House and the Senate today. I believe it was a courageous and forthright statement, and one which needed to be made.

Recently, General Westmoreland, in a speech at the Associated Press annual luncheon, made some assessments of the war in which we are engaged which have raised much comment.

The Washington, D.C., Post on April 25 reported the text of his remarks of the previous day. The same day, the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., carried an editorial, "Westmoreland's Appeal," commending General Westmoreland for his efforts to isolate the peaceniks and demonstrators by appealing to the patriotism and the good sense of the American people. Elsewhere in the same newspaper, David Lawrence commented on Westmoreland's message in an article entitled "Westmoreland's Frank Address." Mr. Lawrence pointed out that unity at home is essential to the success of the military policy.

These and other writers praised General Westmoreland for his remarks, and expressed hope that his efforts would bring about more solid support of the President as Commander in Chief of our Nation's military forces.

I believe that in the remarks before the Associated Press annual luncheon and in his statement today, before the joint session of Congress, General Westmoreland has expressed the necessity for unity on the part of the American people, and has expressed the need for patience, for understanding, and for continued support to the fighting men in Vietnam.

A careful review of General Westmoreland's recent statement would indicate he was referring specifically to the antiwar demonstrations staged in this country. As my colleagues know, on April 14, I spoke on this floor in protest of the outrageous antiwar demonstrations planned for major cities in the United States, on both the east and west coasts. I pointed out that any thoughtful citizen could only view with disgust the spectacle of an ugly kind of political manipulation which gives rise to such demonstrations, for the spirit fostering them is alien to the basic principles of our Republic.

I do not protest the right of American citizens to disagree with any Federal policy or to debate the issues of our day. Two of the basic rights guaranteed by our Constitution are freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

I warned that our Nation was being derogated in the eyes of the watching world by actions of demonstrators, and I deplored the obvious fact that such demonstrations encouraged our Communist enemies, prolonged the war, and helped to kill American boys. I stated that, in effect, these "Vietniks" in our midst are helping to "plow American boys under."

Two of the basic rights guaranteed by our Constitution are freedom of speech and freedom of assembly, rights which generations of Americans have laid down their lives to protect.

I do not protest the right of American citizens to disagree with any Federal policy or to debate the issues of our day, but I do protest what is obviously the subversive intent of the anti-Vietnam demonstrations which this country is witnessing in ugly disruptiveness. These demonstrators are not seeking simply to express their own viewpoint, but they seek to coerce other citizens and our Government to adopt their viewpoint. To the extent that these demonstrations incite violence and to the extent that demonstrators intimidate those not sharing their opinions, these demonstrators are infringing on the rights of others. Not only do they infringe on the rights of others, but they have also aided and abetted the enemy by encouraging him to believe that our Government does not have the full support of the American public and that in a protracted war that lack of support will increase to the point that the United States will be forced to withdraw.

As our commander in Vietnam so succinctly expressed it:

> The enemy does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve.

Despite the military defeats which our troops inflict upon the enemy, American protest demonstrations are interpreted by the enemy as an augmenting American discontent with continuation of the Vietnamese war, a discontent which is counted by the enemy as a political gain in his favor. As General Westmoreland assessed the situation:

> Despite staggering combat losses, 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 gives him hope that he can win politically that which he cannot accomplish militarily.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, aiding and abetting the enemy is inexcusable. Those American boys who daily place their lives in jeopardy in Vietnam to both prevent the Vietnam conflict from turning into the annihilation of the world and to serve in what has been determined a necessary capacity by our authorized executive policymakers as vital to American security—these boys deserve better treatment by the American public. These are our sons, our husbands, our sweethearts, and moreover, our future. I urge every American to examine his conscience before taking actions which demoralize and endanger these boys, and which encourage the enemy to prolong this horrible war in which we are engaged. It is the responsibility of the American public through debate to force the administration to continually reexamine our policy, but it is also our responsibility not to thwart the achievements and make more difficult the hazardous tasks of our boys on the battlefront.

Throughout American history we have been traditionally reluctant to enter into wars, but we have traditionally rallied behind our presidents and our fighting men, despite our opposition to war, despite different political affiliations. I, personally, regret that we ever became involved in South Vietnam. But the fact remains that we are there. Our fighting men are there. Because our Government was quicker to respond to the threat this time, because the situation is highly complicated by the youthful weaknesses of the nation we are assisting to defend, because we are dealing with a highly sophisticated enemy when it comes to the relatively new use of psychological warfare, this war has an aura of ambiguity connected with it which has not existed in previous wars. Nevertheless, we are at war. I add my appeal to that made by General Westmoreland that those who disapprove of our involvement in the Vietnam war refrain from actions, actions which encourage and strengthen the enemy confronting our American soldiers.

Mr. President, I also join with General Westmoreland, as I believe every Senator would join with him, in the statement he made today before the joint session that—

> Backed at home by resolve, confidence, patience, determination and continued support, we will prevail in Vietnam over Communist aggression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper articles and editorial, which I have previously identified, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S REMARKS AT ASSOCIATED PRESS MEETING

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 have, by this time, his own image 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 the battle going? And what lies ahead? These questions I will address.

The Vietnamese—and we their allies—are involved in a total undertaking—a single, all-pervading confrontation in which the fate of the people of Vietnam, the independence of the free nations of Asia, and the future of emerging nations—as well as the reputation and the very 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 areas 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 he will defeat us. And through a clever combination of psychological and political warfare—both here and abroad—he has gained support which gives him hope that he can win politically that which 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 standard three-phase pattern—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, Hanoi directed that the Vietcong begin 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 deci-

sion by Hanoi to enter the decisive, and final, phase. Vietcong companies were formed into battalions, regiments and divisions, and North Vietnamese army units began to infiltrate covertly to the south.

On Hanoi's terms

Never at any time during those 10 years of subversion, terror and attack did Hanoi relax its control over its war against 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.

What we have is not a civil war. It is a massive campaign of external aggression from Communist North Vietnam.

The political cells have created an enemy pseudo-government that still pervades many villages and hamlets. The guerrillas wage constantly, mostly at night, the cruelest kind of war—terrorism—civilians are shot, bombed and mutilated as examples to those who might resist or defect, or simply because they are leaders.

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 20 miles north of Saigon. Among the victims were five revolutionary development team members. Three of them were women. Their hands were tied behind their backs and they were shot through the head.

During the last nine years, 53,000 Vietnamese—a large share of them teachers, policemen, and elected or natural leaders—have been killed or kidnaped. 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 would not submit to blackmail.

At the other end of the war spectrum, we have fought, in the south, during the past year, major elements of eight North 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, intimidation, and murder of those individuals who oppose it.

Two years ago South Vietnam was on the verge of defeat. 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 longstanding 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 stand firm—to stay the course. This meant using whatever military and economic power was necessary.

Once we had major forces ashore we began to look for the enemy, and he was not hard to find. Major battles ensued; they were bitter and bloody. But in them we learned that the enemy has little regard for human life and, for propaganda purposes, will turn losses and defeats into absurd claims of victory.

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 he stood and fought and we punished him severely. Now he is becoming more difficult to find. We have invaded his elaborate and widely scattered base areas—some of them built over a period of 20 years.

Working closely with the Vietnamese forces we have moved into many of the populated and productive areas which formerly provided supplies and recruits to the enemy.

Infiltration is costly

We have turned the enemy's ambushes against him and we have learned how to draw him into an ambush. We have sent our deep patrols to find him. He has been punished by B52 strikes and unparalleled close support from our tactical air, artillery and naval gunfire. And on land and sea we have made his infiltration costly.

Although the military picture 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 breaking up his major units and scattering them about, or that he has given up his plans to try to inflict major defeat upon us. He is taking great casualties 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 morale purposes, and he will continue to strive for one.

So the end is not in sight. The enemy can hide in the jungles and mountains of South Vietnam where we cannot reach him without major effort. He rests and regroups, trains and replenishes in hidden camps and supply areas in regions along the borders of neutral countries and the demilitarized zone which he overtly violated almost a year ago. He continues to recruit and train guerrillas for use as guides and intelligence agents for his main force units and for sabotage and terror. So we must be prepared for more bitter fighting in days to come.

Before leaving the military situation, I must honestly say that I am concerned about cease-fire proposals. In other wars, a 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 periods to reinforce and resupply his units, and to strengthen and realign his political posture.

One of the regrettable facts of war—any war—is that casualties are not confined to the military forces involved. There are civilian casualties in Vietnam and these are of constant concern to me, my commanders and men. But, civilian casualties do not result from indiscriminate use of our firepower. They are caused by mechanical failure or human error. This is in sharp contrast to the Vietcong policy of calculated attacks on civilians.

Never in the history of warfare have 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 to understand and admire them. A look at their record in combat, as well as in political administration, reveals an exceptional performance, when all is 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 guerrilla and main forces alone, until our arrival, and, during that time, they were expanding their forces to the limit that their manpower and economy could support. Except for the continental army of our early years, never before in history has a young military force been subjected to such a challenge. In my book, the Republic of Vietnam armed forces have conducted themselves with credit. As I tour the country several times each week, I am encouraged by the obvious improvement in the morale, proficiency and quality of their fighting forces.

Stanch allies

Today the Republic of Vietnam armed forces are working and fighting side by side with their allies—the Koreans, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the Tais and the Filipinos, as well as the Americans, and they have earned the confidence of these stanch 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.

More important to the Vietnamese, I think, is the fact that our American servicemen are eager to help them build schools, dispensaries, and other things of lasting value to their communities. These civic action projects, voluntarily undertaken by our troops and those of our allies, are inspiring to behold.

A young corporal undertakes the support of a Montagnard family whose breadwinner has been assassinated. An American squad or platoon adopts a hamlet, bringing to its people the material things they need and the spiritual uplift which will help them to self-sufficiency. Many communities in Vietnam are living a better life because of the encouragement and help our troops have given to them. A true missionary zeal among our troops is commonplace and is one of 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 I see their courage against the enemy and their compassion toward their friends, I am inspired by their example.

I would like to tell you more about the men of my command. Today your soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines and coast guardsmen:

Are better educated than before.

Are better informed.

Have traditional American ingenuity and initiative.

Are better physical specimens.

Have high morale.

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 pride . . . and they are dismayed, as I am, by recent unpatriotic acts here at home.

Who are these men? They are mostly youngsters representing every State of the 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 policies, professional unit leadership, and unprecedented material support. Their medical care is superb, their food is excellent and their mail is carefully handled. Shortages have been few and of short duration.

Forward with confidence

As an individual, this fighting man is a tough, determined professional in battle one day, and next day, a sensitive, compassionate friend helping the Vietnamese people. He is a fighter, a thinker, and a doer. He has seen—at first hand—Communist subversion and aggression at work; he has acquired a deeper appreciation of the importance of freedom. And from his ranks in the years ahead will come the confident, alert, intelligent citizens and leaders who will make this nation's future greater than its past.

With fighting forces like these, a com-

mander cannot help but look forward with confidence as he views the military situation.

But I am mindful that the military war in South Vietnam is, from the enemy's point of view, only part of a protracted and carefully coordinated attack, waged in the international arena. Regrettably, I see signs of enemy success in that world arena which he cannot match on the battlefield. He does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, 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 in our battlefield capability. And I am confident of 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.

Thank you.

(Gen. Westmoreland answered written questions submitted at the annual meeting of the Associated Press. Following is a partial text 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 troops in considerable numbers during the past year. They are continuing to arrive. The number of troops that will ultimately be needed is a matter that will have to be studied in consideration of many factors—our estimate of the enemy's capabilities and intentions, the economy of South Vietnam. Because as we deploy troops to go ashore we per se put pressure on their economy and this is a factor that has to be considered. These matters and these factors 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 military security, I cannot give you any definitive number as to my estimate of the number of troops that will be required.

Bombing of airfield

Q. Would you comment please on the bombing today in North Vietnam, an airfield there. What happens if the Migs take sanctuary in Red China?

A. I was delighted to learn that the Mig airfields have been bombed, at least two of them today. This was a military target on which was based aircraft that had been used offensively against our fighter-bombers. It is true that Migs could take sanctuary in China, as they did during the Korean War, but the Migs would be at a disadvantage operating from those bases compared with those in North Vietnam. The reaction time would be increased and they would therefore become a lesser threat to our fighter-bombers, 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 this count?

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 from time to time some exaggeration. There could be some double counting of casualties, but in my opinion this is more than offset by those enemy troops that are killed by artillery or air strikes that we never know about. Also we do not claim credit, in estimating or assessing casualties on the enemy, those that die 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 on the conservative side when all factors are considered.

Political aspects of war

Q. Could you run this war without political help and could you win this war if given a free hand in military decisions?

A. As a military man, this is a bit of an awkward question. I think it is impossible in view of the nature of the war, a war of both subversion and invasion, a war in which political and psychological factors are of such consequence, to sort out the war between the political and the military. Political factors must be considered, they must be considered in selecting targets. They must be considered in our actions involving nearby so-called neutral countries. They must be considered in the means that are used in pursuing the war. The reason for this is not only because of the complexity 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 political factors have to be considered and the decisions involved are necessarily above my levels. 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.

Sino-Soviet intervention

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 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 terms of air defense, weapons and systems. The Communist Chinese are providing support in the form of transportation units and some anti-aircraft weapon but primarily infantry-type weapon 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 could hazard the risk that would necessarily be involved.

Vietcong fighting spirit

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

A. The Vietcong, organized, directed and commanded from Hanoi, have placed good emphasis on political indoctrination. As a matter of interest their training program for their unit 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 use strong-arm methods that are required to keep their troops in line.

Now, this so-called cadre, or leadership, are excellent. They have been well trained and indoctrinated and they are committed. However, we have noted a number of recent trends that are encouraging. 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 the rank and file of these units would like very much to defect, to come in under the government of Vietnam's amnesty program, the so-called Chieu Hoi program. But the cadre control them so tightly that they cannot get away. We also know that there is considerable friction between the North Vietnamese leadership and the South Vietnamese, the Vietcong North Vietnamese leaders are playing more and more a role 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 defectors were primarily confined to the lower ranks, now we are getting some of the senior officers. I talked to one the other day, a senior officer, and he told me 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 find a way. The control by the North Vietnamese leaders was of such consequence that they could not make the break.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

WESTMORELAND'S APPEAL

In his address to the Associated Press managing editors, General Westmoreland was calling for two things—understanding of the war in Vietnam 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 435,000 Americans.

This general is not a wishful thinker. "The end," he said, "is not in sight. I foresee, in the months ahead, some of the bitterest fighting of the war."

But General Westmoreland also spoke with confidence in our "battlefield capability." The problem as he sees it no longer involves danger of a military defeat. A military victory is beyond the reach of the Communists. He is concerned, 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 am, by recent unpatriotic acts here at home. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies."

General Westmoreland knows, of course, that it is impossible to ban anti-war demonstrations in this country. Even as he spoke to the editors, demonstrators were marching in front of the hotel, one of them carrying a placard which read: "Westmoreland Wanted for War Crimes."

What can be done, however, and what General Westmoreland evidently hoped to do, is to isolate the peaceniks by appealing to the patriotism and the good sense of the American people.

The same thing is true of the address to the Economics Club of Detroit by General Wallace M. Greene Jr., commandant of the Marine Corps.

A great many, perhaps most, Americans are uneasy and unhappy with the war in Vietnam. But they also know that there is no easy way out. And as they come to realize that such shameful episodes as the recent demonstrations in New York and San Francisco serve no better purpose than to encourage the enemy and prolong the war, we think they will listen to the General Westmorelands and the General Greenes, not to the shrill, irrational clamor on the American Left.

WELCOME ABOARD

A few months ago Senator Pastore was calling for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. Now he has changed his mind.

The Rhode Island Democrat, not unlike Senator Brooke, of Massachusetts, has taken a hard look at the recent evidence and has concluded that, by and large, the President is doing what has to be done.

This is not to say that Senator Pastore has become a hawk in any extreme sense of that overworked word. But he has concluded that it is Ho Chi Minh, not Lyndon B. Johnson, who stands in the way of a just and honorable settlement of the war. Coming from a respected member of the Senate, this is a development to be welcomed. And we are of the belief that there would be more such conversions if many of those who persist in damning the President would put aside their emotions and examine the facts.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

WESTMORELAND'S FRANK ADDRESS

(By David Lawrence)

Someone in the administration certainly made a wise decision in letting Gen. William C. Westmoreland go before the managing editors of the Associated Press at their annual meeting in New York City this week and make such a frank and outspoken address about the Vietnam war.

The only question that arises is why the things he said were not emphasized heretofore by the government of the United States, so that throughout the world it would become known that the protesting groups in this country do not reflect public opinion.

The United States military commander in Vietnam said pointedly that he saw signs of "enemy success in the world arena" which could not be matched on the battlefield. The general stated the case succinctly when he added:

"He (the enemy) does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies."

For several months now, inside and outside of Congress, criticism of the Vietnam war not only has been disheartening, but has actually played a part in prolonging the conflict and preventing peace negotiations. Scarcely a day passes that some senator doesn't arise to announce that the war is being "escalated" or that America has no business fighting for freedom any more. The impression conveyed is that, when the United States is engaged in a war, it must ask the members of the Senate just what tactics to employ. This not only damages morale but causes confusion in the handling of the war strategy itself.

Whenever the American forces intensify their attack, there is an outcry in Congress. Thus, on the same day that Westmoreland was making his speech in New York, the Democratic leader of the Senate, Mike Mansfield, said that the American air strikes against the MIG bases in North Vietnam represent "further escalation" which, he declared, "will make it more difficult to get negotiations under way."

Another Democratic leader—Vice President Hubert Humphrey—almost coincidentally was telling the Texas state legislature at Austin that it would be "A betrayal of American liberalism" for this country to forsake the rest of the world and fail to use America's strength to preserve freedom. He declared:

"What would be the morality of a nation which devoted its riches only to itself, or regarded freedom in one part of the world as less precious than in another?"

Neither political party has been able to give the President the solid support which the commander-in-chief has always had in past wars in American history.

The Vietnam war is being pursued on the battlefield and in the air more effectively today than ever before. But unity at home is essential to the success of the military policy.

Although the United Nations seems frustrated, individual governments can still perform a useful function in expressing themselves frankly in support of the American position.

In the next few months, world opinion could force the North Vietnamese to the conference table and bring an end to the war. This is not likely, however, as long as there are staged protests as well as criticisms in Congress which indicate that either the United States is afraid of the enemy and will not use its maximum power, or that an artificially developed fear of "escalation" will cause the American government to retreat and eventually withdraw in humiliation.

President Johnson is known to have taken a positive position—namely, that he will follow the advice of the military men and pursue the war vigorously in order to persuade the enemy that it is better for the aggressors to withdraw now from South Vietnam and save themselves from a destructive punishment.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) 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.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, am I correct that the pending business is S. 1039?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. 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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider Calendar No. 146 on the calendar of nominations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

Rear Adm. James C. Tison, Jr., USESSA, Director, Coast and Geodetic Survey, to serve as a member of the Mississippi River Commission;

Brig. Gen. William T. Bradley, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission; and

Brig. Gen. John A. B. Dillard, Jr., U.S. Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There is no objection, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

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. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RUSH-BAGOT AGREEMENT DAYS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a very significant event in the United States-Canadian relations—the enactment of a resolution which I sponsored, with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], our senior minority member, designating April 28 and 29 as Rush-Bagot Agreement Days, in commemoration of the signing, 150 years ago, of the Rush-Bagot Agreement, which provided for a completely disarmed border between the United States and Canada. As this is also the year of the Canadian exposition known as Expo-67, it is even more especially a significant anniversary.

Following the Rush-Bagot Agreement, the principles of disarmament gradually extend from the area covered by the agreement—which included the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain—to the en-

tire borderline between the United States and Canada. So, as the result of the foresight of our then Secretary of State, Richard Rush, and the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, Charles Bagot, we today enjoy, with Canada, the longest unfortified boundary on the globe—5,270 miles long, including Alaska.

This commemorative resolution was signed by the President yesterday. The free boundary between the United States and Canada has become a symbol of what can be accomplished by neighbors, and an example to the rest of the world. I am deeply honored to have been able to sponsor the resolution memorializing the commemoration of that great international event. I think it is an occasion for mutual congratulations between the United States and Canada that our two countries are able to celebrate such an anniversary, and look back upon the successful history of so celebrated a partnership effort in terms of international peace.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum entitled "Example of Successful Disarmament Treaty," published this month by the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

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

"RUSH-BAGOT AGREEMENT DAYS," APRIL 28–29, 1967—EXAMPLE OF SUCCESSFUL DISARMAMENT TREATY

The Rush-Bagot agreement, whose 150th Anniversary is celebrated April 28–29, demilitarized the U.S.-Canadian frontier. It remains one of the most successful disarmament agreements of all time. It is therefore most appropriate that this agreement, which has enabled U.S.-Canadian friendship to grow, should be commemorated by the Senate and House—S. J. Res. 49 (Javits and Aiken) and H. J. Res. 468 (Button).

The following extract from *The Arms Race* by Nobel prize winner Philip Noel-Baker gives some background on the treaty. Philip Noel-Baker quotes from three noted historians and then summarizes four points to be drawn from the Agreement:

"The disarmament was effected in the area which was regarded as of vital strategical importance.

"It was opposed by the military advisers of both Governments, and for some years their views prevailed.

"It was only agreed to after 'a sharp struggle' in the British Cabinet (later 'sharp struggles' about disarmament ended differently).

"Those who opposed it said that it left one party (the weaker) 'defenceless.' "

The full text from *The Arms Race*, pages 511–515, discussing the Rush-Bagot Agreement, follows:

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN FRONTIER

As the result of the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817 between the British and United States Governments, the whole frontier between Canada and the United States was demilitarised. The story of the Agreement, and of its results, can best be told by extracts from leading historians:

Sir Charles Webster: "The war of 1812 had clearly shown that the *strategic situation on the Canadian frontier depended almost entirely on the command of the Lakes. Wellington had insisted on it as the key to the situation, when invited to take command in 1814.* It was only natural, therefore, that, immediately peace was obtained, both countries should show the keenest anxiety to secure their *position by establishing naval superiority. Castlereagh had from the first, however, desired an arrangement to prevent so dangerous and ruinous a competition. He had in 1814 been overruled by the military advisers,* and the British Government adopted the view that as they were the 'weaker party' in North America they ought to be allowed control of the Lakes as a measure of defence. Naturally the Government of the United States could not agree to a suggestion which would have left them open to attack, while Canada was almost completely protected. Nevertheless, Madison and Monroe were no less anxious than Castlereagh to avoid the construction of rival fleets. . . . In April 1816 he (Castlereagh) reopened negotiations, and at once agreed that no new construction should be begun until the matter had been discussed further. *The shipbuilding race was thus at once stopped.* . . . Monroe . . . made the definite suggestion that naval armaments should be limited to the few vessels necessary for customs and police. Castlereagh obtained the agreement of the Cabinet. . . .

"This was a positive achievement and the greatest contribution to the establishment of good relations between the two peoples during this period." [The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, pp. 446–477.]

The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy: "Since complete disarmament would appear to leave the Canadian Colonists defenceless against a sudden American attack, the British Cabinet was somewhat loath to consider the proposal. . . . Ultimately, however, Castlereagh expressed his readiness to enter upon negotiations. . . . It [the Rush-Bagot Agreement] was very short and *provided only for mutual disarmament upon the Lakes. . . . It had the most important effects; for in the temptation to naval rivalry on the opposite shores of the Lakes lay the germ of infinite mischief.* Its removal *set a precedent for the management of the frontier between the United States and British North America which has saved both Powers from great expense in fortifications and military guards and has deprived the frontier disputes of much of the acute danger they might otherwise have caused."* [Vol. II, pp. 223–224.]

G. M. Trevelyan: *"Before Castlereagh's career as Foreign Secretary ended, the fortunes of Anglo-American peace had been established on the sound basis of disarmament along the Canadian border, enabling future generations to weather many fierce storms, and to settle a frontier problem that no other two Great Powers would have been able to decide without war. . . .*

"The problem before Great Britain and Canada on one side and the United States on the other was nothing less than to fix a frontier of four thousand miles, which, except in the region of the Lakes, was not indicated by any natural boundary. It was perhaps the greatest operation that has ever been achieved in the interest of peace, and it took many years and many statesmen to accomplish and perfect it. But the most important stage of the whole proceeding came in 1817, when, after a sharp struggle inside the British Cabinet, the British and American Governments agreed to abolish their navies on the Great Lakes, and forthwith dismantled, sold or sank the warships on Erie and Ontario. These fleets have never been reconstructed. From that moment forward, 'the long, invisible unguarded line' that divides Canada from her neighbour has been successfully defended by the sole garrison of trust and good will, even during the frequently recurring periods of acrimonious dispute as to its whereabouts. *If there had been armaments there would some time have been war."* [British History in the Nineteenth Century, pp. 177–178.] . . .

It was not, as is so often said, the fact of common race, or a common language, that saved Britain and the United States from war throughout the nineteenth century and made war unthinkable in the twentieth; those factors may have helped, but, according to the consensus of opinion among the historians, the vital and decisive factor was the total abolition, and the immediate "scrapping," of the armaments which each of the two parties then felt to be "especially efficacious against its national defence."

Later generations of Britons have owed a great debt of gratitude to Castlereagh and his colleagues for their persistence in their sharp but victorious struggle for disarmament.

[Italics as in original.]

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. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the week's news carries three major stories: First, that King Constantine of Greece appeared in public in full dress military uniform to express his tacit approval of the military coup d'etat that destroyed the constitutional Government in Greece; second, that retiring Ambassador Henry Lodge believes continuance of the military junta in office in South Vietnam is preferable to a civilian government; and, third, that General Westmoreland returned from the battlefields of southeast Asia to take the case for the war to the public stump in the United States.

The fruits of 20 years of American economic and military aid to Greece have been the destruction of constitutionalism there at the hands of the people we armed to the teeth with the latest of American planes and tanks, and whose armies we feed and clothe with American money. Communism could scarcely have achieved a more complete victory over constitutionalism in that country than did the military dictatorship we spawned there.

The reliance of the United States upon military force in South Vietnam has grown steadily. It has been evident to me for some 3 years now, that force alone could achieve the continuance in office of a pro-American government in that country. Ambassador Lodge's advocacy of the military junta is a tacit admission that civilian government in South Vietnam has not achieved American ends in that part of the world, and cannot do so.

Here at home, we have seen the administration seek to blame the failure of its Vietnam policy not upon its own mistakes, but upon Americans who have warned from the start that the United States should not bog itself down on the mainland of Asia. Those warnings have not come just from a handful of Senators, but from such eminent military leaders as General MacArthur, General Gavin, General Ridgway, and General Eisenhower.

It is in the American tradition to blame other Americans for our reverses abroad. Who does not remember the outcry that it was the American State Department that "lost" China to communism, and not the corruption of Chang Kai-shek and his feudal war lords plus the rise of national unity in every nation of Asia? No, it was someone here in the United States, and someone in high office, who accomplished what the Communists would never be able to accomplish.

So it is not at all surprising to me to hear the advocates of the war in Vietnam blaming Americans for the fact that 3 years of optimistic predictions, 3 years of steady escalation of American military force, and 3 years of repudiation of President Johnson's 1964 campaign promises have not produced victory in South Vietnam.

They have not produced victory because our policy in Vietnam is based upon mistaken premises and seeks objectives that cannot be achieved by the means we are applying—those means being essentially the use of overwhelming military force.

Wrapping a bad policy in the American flag does not improve its chances for success one iota. It only means that more American men will die in the effort to advance it.

No one has more personal respect than I for General Westmoreland, and for the courage and professional competence of himself and the men he commands. But I ask him: "What war, anytime, anywhere, has not been basically a test of resolve? Is it possible that this war is so different from every other war, and especially from every other American war, that it alone will not stand the test of analysis among our own people? War is always a test of the resolve of one group against the other. What has up to now differentiated America from other nations at war has been the assumption that war does not suspend our system of constitutional government."

Perhaps General Westmoreland, and the civilans who brought him to the United States and put him on the public rostrum, have not read the words of Justice Jackson in the case of West Virginia against Barnett, when he upheld the right of an American child to refuse to salute the flag:

> Freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be the mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order.

General Westmoreland is a fine man and a fine military officer. But it is not his function in our system of government to enter the political arena until he puts aside his uniform. Nor should he be asked to do so by his civilian supervisors, who are in effect asking him to perform what is their rightful function.

If anything is ingrained in our constitutional freedom under our system, it is that the military are to take commands in respect to carrying out our constitutional system of government, and not seek to give them. That is a lesson of constitutionalism that apparently General Westmoreland seems not to have learned.

I know of no more complete and important answer to the General's appearances and to the administration for which he speaks than that offered at Yale Political Union on April 26 by my colleague from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, and I ask unanimous consent to have the text of his remarks printed at the conclusion of my own remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in particular, I call attention to his statement:

> The President says we are in South Vietnam to preserve that country's liberty. But what is being done in the name of liberty? Are we not being asked to preserve the liberty of South Vietnam at the expense of our own? Are we not helping the South Vietnamese to write and adopt a Constitution to define their liberties while at the same time we are allowing the President to re-define our Constitution to deny us liberty?

The Westmoreland visit has had the effect of shifting the discussion in the United States away from the merits of the war into a discussion of whether free speech is being squelched. But free speech will not be squelched by generals or Presidents or Secretaries of Defense or Secretaries of State or by anyone else in this country so long as men dedicated to our constitutional system have the courage to dissent and, in dissenting, bring to the American people the facts about this illegal, immoral, and unjustified war that is taking the lives of our youth.

That issue is not going to be silenced as far as the dissenters are concerned by a General Westmoreland, by a President, by a Cabinet member, or by any of my colleagues in the Senate here in this historic debate.

We intend to continue to try to get this Republic to change the ill-fated course of action on which the President is leading us.

It will not be long before new troop assignments to Vietnam, new casualty lists, new bombing targets in North Vietnam, new contributions to the war from China and the Soviet Union, will again compel Americans to assess the cost of what we are doing in southeast Asia with results. More important, these events will also compel the American people to do just what the French people did and reconsider whether military force can achieve a permanent foothold for our country in southeast Asia.

Make no mistake that this is exactly what the war is about. It is a war to make certain that a government we approve of remains in power in Saigon, this military tyranny in the form of the Ky junta, every member of which was a French officer participating in a war against his own people.

The mass of the South Vietnamese people know that Ky and the members of his military junta are responsible for the killing of thousands of fellow countrymen in the Indochina war, when the Vietnamese were in revolt against the French dynasty and colonial power in Indochina.

We are killing American boys today to try to support that tyranny in South Vietnam. As witnesses before the Committee on Foreign Relations have testified, that tyranny will be dependent for its perpetuation upon the maintenance for years of American bayonets in South Vietnam.

Any contest of resolve going on, may I say to General Westmoreland, is no different from the test of national resolves in World War II, or World War I, or the test of intranational resolve in the Civil War.

Mr. President, I appeal once again to the American people to consider what the end is that we seek in Vietnam; to judge whether it can be accomplished with methods and at a price that are in keeping with our international principles and our interests elsewhere in the world.

I regret that General Westmoreland has said nothing that sheds light upon these real issues, for they are going to remain the issues before the American people.

In the words of Adlai Stevenson, in his acceptance of the Democratic Party nomination in 1952, the issues that confront mankind and Americans will not fall before a general's baton.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS OF SENATOR MARK O. HATFIELD AT THE YALE POLITICAL UNION, NEW HAVEN, CONN., APRIL 26, 1967

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce, or a tragedy, or perhaps both."

These are the words of President James Madison and I find them hauntingly appropriate today as more and more Americans admit to complete confusion regarding our policies and purposes in Vietnam. As this confusion has grown greater, and as it has become more difficult to define and defend a moderate stand, increasing numbers have sought solution in extremes. Louder and more demanding have grown cries for escalation—"let's win and get out." Equally demanding have grown the cries for immediate abandonment. And, in this clamor and confusion, the voices of moderation have been muted.

The solution for Vietnam is not to be found in emotional extremes but in a well-reasoned policy that respects historical fact and that accommodates current realities.

The present course of our involvement has been charted on a distorted map. The mapmakers have deliberately misinterpreted the 20 year history of this conflict to justify our present involvement, and they follow their twisted path with a lack of sensitivity to political realities and priorities.

If we are to reach our destination of a just peace in Southeast Asia, I am convinced that we must rechart our course—first, through an honest interpretation of history and an alteration of our policies to comply with this history, and second, through a recognition of this conflict as a political problem that must be solved through political offensives and not solely by military force.

We must recognize that Ho Chi Minh has been fighting and earning popular support since before the end of the Second World War and always under the primary cause of *nationalism*. And, following the Geneva Agreements, the conflict in South Vietnam was clearly a *civil war* among the Vietnamese people and not a war of aggression initiated by a foreign power. These are the raw facts of history and the true nature of this conflict.

But to justify our role in Vietnam, our gigantic intrusion into the affairs of this

small country, President Johnson misrepresented the nature of this conflict as a "war of aggression" conducted by the North Vietnamese. It was on the basis of this deliberately distorted definition that Americans accepted the commitment of 100,000 men to South Vietnam early in 1965. Secretary of State Rusk explained that this escalation, this departure from our role as advisors to the South Vietnamese, was necessary to meet aggression from the North. The 100,000 men, Rusk said, was a response to the movement of the entire North Vietnamese 325th Division into the South at the end of 1964. A State Department White Paper reported that 4,400 and possibly as many as 7,400 North Vietnamese had infiltrated into the South during 1964. In June 1966, however, the Pentagon confirmed Senator Mansfield's report that only 400 North Vietnamese soldiers had infiltrated during 1964. Mansfield concluded, and Secretary McNamara admitted, that it had been the weakness of the South Vietnamese government and the threat of its imminent collapse—and not the strength of the Communists—that had caused the commitment of 100,000 men, in 120 days, in early 1965. Thus on the basis of a misrepresentation by the Administration, the American public allowed the President to send American boys to fight a war he had said should be fought by Asians; to falsely redefine the conflict as primarily a war of aggression; and to seek a military solution to this political problem.

Other misrepresentations and contradictions have created more confusion and further reduced the public's capability to effectively influence the course of the war. The President has misrepresented the nature of the conflict and he has also misrepresented the nature of United States policy. As a candidate for President in 1964, Mr. Johnson stated in August, "Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions." Yet within three months of his election as President, the decision was made to send Marine combat troops to Vietnam.

This reversal in positions and contradiction in statements is characteristic of Secretary of Defense McNamara also. On March 15, 1962; on May 12, 1962; on January 27, 1964; and on November 10, 1964, he stated that the United States was in South Vietnam to provide training, that he had no plan for introducing U.S. combat forces to South Vietnam, that we were there only to support the frontline troops of the South Vietnamese army, and that the war must be fought and won by the Vietnamese. But today, in absolute contradiction to assurances made to the American people that the war would be fought by the South Vietnamese and not by the United States, American combat troops number nearly 500,000.

Mr. McNamara has made numerous other statements that have been contradicted by fact. Perhaps best known of these is his prediction in October of 1963 that the major part of the U.S. military task could be completed by the end of 1965. This statement is by no means his only inaccurate prophecy or faulty assessment however. On May 12, 1962, he stated "Progress in the last 8 to 10 weeks has been great . . . nothing but progress and hopeful indications of further progress in the future." On July 25, 1962, he said: "Our military assistance to Vietnam is paying off. I continue to be encouraged. There are many signs indicating progress." And on January 31, 1963, he restated his optimism: "There is a new feeling of confidence that victory is possible in South Vietnam." According to McNamara's statements, we have been making great progress. Unfortunately, McNamara's "progress" has brought us no closer to a solution than we were in 1962.

The President has stated that "the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement." Yet the President has failed completely to establish peace negotiations. This failure cannot be completely blamed on Ho Chi Minh's refusal to be "reasonable." There are a number of well-documented instances where the United States refused offers from Hanoi to negotiate. In 1964 the United States turned down two tangible and specific proposals to initiate peace discussions. In late July, General DeGaulle called for a Geneva-type conference and Russia asked the fourteen nations of the Geneva conference to reconvene. All major parties to the conflict agreed to the meeting but the United States replied: "We do not believe in conferences called to ratify terror, so our policy is unchanged." And, during September 1964 North Vietnam offered to meet with U.S. representatives in Rangoon, Burma, to discuss terms for ending the hostilities in Vietnam. Despite U Thant's determined efforts to arrange the talks, the U.S. rejected the proposal.

Late in February, 1965, U Thant again tried to set up peace discussions and disclosed at a news conference that he had made concrete proposals and suggestions to the United States and to other powers principally involved in the Vietnam question. But the United States refused to participate and Administration officials confessed several months later that, if they had agreed to peace talks with Hanoi, it might have toppled the Government of Saigon.

A recent dialogue on the possibility of establishing peace negotiations is a repetition of the same old story of the Administration rejecting an offer to negotiate as not "meaningful" or not substantial. On December 4, 1966, a message from Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki stated that Hanoi had agreed to talks at the Ambassadorial level in Warsaw. North Vietnam asked that special representatives be dispatched from Washington for this purpose. But after the American bombing raids near Hanoi December 13 and 14 in which civilian areas were damaged, North Vietnam withdrew its agreement, accusing the United States of bad faith.

The Administration now refuses to seek negotiations under conditions that it would have accepted a year ago. Perhaps the North Vietnamese do not sincerely want peace discussions and, even if negotiations were established, the results might be disappointing. But we must explore every avenue to peace and we cannot afford to second-guess the outcome of a complex political situation.

In fighting a war, our position must naturally be flexible, but this does not mean that the truth must be flexible, that the truth must be subservient to political motives. Every time that truth is distorted or denied us, we are denied a bit of our liberty. When government spokesmen misrepresent international situations and misrepresent our national intentions, they effectively greatly narrow alternatives to their policies. Many feel forced then, out of confusion and on the basis of no clear alternative, to endorse current policy.

Thus is created the tyranny of the "big lie"—a tyranny of "no alternatives," a tyranny that does not allow Americans the liberty of choice and that does not allow us effective voice in directing our nation's course.

Thus, we have an Administration that presents no alternative to escalating the war—to expanding its efforts to solve this basically political and economic struggle with military force.

I am firmly convinced that continued military escalation is destroying the possibility of a negotiated and lasting peace.

The purpose of this escalation, according to the Administration, is to bring Ho Chi Minh to the peace table. What kind of distorted logic leads us to believe that bombing North Vietnam's cities and factories will bring Ho to a conference table to discuss peace. We must take into account the psychology of escalation. The more we escalate the war, the more we bomb North Vietnam, the more going to the conference table becomes surrender. You don't "negotiate" with a man while holding a gun to his head: you outline the terms for his surrender. For Ho Chi Minh to agree to peace talks while we were bombing his country would be a great humiliation and would, in Ho's eyes, be virtual capitulation.

An American professor of psychiatry, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year, stated that escalation was not an effective method of establishing peace negotiations. Dr. Jerome D. Frank, Professor of Psychiatry at the Johns Hopkins University, stated: "The Vietnam war has assumed an ideological character similar to the holy wars of former times, and this has ominous implications. . . . People fighting for their ideals seldom if ever can be forced into surrendering by punishment. . . . The notion that one can cause people to abandon their ideologies by inflicting pain on them should have died in Rome with the Christian martyrs."

Annihilation of the North Vietnamese will not bring peace to the South. A defeated Ho Chi Minh, with his 50,000 troops returned to the North, would still leave five-sixths of the present enemy forces continuing the war in the South.

This Administration has lost its capacity to lead us to a peaceful conclusion of the war. It is defensively and inflexibly committed to policies which have not worked since they were initiated 20 years ago and show no hint of working now.

Yet our Vietnam policy-makers ask Americans to line up shoulder to shoulder and, in the name of blind faith and national unity, endorse their policies. They attempt to silence their critics by accusing the dissenters of aiding the enemy and of prolonging the war.

This Administration is using political blackmail to eliminate the painful but democratic necessity of giving all views a fair hearing. Those who dare to challenge the Administration's policies do so at the risk of having their patriotism questioned. I want to caution that we must not confuse patriotism with blind endorsement of bad policies.

They have now brought one of the most respected Vietnam policy-makers, the military field commander, to the United States where he is joining in the effort to silence the opposition. I want to contrast this general's statements—denouncing those who disagree with the Administration's policies—with the comment of one of America's great soldiers and statesmen. General George Washington in an address to the officers of the Army in 1783 defended the right and *necessity* to hear all opinions "If men are to be precluded from offering their sentiments on a matter—which may involve the most serious and alarming consequences that can invite the consideration of mankind—(then) reason is of no use; the freedom of speech may be taken away and, dumb and silent, we may be led like sheep to the slaughter."

As much as I oppose our present policies in Vietnam, I *can* attribute them to be the misguided actions of sincere men. I cannot, however, on any grounds, excuse the present vicious attempts by these men to gag the voices of opposition by impuning their patriotism.

What are these powerful and influential men telling the American people? That no one should criticize the war in Vietnam? That no one should voice any protest? That every truly loyal American will in silence accept every Administration decision in the conduct of this war? That it is disloyal and treasonous to dissent?

I am very deeply concerned by this at-

tempt to silence opposing opinions. The President says we are in South Vietnam to preserve that country's liberty. But just what is being done in the name of liberty? Are we not being asked to preserve the liberty of South Vietnam at the expense of our own? Are we not helping the South Vietnamese to write and adopt a Constitution to define their liberties while at the same time we are allowing the President to re-define our Constitution to deny us our liberty?

The President cannot suspend the freedom of speech granted by the Bill of Rights in order to make his administration of the war popular. The Constitutional right of free speech has been upheld to be the same both in peace and in war. Our Bill of Rights is not suspended even in a period of declared war, much less in a time of undeclared war.

The courts have ruled that free speech is always untrammelled unless its exercise creates a "clear and present danger." Only if the words are of such a nature and are used under such circumstances that men, judging in calmness, could reasonably say that they created a clear and present danger that they would bring about the evils which our government has a right to prevent, only then can freedom of speech be curtailed.

The case for freedom of speech should need no restating. But Justice Brandeis has stated it so well and so forthrightly that I believe it bears review at this time. He said, in a 1927 case: "Those who won our independence believed that the final end of the state was to make men free to develop their faculties. . . . They believed that freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth; that without free speech and assembly discussion would be futile; that with them, discussion affords ordinarily adequate protection against the dissemination of noxious doctrine; . . . (they knew) that the path of safety lies in the opportunity to discuss freely supposed grievances and proposed remedies; and that the fitting remedy for evil counsels is good ones. . . . Recognizing the occasional tyrannies of governing majorities, they amended the Constitution so that free speech and assembly should be guaranteed.

"Fear of serious injury cannot alone justify suppression of free speech. . . . Those who won our independence by revolution . . . did not exalt order at the cost of liberty."

What kind of men have we at the helm of government who would deliberately coerce the public into accepting their policies on the threat of being branded traitors. These are the tactics of tyrants with little understanding or respect for constitutional rights of men. They fail to realize that the freedom to stand opposed to the government's policy, the freedom to speak out against government actions which corrupt the basic tenets of our society, that this freedom is not a *privilege* that can be withdrawn when the boat begins to rock. This freedom is the inherent and ultimate *right* of people in a democracy. It is a right that supercedes any ambitions or complexes of men and stands above the gravity of any issue. Our belief in liberty is the foundation of our political system and any encroachment of this liberty—for whatever purposes—threatens our entire democratic structure.

I ask you "where is the conscience of America?" Where are the voices raised against such tactics? Where are the libertarians to denounce this diminishing of liberty for the sake of consensus? Have Americans become so mesmerized by the McCarthy-ite tactics of the Administration—the tactics of indiscriminate insinuation of unpatriotic motives to those that dissent—that they fail to recognize the threat of these tactics to liberty.

We must remember that liberty is not something that is once won and forever secure. In the words of Daniel Webster, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are *always* ready to guard and defend it."

I am also very deeply concerned that the Republican Party might become an accomplice in this political pressure to silence opposition. We have heard a number of leading Republicans comment that the Party should remain silent concerning Vietnam and not allow it to become a political issue. I strongly challenge this contention. I believe the Republican Party has an obligation to the fighting men in Vietnam. It must offer alternatives to the Administration's present policy that calls upon these young men to sacrifice their lives without bringing their comrades and country any closer to victory or solution. The Party also has an obligation to the country and the two-party system to offer alternative policies that we feel would better realize our national goal of peace in Vietnam.

Many have offered alternatives to military escalation and the American public deserves an opportunity to study and select or reject these alternatives.

I have, for a good number of months, listed three possible alternatives to our present policy that I believe might make it possible to extracate ourselves with honor from Vietnam.

First, on the military front, I believe that we should take steps to de-Americanize the war. This is essentially an Asian war with Asian interests most clearly at stake. President Marcos of the Philippines has declared that there must be Asian solutions to Asian problems and we should do everything possible to help them to wage their own military action. Asian troops should be *substituted* for American forces on a carefully scheduled program with logistical assistance from the United States. The President has warned us that the conflict in Vietnam could last for another 10 or 15 years and we should not wait another half-decade before taking positive steps to turn this war over to the people who have the primacy of interest in its outcome.

On the diplomatic front, I believe we should do everything we can to encourage the calling of an all-Asian conference. Through such a conference, the conflict could be re-defined as a diplomatic problem to be most realistically negotiated by Asian diplomats, rather than as an American military problem to be solved by guns. An Asian diplomatic offensive might lead to reduced tensions and misunderstandings between adversaries in the conflict and build a bridge of trust between the two sides so that the atmosphere for peace discussions is improved.

Third, on the economic front, we must begin now to prepare South Vietnam for peace and the inevitable transition from a war-oriented to a peace-time economy. We should work for the creation of a Southeast Asian common market based on agricultural economies. Our goal of peace and stability in South Vietnam will not automatically be reached with the conclusion of the present conflict. When the hostilities cease in South Vietnam, the prospects for continued peace will depend to a great extent on this area's ability to progress economically and to meet the rising expectations of its people. None of the countries of Southeast Asia is large enough to support strong and viable economies in the near future. Through tariff agreements and cooperative planning, however, these countries could coordinate the development of their individual and total resources. They should also be able to avoid the initial expense and long-term inefficiency of duplicating basic agriculture-oriented industries necessary to the development of each country.

The alternatives I have just offered join many other ideas worthy of careful consideration in seeking a solution to the war in Vietnam.

But whatever alternative we would adopt or whatever course we would pursue we cannot commit ourselves to a program that destroys liberty in name of some other goal.

As Justice Brandeis counseled us, liberty must be valued as both a means and an end, and he said, "Those who won our independence believe . . . liberty to be the secret of happiness and courage to be the secret of liberty."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I got such a different reaction from the visit and from the speech of our distinguished commander in the field, General Westmoreland, from that which was apparently received by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon, that I can hardly believe that we attended the same affair.

After I left that rather memorable occasion—and certainly it was an inspiring one—I was asked by one of the radio stations of my own State to make a brief statement as to my reactions, and I made it in the following words:

> I thought that General Westmoreland's address was both a thorough factual report and a much-needed inspiration. It is to be re-broadcast to our half million men in Southeast Asia and should have a fine reaction from them. There was not only prolonged applause and general approval by the Congress, but also admirable restraint by the General in that he made no reference whatever to unpleasant differences on the home front.

There was, of course, not a word in the eloquent address of General Westmoreland that referred to differences on the homefront. His report was a factual one, his report was an inspiring one, and his report was a restrained one. It is on the point of the restraint which he used that I wish to make a few remarks.

I recognize, as completely as does any Senator, the right of free speech. I recognize also, however, the heavy responsibility that lies upon public servants, officials, and Senators who represent great States, to be careful about what they say on a question so inflammatory as the one which has been stirred up with reference to the war in Vietnam.

I care not to speak about any other Senator or any other Senator's State, but I should like to refer to my own State, if I may. It so happens that my distinguished colleague, Senator SMATHERS, is himself a marine veteran of World War II. It happens that his two sons are participants in the Vietnam war. One has just returned after 2 years of fine service on a destroyer in the Tonkin Gulf. The other is still serving in an underwater demolition team in Vietnam. Neither of those services is a sinecure.

It happens in my own case—if I may refer to it—that my own two sons saw active service in World War II—one as a marine in combat in Saipan, Tinian, and Okinawa, as a lieutenant, commanding a rifle platoon; the other as a tailgunner in a Navy torpedo plane. My own service was on four fronts in France in World War I, to which I shall refer no further.

The point I make now is that many of

the people of my State of Florida know these facts perfectly well. Most of the people of Florida, I believe, would be rather shocked if they heard Senator SMATHERS or the senior Senator from Florida attacking the objectives of our Nation or the decent position of our Nation in Vietnam. Thousands of families in the State of Florida have boys or girls in Vietnam. Those boys and girls will gain information of things spoken in the Senate, just as they will hear General Westmoreland's speech when it is repeated over radio to our Armed Forces in southeast Asia. The effect upon such families in Florida and upon such boys and girls from Florida who are serving in southeast Asia is something which we must carefully consider, we two Senators from Florida. If we failed to consider this effect, I believe we would have failed to show the restraint that General Westmoreland showed in his fine address today. I listened with great care. Not a word was spoken by him which indicated in the slightest that there were differences here on the homefront.

With all due respect to the right of freedom of speech, I believe that the question of timeliness, the question of where we say things, the question of what we say, the question of the method and manner in which we say them, the question of the words we use, as to whether they are inflammatory and confidence-destroying or not, are questions of very great importance in their bearing upon our responsibility as Members of the Senate, or in any other official position.

Mr. President, without going into great detail, I simply wish to say that I hope we may think carefully about the restraint shown by General Westmoreland. I hope that we may consider whether or not that restraint will be appropriate for us to show, regardless of what our own thinking may be on the Vietnam affair. There has been much too much fire and much too much smoke about this issue, and I believe that when so raised, it does harm to our Nation. It certainly does harm in the homes that have sent their boys and girls to Vietnam. It does harm in those homes where boys are about to be sent to the Armed Forces, ultimately to go, perhaps, to Vietnam. It does harm—more than anywhere else—in the fact that it gets to those boys at the front, who know something about who represents them and what the records are in public service of those who represent them.

Mr. President, I hope that above everything we may get from the address of General Westmoreland, we will get the idea that restraint is appropriate, restraint is timely, and restraint should be practiced by all of us in what we say with reference to the Vietnam affair.

Mr. President, I shall conclude in a moment. The sole purpose of my speaking at this time is to invite attention, first, to the admirable restraint employed by General Westmoreland today. He gave not a word of recognition, even, of the fact that he is engaged in an activity concerning which there are grave differences of opinion on the home front, and as to which many things have been said and done that are not temperate, are not moderate, are not tolerant. He did not use the occasion to reply to them in any fashion at all.

I express the hope that we in the Senate may be more moderate, more temperate, more tolerant, and less violent in our speeches as they affect the Vietnam war, and that we may realize the enormous responsibility that we have, in that our remarks cannot help having implications upon the thinking of thousands of people in our own States, and perhaps in others, particularly in families whose boys and girls are in Vietnam, or in families from which boys and girls may be soon called to Vietnam.

I think we must practice greater restraint, and we should seize this chance to emulate the lesson given by General Westmoreland, that restraint, even in this difficult time, as to this difficult problem, is possible. It should be practiced by all of us.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator, may I say.

THE DODD CASE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this Senator does not agree that TOM DODD should be censured, and in view of the fact that the committee has recommended unanimously that censure should take place, I would hope that the majority leader will not insist on voting on this matter until those of us who would care to stand by TOM DODD'S side have had an opportunity to study the matter and adequately prepare ourselves.

I would not be making this request, I might say, if a single member of that committee had stood steadfastly by the side of TOM DODD. However, in view of the fact that I expect to stand for him, and I have not followed this matter in great detail, I would hope that I would not be asked to debate the matter before I have had an opportunity to study it in greater detail than I would be able to do during the next few days.

The majority leader, I believe, is willing to give me some assurance that the matter will not be called up in the next few days.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], before he became unavoidably absent and I, of course, can give no assurances on my own; but in conjunction with the distinguished minority leader I can give the Senator the assurance that it will not be taken up next week.

The distinguished minority leader and I have agreed that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] should have, as a matter of courtesy, a reasonable length of time in which to prepare himself on the basis of the report which was issued by the Stennis committee on yesterday, and, in that respect, it has always been our intention that the matter would not be called up this coming week. At some time after that, however, the matter will be considered and I hope that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana would allow the distinguished minority leader and me to arrive at a reasonable time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. I have a high regard for TOM DODD. I have both a high regard and a deep affection for him. I feel he is being done an injustice. I do not criticize the committee. These are wonderful men. I know their job was a very distasteful task.

I do feel, in some respects, that certain people in the press, particularly two columnists, have exerted great pressure in this matter, but at this time I do not think the case justifies the censure of this Senator. He should not have to plead his own case. Any man who has been a good father, a good husband, and a friend of many of us, as TOM DODD has been, should have a friend in this body to speak for him. If no one else does, I shall.

I hope I will have enough time to prepare my case before we proceed to judgment on it, because in my judgment there is an important matter involved here. In some respects I fear that this recommendation of the committee may be a case of punishing one man, making a scapegoat of one man, for a practice which may be altogether too prevalent, and which should be corrected, but not by putting all of the fault and blame on one man. It seems to me that the matter should be the subject of an act of Congress to determine what a Senator can and cannot do.

I feel, in general terms, that what is suggested here amounts in some respects to conviction on an ex post facto law; in effect on a law that does not exist at all.

Having had the distasteful task of voting its equivalent of censure on a colleague in years gone by, I personally think it is a sad thing and something that one should do only when it is absolutely necessary.

I think the man committed no crime. Quite to the contrary, those who would injure his reputation and destroy an effective man are more nearly the culprits than he is. In other words, I think that people who engaged in downright theft and burglary have not been recommended for prosecution here. Instead, an honorable and decent man, who is to a large extent the victim of circumstances beyond his control, is being recommended for censure.

I do not criticize the committee. I think they had a very difficult job. I offer apologies to those whom I urged to serve on the committee for the soul-searching task we forced upon them, but I do feel that the man's case should be thoughtfully considered.

I appreciate the majority leader's assurance that we will not vote on the matter quickly. I thank him very much.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in this connection I had an opportunity a few moments ago to speak to the chairman of the select committee. He wishes to be certain that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is given every opportunity and ample time to prepare whatever statements and discussions he wishes to have, or that his friends wish to make for him.

We shall yield, certainly, to the wishes of the Senator and we intend to follow explicitly the suggestions of the majority leader, working with the minority leader, with respect to this matter coming up in approximately 1 or 2 weeks. If 1 week is not sufficient it would be agreeable with the chairman to try to accord to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] the time that would be required.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no doubt whatever that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the members of the committee are all fairminded men. I have no doubt that the result will be agreed to.

I wanted to make the statement so that I would not be told subsequently that I should have asked for some small delay. I did not want to wait until the motion was made and then find that it was too late.

ADDRESS BY PAUL A. STRACHAN BEFORE MEETING OF PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Paul A. Strachan made a speech to the meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Paul A. Strachan is a veteran in the cause of the physically handicapped. He formerly lived in Washington but for a great many years has been a citizen of Florida.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Strachan's speech and also a series of testimonial statements made by distinguished Americans on behalf of Mr. Strachan be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. Vice-President, Chairman, Members of the Committee, and friends of the Handicapped, I thank the Chairman, and the Committee for having bestowed upon me the Distinguished Service Award.

As the originator of this movement, I believe all of you would like to know how this Committee came into being, and I shall recall this to your memory by citing the action of Congress on the last day of the Session.

The hands of the clock facing the Vice-President's rostrum in the Senate Chamber moved slowly forward. As said, as it was the last day of the Session, contrary to conditions usual at such times, the Senate had almost full attendance.

"Dear Alben" Barkley, the Majority Leader, and Wallace White, Minority Leader, had a gentleman's agreement that no legislation would be voted on that day, as the House had adjourned the previous day and the Senate Session, therefore, was more or less to clean up odds and ends.

However, "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," House Joint Resolution 22, (which became Public Law 176) had passed the House, and awaited action by the Senate.

Upon learning of the gentleman's agreement, Sen. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, was pressed by me to call Leader Barkley's attention to the fact that House Resolution 23 had been approved by the House and, anticipating no opposition, the Senate could simply take routine action to enact it.

With the aid of Sen. Pat McCarran, of Nevada, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which had charge of the Resolution, we succeeded in getting that Committee to approve action and Senators Barkley and White were so notified.

Sen. Barkley had no objection to setting aside the gentleman's agreement, but Sen. White stated that Sen. Aiken, of Vermont, had objected to the Resolution and that his approval was necessary.

On learning that Sen. Aiken was in Vermont, his home State, we spent considerable time in long-distance phoning to reach him, and finally, when the matter was explained, he stated that he had been under an erroneous impression about the Resolution, and, learning the facts, he waived objection.

We so told Senators Barkley, White, and Kilgore. As stated, the Senate had certain routine business to complete, and action was taken very slowly.

The clock's hands moved slowly toward 4 PM, and then 5 PM, but still, no action on the Resolution. We knew that the Senate intended adjournment at about 5:30 to 6 PM, and were fearful that our measure would get lost in the shuffle and, if so, we would have the same dreary business of having it re-introduced; action by both House and Senate, and we had already spent more than 5 years of hard work on it, and we did not want to spend two years more. So our anxiety was keen.

At 5:30 PM, in order to attend some important business, we returned to our Headquarters, 1370 National Press Bldg., Washington, where we phoned to various Senators to try to speed action on the Resolution.

At nearly 6 PM, we received word that our Resolution had been approved by the Senate and, our nearly 6 year battle to have it acted upon had been capped by a win!

The purpose of "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week" was, and is, to unite Government—Federal, State, County, and Municipal—with all private industries, businesses and organizations, to further employment of what was, then, 23,000,000 (now, 1967, more than 72,000,000 Handicapped, of whom some 20,000,000 are from 60% to 100% Severely Handicapped), which include the Blind, Partially Sighted, Deaf, Hard of Hearing, Arthritics, Amputees, Cardiacs, Cerebral Palsied, Diabetics, Epileptics, victims of Cancer, Muscular Dystrophy, Multiple Sclerosis, Poliomyelitis, Rheumatism, Tuberculosis, and other "cripplers", as well as those having Congenital Defects and Deformities. The Resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas there is now, and shall be for some time to come, a positive necessity for utilizing every available ounce of manpower in America; and

"Whereas the growing and acute problems of the physically handicapped, who number approximately 25,000,000 citizens, who are being augmented by an average of 800,000 citizens injured in industry, yearly—to say nothing of those who have been, or will be, injured or diseased as a result of military service—is engaging more and more attention of the Federal Government and private industry; and

"Whereas rehabilitation and placement of the physically handicapped are among the most important problems in our national economy, as, if a means is provided to make such people self-supporting, wholly or in part, the entire Nation will be beneficiary, because of lessening drain upon national finance; and

"Whereas Congress and the Chief Executive have expressed concern and have initiated constantly expanding programs on behalf of the physically handicapped, as well as leaders in private industry, Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled, That, hereafter, the first week in October of each year shall be designated as 'National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week'. During said Week, appropriate ceremonies are to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which shall be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified, but physically handicapped workers.

"The President is hereby requested to issue a suitable proclamation each year, and the Governors of States, Mayors of Cities, and heads of other instrumentalities of Government, as well as leaders of Industry, Educational; Religious Groups; Labor; Veterans; Women; Farm; Scientific and Professional and all other organizations and individuals at interest, are invited to participate."

The foregoing Resolution was unanimously adopted by House and Senate, and Sponsored by Sen. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, and Representative Jerry Voorhis, of California, and Signed by President Truman on August 11, 1945, as House Resolution, now Public Law 176. The "week", then, was simply an effort on my part to direct public attention to the problems and needs of our millions of Handicapped.

I pressed my friend, Secretary of Labor, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, to establish this Committee, with President Truman's approval, and that was done.

It has been estimated that operations stemming from the "week" have been the means of affording employment to more than 5,000,000 Handicapped, who earned more than $4,000,000,000 and paid taxes of more than $1,000,000,000 and, its beneficent movement has benefited the Handicapped in many other ways, including Social Acceptance,—far better programs of Rehabilitation and Employment, etc.

I wish to commend all of you for the fine work you have done, in aiding the Handicapped. You have, thus, contributed greatly to the Nation's welfare, by putting many people, hitherto on charity rolls, to work, so that they became tax-payers instead of tax-eaters.

But, the job is incomplete. We must have more study of the problems of the Handicapped, including, medical, educational, counseling, and, above all, employment of handicapped.

I am afraid that still too many of our industrialists and business men are like the Internal Revenue Agent, who said to the Taxpayer, "We sympathize with your problems, but they won't fit into our computer!"

Suitable employment is the key to the whole handicapped program, because, if a man can't work, why? Does he need medical service; counseling, education and training and, above all, proper placement? If so, the answer is to aid such individual by applying the best remedy that will fit him for a job.

Then, too, we need many, many more carefully trained counselors, placement officers, and welfare workers, to say nothing of the great need for more physicians, surgeons, and therapists.

Present plans, involving new legislation, already pin-point these needs, and we hope that Congress will speedily approve such legislation, and the Administration implement it, as it does not pour taxpayer's money down a rat-hole, but utilizes it to help Handicapped to help themselves, thus easing the strain on the rest of our population in having to carry these people on Welfare rolls, or charity.

Although the work of the Committee, and other public and private agencies have ameliorated, to some extent, the needs and miseries of the Handicapped, yet, the Handicapped population has not diminished, but, as is shown by official reports, we still have an increase of some 300,000 Handicapped each year, from accidents, injuries, and dis-

eases. The American Medical Association says there are approximately 72,000,000 or more of our population in some degree handicapped.

One thing I have pounded on, for more than 40 years: That, the Federal Government needs, and must have, a coordinator for the present 57 programs that deal with this problem. At the time this Committee was founded, President Truman, then Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach, and myself, discussed this phase, at length, and it was agreed that, when the Committee got properly organized, say, in a year or so, we would propose to have the Coordinator of all Handicapped Programs in the Federal Service.

This would not mean that present agencies would be abolished, but, their work would and should be integrated. I recommend that the Committee take appropriate action to launch this necessary move. Surely, after 20 years, we have learned enough to qualify it.

Now, I come to the close of my peroration. I just arose from a sick bed, and am weak, but willing. Leukemia is a tough disease to battle, and it may well be that I shall not be around to trouble you, or others, within a year or so.

During my long illness I reflected on what I would do with my remaining time. I decided to resume activities to set up the American Institute for Human Engineering, in Florida, to be the one spot in all the World wherein Handicapped might be treated; trained; counseled and guided, and, by participating in a well-organized Job Referral and Placement phase, become qualified to take their places as full-fledged citizens of our great Nation.

This job is a must! The institute is badly needed, and should have the support of every humanitarian, thinking person.

The Florida location would provide needed climatic advantages to expedite return to health and usefulness—and it is nearer to the most populous States than is the West Coast.

I know this will require brains, money and enthusiasm and boundless energy, and we would welcome all of you as Members of the Institute. If you are interested, write me, Route 1 Box 135, Brooksville, Fla., and I will send you a pamphlet describing the Institute program.

Again, I want to thank all of you for what you have done for the Handicapped, and urge that you redouble your efforts in future. This is one thing you cannot pick up in the morning, and then, lay it down for the rest of the day. No! The great needs and problems of the Handicapped require continual and continuous study and action.

For long intervals over the past 46 years, I have dedicated myself to advancing the program for Handicapped. Now, that my time is limited, I can say, with our late, great Vice-President Barkley, who stated, in effect, "I would rather serve the poor and needy, than sit in the seats of the mighty!"

Then, he fell dead in front of his audience, and I feel the same way about serving the Handicapped.

I thank you.

Many eminent Americans have lauded the work done by Paul Strachan, especially through the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. Among these are the following:

Sam Rayburn, former Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives: "I think the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped has performed a splendid task, and I wish it well in all the fine work it has done."

Joseph W. Martin, Jr., former Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives: "I shall consider it an honor to have my name included among the Congressional Incorporators of AFPH."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (While President of U.S.A.): "You are doing a great and necessary work in developing the talents and skills of our Handicapped citizens."

Walter H. Ditmars, former President, Gray Mfg. Co.: "As the AFPH Program is the most business-like approach to the Handicapped problem, I believe that Industry and Business should lend full support to that program."

Hon. Lois Mary McBride, Judge, Court Common Pleas, Pittsburgh: "You are to be commended for your fine program."

Dr. Carlos E. Ward, Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist, Veterans Administration: "Rehabilitation and Employment of Handicapped people are among the most important problems we must meet. Accomplishment of successful and effective rehabilitation of the seriously handicapped depends upon well coordinated teamwork on the part of specially trained workers in several professional fields. I know that the AFPH program is geared to the needs of our times and it should have full support from the public."

Dr. Elena D. Gall, Coordinator, Special Education, Hunter College: "Public and private programs for our 38,000,000 Handicapped, developed by AFPH, have been the means of carrying on a continuous educational campaign that has resulted in great good, and I believe AFPH deserves the support of all good Americans who realize the need for positive action on this great national problem."

Dr. H. C. Byrd, President-Emeritus, University of Maryland: "You have my approval to use my name as a Congressional Incorporator."

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, (now Vice President, USA): "I am happy to give you permission to use my name as one of the many Congressional incorporators of a bill granting AFPH a Congressional Charter."

Jacob J. Weinstein, Rabbi, K.A.M. Temple, Chicago: "I am happy to give you permission to use my name as one of the many Congressional incorporators of a bill granting AFPH a Congressional Charter."

P. S. Litchfield, late Board Chairman, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.: "Wishing you and your associates success in your undertaking."

Hon. Mary T. Norton, former U.S. Representative, New Jersey: "This is your authority to include my name in connection with the bill."

Leo Axlrod, Chairman, Committee on Handicapped Placement, Miamia (Fla.) Chamber of Commerce, owner Empire Furniture and Rattan Factory: "Mr. J. N. McArthur, President, Miami Chamber of Commerce, and President of all-Dade County NEPHW Committee, and Mr. Alfred Canel, our Chamber's Manager, will be pleased to have you enter their names as sponsoring your Charter. I will be pleased to be included, as I know the aspirations, hopes, and future ambitions of millions of handicapped depend on full development and application of the AFPH Program."

Harry M. Moses, former President, Bituminous Coal Operators Assn.: "I am in complete sympathy with your aims and ambitions. I have been engaged all my adult life in the problems of accident prevention in the coal mines and know the attendant necessity for rehabilitation."

Dr. John R. Steelman, former Assistant to President Truman: "Use my name."

Arthur Clarendon Smith, Sr., Smith's Transfer & Storage Co., Washington: "As a business man, naturally I am interested in conservation of resources and, certainly, our greatest undeveloped asset is, our millions of handicapped people. The AFPH Program has proven to be the most effective means of utilizing handicapped, and making them producers. Therefore, I support the AFPH and call upon my fellow business men to do likewise."

Dr. Samuel Lewis Fox, M.D., Baltimore: "I shall be happy to join you as one of the Congressional Incorporators."

Hon. G. Mennen Williams, former Governor of Michigan and now Assistant Secretary of State: "The AFPH has always been in the forefront of those seeking to enable this Nation's handicapped people to realize their full potentials as individuals and citizens. This Federation deserves full public support so that we may add to the happiness of those who would be otherwise handicapped, and strength to our economy, by making these people self-supporting."

Hon. Joseph Donohue, former Commissioner, District of Columbia: "I shall be honored to have you use my name as one of the Congressional Incorporators."

Hon. Charley E. Johns, former Acting Governor of Florida: "I will be happy for you to include my name among the Congressional incorporators, I am eager to do anything I can toward helping the physically handicapped."

Arthur Dick, D.D.S., M.D., Washington: "I accept with pleasure the invitation to be one of the Congressional incorporators."

Spyros P. Skouras, former President, 20th Century-Fox Film Corporation: "I will be happy to lend my name as one of the Congressional incorporators for this most worthy cause."

Darrell C. Crain, M.D., Washington: "I am happy to have you use my name as one of the Congressional incorporators of your organization."

Arthur Pardue, Bishop, Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh: "I would be happy to have you use my name as one of the Congressional incorporators of your organization."

George Meany, President, AFL–CIO: (Letter to all Officers of National and International Unions, State Federations of Labor, and directly affiliated Local Unions): "The Convention of the AFL endorsed the program of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped in dealing with the problems of millions of physically handicapped citizens, and particularly its legislative proposal for the establishment of a Federal Agency for Handicapped, and (Tax Exemption) for Those Who Support Handicapped Persons; and called upon affiliated organizations to lend legislative, and if possible, financial support to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped."

John D. Pennkamp, Associate Editor, Miami (Fla.) HERALD: "It will be a privilege to be one of your Congressional incorporators."

Joseph M. McGrath, Asst. Legislative Director, National Association of Home Builders: "I will be very happy to be one of the Congressional incorporators of AFPH."

John L. Lewis, President-Emeritus, United Mine Workers of America: "In one of our conferences of Executive Officers at Headquarters, Vice-President, John O'Leary, now gone to his eternal reward, paid Paul Strachan one of the most moving and eloquent tributes I think was ever uttered. It was based on his knowledge of Brother Strachan's work, in listening to his talk upon an occasion when he made known the aspiration and the time he decided to dedicate himself exclusively for the rest of his life, to the cause of making a contribution to that countless number of men and women who, in contrast to ourselves, live in daily agony, daily denial of privilege, or in pain and distress. I salute you, Brother Strachan, and trust that Providence will preserve you to carry on this work and give you strength, day by day, to go through the necessary ordeal of making that contribution; and to your loyal and efficient assistant and co-laborer, Miss Mildred Scott, I express the same sentiments, because I have come to have an appreciation of her own contribution as your good right arm, day by day."

Sidney Fishman, Ph.D., College of Engineering, New York University: "I shall be happy to be included as a Congressional Incorporator for the AFPH."

Paul C. Sparks, Vice Pres., I.C.T. Group, Dallas, Texas: "It will be a pleasure to have you list my name as one of the Congressional incorporators."

John Ford, eminent Movie Producer, Hollywood: "It has been said that the Motion Picture is, simply, the mirror of life, and in it we see human nature, in all its guises, foibles, and nobilities. The same can be said of the Handicapped, millions of whom never attain self-sustaining status because they have lacked the essential medical treatment; education; guidance, and placement. Charles Steinmetz; deaf Beethoven; arthritic Clarence Day; Deaf Thomas Alva Edison, to say nothing of the distinguished victim of Polio, F.D.R.! The handicapped program developed and applied by AFPH, deserves universal support."

From CIO Constitutional Convention: "CIO affiliates have supported, both nationally and locally, the efforts of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, to secure increased opportunities for disabled citizens thru financial and full moral support from all citizens."

Mahlon S. Tisdale, Vice-Adm., UNC-Ret., Vallejo, Calif.: "A federal program to assist all types of physically handicapped is necessary to our economy. AFPH has proposed and is working constantly to effectuate such a program and should, therefore, have financial and full moral support from all citizens."

J. E. Martin, Jr., M.D., Golden Clinic, Memorial General Hospital Assn., Elkins, W. Va.: "I shall consider it an honor to be one of the Congressional incorporators of AFPH."

Winthrop M. Phelps, M.D., Baltimore: "I shall be glad to have you use my name as one of the Congressional incorporators."

Samuel A. Weiss, Judge, Court Common Pleas, Pittsburgh: "You can certainly use my name as an incorporator for the AFPH Congressional Charter."

William D. Lennox, M., Children's Medical Center, Boston (late foremost specialist of his time on Epilepsy): "I shall be glad to join you as an Incorporator of AFPH."

Murray D. Lincoln, President, Nationwide Insurance: "Our own organization has cooperated to the fullest extent in employment of those physically handicapped who have the ability to work in an office. Consequently, we in the . . . Insurance Companies, will be happy to cooperate with you in any way possible in getting this Congressional Charter."

T. J. Reardon, Jr., Special Assistant to President Kennedy: "Please accept the President's best wishes and appreciation for your continued interest in the welfare of the Nation's Handicapped."

William B. McKechnie, Jr., President, Atlanta Baseball Club: "I am, of course, in accord with your thinking on the (Institute) proposition."

Baynard Kendrick, Author and Historian, Leesburg, Fla.: "I assure you of my support of the Institute which, I believe, would be a wonderful thing for the State and Country."

Hon. Jennings Randolph, Senator, West Virginia: "You may be sure that it has been a privilege to cooperate in this worth-while effort to aid the physically handicapped citizens of the United States."

Warren M. Briggs, Exec. Vice Pres., Alger-Sullivan Lumber Co., Century, Fla.: "I certainly wish you well in your endeavors."

Martin A. Dale, Private Counsellor to her Serene Highness, Grace, the Princess of Monaco: "Their Highnesses have asked me to express to you their hopes that you may succeed in bringing your project to fruition, since it does, indeed, have merit, and is devoted to a most worthy cause."

Ivan A. Nestigan, Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, in letter to Sen. Randolph: "As you know, Mr. Strachan has a long and impressive record in advocating the cause for employment of the disabled. We are all in his debt for the many ideas he has developed some of which are now expressed in the current activities of the "President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped."

Mrs. Grace B. Brown, Oakland, Calif.: "Your work has benefitted suffering humanity and I hope the Institute plan is soon put into function."

Lee W. Minton, President, Glass Bottle Blowers Assn.: "I know how hard you are working on behalf of the Handicapped."

Sister Mary Augustine, S.M.S.M., Marist Missionary Sisters: "I'll always think you are great. Keep fighting and asking God's help."

Michael J. Straight, Author and Publisher: "Your plan for the Institute is thorough and most ambitious."

Robert S. Allen, War Correspondent, Author, and Columnist: "You are constant, persevering, unswerving, and tenacious."

Hon. Robert Ramspeck, former Majority Whip, U.S. House of Representatives; former President, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and former Vice President, Eastern Airlines: "I think you have done more for the Handicapped than anyone I know."

Hon. Richard B. Russell, Senator from Georgia: "The social and economic advantages attained by our millions of handicapped citizens during the past ten years has been one of the great phenomenons of our times. AFPH has taken the lead in developing and applying these plans."

Hon. John M. Carmody, late Consultant, Labor-Management Relations: "I shall be pleased to be one of the Sponsors to incorporate AFPH."

Hon. Albert Rains, U.S. Representative, Alabama: "I shall be pleased to be a sponsor to incorporate AFPH."

Margaret Fraser Webster, late President, Marjorie Webster Junior College: "No greater service can be rendered to our Nation than developing the full potentials of our Handicapped men and women. The AFPH program, basically, provides a continuing means of improvement in education, training, and placement, that is fully in the public interest and should, therefore, have public support, financially and otherwise."

Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives: "AFPH presents a program in the public interest that is both humanitarian and economic in its application, and which should have the full support of all who have sympathy for and understanding of the needs of our millions of Handicapped people."

The late Colonel George E. Ijams, National Rehabilitation Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars: "The great need of our disabled veterans are paralleled in even greater degree by those of our civilian disabled. Fortunately, our veterans have the facilities of the Veterans Administration available to them in their hour of need. Such facilities are not available to the civilian handicapped through any Federal Department. The American Federation of the Physically Handicapped is the one organization which continually improves the programs for the civilian handicapped, based upon experience gained in study and practice in veterans' rehabilitation."

Rep. Bob Sikes, Florida: "Your organization is doing a fine work."

Philip M. Talbot, Sr., V.P. and Secy., Woodward & Lothrop, Washington: "I will be only too glad to be on the sponsoring group to Congressionally incorporate AFPH."

Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of, and Senator from, New York: "Since I have been in the Senate, and particular, in my duties on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have had occasion to know of the fine work done by your organization in the field of rehabilitation of the physically and mentally handicapped. This field, as you undoubtedly know, has been one of great interest to me, even before I came to Washington."

Norman Gerstenfeld, Rabbi, Washington D.C. Hebrew Congregation: "I will be happy to be included among the Congressional Sponsors."

Perry Faulkner, Former Chief, Veterans Employment Service: "This is your authority to include my name in connection with the bill."

U.S. Senator John J. Sparkman, Alabama: "You have performed a tremendous job in the interest of the handicapped, and I know you will do so as long as you live. All I can say is, "More power to you!" "

Hon. Harry S. Truman, as President of the United States, to Paul A. Strachan, April 16, 1952: "Your activities in behalf of the physically handicapped and particularly your sponsorship of the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week legislation, are well known. Your part in developing the groundwork for the President's Committee program will always be remembered with much appreciation. For the many year-round state and community programs that you have developed out of all these efforts, you have earned the thanks of all your fellow citizens. Please accept my thanks for the many contributions you have made to the program."

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know Mr. Strachan well. He has lived a life of dedicated, devoted service to other handicapped persons, he being one himself. He is a very fine executive, one who is dedicated in many respects to the cause of helping other handicapped persons. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Alabama has seen fit to make the remarks he has. I, too, honor and respect Mr. Strachan for his services.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Florida.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY, MAY 1, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of business today, the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) 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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request which has been approved by all Senators concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, immediately after the approval of the Journal, and without the transaction of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the further consideration of S. 1039; and that debate on an amendment to be proposed by the Sena-

tor from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and that debate on any other amendments be limited to 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders, or whomever they may designate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I renew my request.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Monday, May 1, 1967, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the Senate proceed to the further consideration of S. 1039, 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, and that debate on an amendment to be proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and that debate on any other amendments be limited to 10 minutes, to be equally divided between the mover of the amendment and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S SPEECH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the speech delivered by the distinguished commander of the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

I was interested in what he had to say. He spoke as a soldier, and he acted as a soldier. I approve in particular one paragraph of his prepared remarks which reads as follows:

> Our President and the representatives of the people of the United States—the Congress—have seen to it that our troops in the field have been well supplied and equipped. When a field commander does not have to look over his shoulder to see whether he is being supported, he can concentrate on the battlefield with much greater assurance of success. I speak for my troops when I say we are thankful for this unprecedented material support.

Mr. President, no field commander has ever had to look over his shoulder to find out if he is "supported," because constitutionally, the duty of the military is to carry out policies made by their civilian superiors. They do not make policies. So any military commander, in this constitutional sense and meaning, will always be assured of full support.

I want to commend the distinguished commander of the advisory group in Vietnam for acting in a manner which is consonant with the responsibilities and duties of the military. I want to assure him that so far as the military attributes in this difficulty in which we find ourselves are concerned, the men in the field—who are there not because they have made policy but because they are carrying out the policy made here in Washington—can be assured of full and complete support by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] made a major speech concerning the war in Vietnam. I read fully what he said at that time. I note from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that he was supported by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New York the present occupant of the chair [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Idaho, my seatmate [Mr. CHURCH].

Unfortunately, I was in New Mexico chairing hearings on the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty and could not be here to participate in the discussion. Had I been here, I would have joined my colleagues in their high praise for the position taken by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Earlier today, we had the privilege of listening at a joint meeting—not a joint session, Mr. President, but a joint meeting—of Congress, to General Westmoreland, the commander of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam.

No one could hear General Westmoreland without admiring his presence, his stature, and the eloquent plea he made for his troops. I was delighted to have heard it. I agree with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who indicated that General Westmoreland showed great restraint. I agree with him, too, that it is incumbent upon those of us in the Senate to show some restraint in connection with our comments on the war in Vietnam. But, I was delighted to see that General Westmoreland did not repeat, in his address at the joint meeting, the comments which he made earlier before a meeting of the press with respect to dissenters on the policy which is being pursued by the administration on the war in Vietnam.

I should like to use the same restraint myself in dealing with General Westmoreland's speech. I thought the general made an excellent presentation of the military situation in Vietnam as he saw it, but I should like to suggest that he did not deal—indeed he should not have dealt with, and I am glad that he did not—the larger issues of the war which concern so many of us in the Senate and in the country.

The general did not mention Russia. He did not mention China. He did not mention the danger that acceleration of the war has brought, particularly the bombing of the north in recent days, involving those two great powers against us to a greater extent than they are presently arrayed against us, with the chance that it might bring on the beginning of world war III.

The general wisely did not deal with what is happening to our domestic economy as a result of the war. He did not deal with the impact the war is having on the programs of the Great Society, supported so strongly by the Johnson administration, one of which is the war against poverty which I have the honor to be involved in as chairman of the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the Senate.

Thus, to me, except for the military aspects of the speech, what General Westmoreland said was irrelevant to the main issues which confront us in America with respect to the war in Vietnam.

I suggest, Mr. President, that we must continue to probe, to criticize, and to urge the President to look for a way out of the imbroglio in which we find ourselves, to look for a way to get to the negotiating table, and to look for a way to stop the shooting of American boys, whether they live in Florida, Oregon, Pennsylvania, or New York.

I intend, in that regard, to continue the position which I have heretofore taken. In my opinion, we cannot win a military victory in Vietnam except at excessive cost in American lives and in American fortune.

I believe that this war has got to be settled, in the long run, by diplomats and not by soldiers.

I hope that I have exercised that restraint which was urged on all of us by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Let me close by saying that I have the highest regard for General Westmoreland, who is commanding our troops so adequately in the field, but that, in my opinion everything he said about an early victory is merely a repetition of what Gen. Maxwell Taylor told us 10 years ago.

And, 10 years later, we are no closer to victory than we were then.

I commend General Westmoreland again for the fine appearance he made before the joint meeting.

REACTIVATION OF NAVY BATTLESHIPS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], who is necessarily absent today, I have been asked to make the following statement, which he has prepared:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURPHY, READ BY SENATOR BAKER

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] for their conscientious efforts to reactivate one or more battleships in the mothball fleet for use in Vietnam. They have performed a real service in drawing attention to the need for more naval firing power, and I have been impressed with the careful research that went into their arguments and the logic of those arguments.

I have been aware for some time that a "gun gap" exists in our Navy, a deficiency brought about by the emphasis in recent years on equipping ships with sophisticated weaponry to the detriment of standard armament. I personally believe that we went too far, too fast, in making the transition, but it is bootless to dwell excessively on past mistakes and

I have pointed out my concern in that respect on several past occasions.

As for reactivating a battleship, I spoke of that possibility a year or more ago and I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Senator RUSSELL and Senator HANSEN on the subject. I have always felt that the massive firepower of an *Iowa*-class battleship would be invaluable in Vietnam as it was in Korea.

The case for reactivating a battleship rests primarily, in my view, upon one fact: the unique ability of the ship to wreak destruction to inland targets with fine precision, around the clock, in any weather, while remaining far enough offshore to be almost invulnerable to enemy coastal batteries.

The United States now has four battleships in mothballs. These are the USS *Missouri* at Bremerton, Wash., and the *Iowa, Wisconsin,* and *New Jersey* at Philadelphia. The Navy has estimated it would cost from $11 million to $25 million to reactivate one of these vessels. This is a substantial sum, but it falls into perspective when one notes that a modern jet aircraft costs some $2 million and we have lost a number of aircraft performing missions that might have been done as well or better by battleship fire.

The cost of reactivation, therefore, becomes insignificant assuming that one can prove the effectiveness of a battleship in a situation such as we have in Vietnam. I believe that such a case can be proven.

Vietnam, in the first place, is ideal terrain for bringing battlewagon power to bear. It is a comparatively narrow country in width with a long coastline facing the South China Sea, and the targets we are attempting to hit lie mostly within the 24-mile range of a battleship's 16-inch guns.

More important, the kinds of targets in Vietnam lend themselves to battleship fire. There are photographs in the Pentagon files showing that a bridge destroyed by an aircraft one day was being rebuilt the next, a road damaged one morning by bombs was being used a few days later. Without taking anything away from the magnificent performance of our aviators in Vietnam, there are occasions when naval gunfire is superior in reducing the chances of a target being reconstructed by the enemy.

As Senator RUSSELL, in his April 10 statement, so eloquently pointed out:

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

Adding another incentive to reactivation of a battleship is the extreme accuracy that can be obtained from their 16-inch guns. We possess maps of the target areas in Vietnam so that battleship fire could be closely confined to fixed targets such as crossroads and bridges and powerplants. Such pinpoint fire, it goes without saying, narrows the chances of civilians and other noncombatants becoming casualties.

Perhaps the best reason, in my judgment, for taking advantages of a battleship's capabilities in the Vietnamese war is this: the number of casualties among American fighting men can be reduced substantially. It is obvious that North Vietnam has placed great reliance on surface-to-air missiles. These have been effective against our aircraft.

But defending against a projectile from a 16-inch gun on a battleship is another matter. No missile can stop a shell weighing 1,900 to 2,400 pounds as it whistles down upon a target. The sole recourse for an enemy is to strike at the launching platform; that is, the vessel offshore. We, of course, have air control and sea mastery in Vietnam. A battleship thus could be reached only by the heaviest enemy coastal guns, and even then with difficulty for it is a moving target. Adm. Roy L. Johnson, commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, has been quoted in the press as requesting "additional firepower" and he has been further quoted as saying that he would like "both" battleships and cruisers. It is my understanding that Admiral Johnson's request is currently under review. The question is whether his needs can be met by reactivating one or more battleships, one or more heavy cruisers, or a squadron of destroyers. Admiral Johnson, avoiding the battleship versus cruiser argument, is primarily interested, and properly so, in simply obtaining more gunpower. I believe, however, that our purpose could best be served by reactivation of a battleship. I hope that the Defense Department will give the Navy the go-ahead to put a battlewagon on the line in Vietnam.

NEED FOR JOB VACANCY STATISTICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, economic policy can be no better than the statistics on which it is based. Prudent policy requires job vacancy statistics. We do not have them, and this Congress, not the administration, is responsible. The administration has pleaded for the relatively small sum required to fund an adequate program. The Congress has refused to provide it.

We need information on available job opportunities if we are to do an effective job in combating poverty and unemployment—I believe this body will be interested in being reminded of the hearings and report made last June by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee. I was chairman of the subcommittee which included our distinguished economist friend, Paul Douglas, Senators TALMADGE and MILLER, along with Representatives BOLLING and CURTIS.

After hearing Government witnesses and a number of researchers in the field, our subcommittee said:

> Cost estimates can perhaps be put into perspective by calling attention to the magnitude of some of the potential benefits of the job vacancy data. If the $2.5 million program led to slightly more efficient use of the several billions of dollars appropriated to manpower development, the investment for data would pay handsomely. If it enabled unemployed or underemployed workers to find productive jobs, the investment would pay a private dividend to the individuals; it would pay a public dividend in the form of additional tax dollars and lower welfare payments; and it would pay dividends in terms of greater real national output. Job vacancy information, along with manpower retraining, can help to break the bonds of isolation afflicting low income persons in urban ghettos, areas of chronic high unemployment, and subsistence agriculture.

The subcommittee noted that there has been hesitance in some areas about the collection of statistics on job vacancies lest these be misinterpreted and misused. This could arise if some users of the data subtract the number of vacancies from the number of unemployed and attach an oversimplified meaning to the "net" results. Estimates of vacancies can be compared to employment figures only with extreme caution since the characteristics of the unemployed workers may differ greatly from the employers' needs.

The subcommittee is now chaired by my able colleague Senator TALMADGE. He advises that he intends to raise the question of the feasibility of speeding up development of job vacancy statistics during his forthcoming hearings on coordination and integration of government statistics programs. These are scheduled for May 15, 17, 18, and 22.

In spite of this risk that some misuse might arise in matching vacancies with the unemployed without taking into account pay, skills, or location of the jobs, our subcommittee, in endorsing the need, did point out a number of operational and analytical uses which the data would have. These were summarized in the committee's report, as follows:

> I. USES OF JOB VACANCY STATISTICS
>
> Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Arthur Ross, testified:
>
> "The lack of vacancy information constitutes the most significant gap in our knowledge of labor market conditions. Statistics on job vacancies would give us a measure of unsatisfied demand for labor which, together with our data on employment, would provide a more complete measure of the demand for labor—something we have never had before."
>
> *Operational uses*
>
> Job vacancy statistics would have the following operational uses:
>
> (1) Vacancy data would disclose unmet needs for workers in a wide range of occupations, and would indicate training requirements in such programs as those provided by the Economic Opportunity Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act which states that the Secretary of Labor "shall determine the skill requirements of the economy * * *."
>
> (2) Job vacancy information, collected in the pilot studies, has been used for establishing vocational training courses for both adults and high school students.
>
> (3) Vacancy information has also been used in counseling workers and others about to enter the job market as to their opportunities.
>
> (4) Vacancy data would aid the Employment Service in matching unemployed and under-employed workers with available job openings. This would apply both to placements within areas and among areas. In the latter instance, the data would aid in bringing employees in labor surplus areas into contact with employers in labor shortage areas, and vice versa.
>
> (5) Vacancy statistics have been useful in helping Employment Service staff to structure their contacts with employers more effectively.
>
> (6) Job vacancy information can be used by business firms to get a picture of the

area in which they are recruiting workers, and thereby develop more effective recruiting policies. This would be especially valuable to firms considering new plant locations.

(7) The survey of job vacancies might stimulate firms to improve their efficiency through more conscious manpower planning.

(8) Such information could be of equal value to labor organizations in evaluating the demand for the services of their members and in developing policies for training, apprenticeship, and collective bargaining.

(9) Information on job openings is essential for the operation of any program designed to assist in the geographic transfer of workers, as is now provided on a pilot basis by the Manpower, Development, and Training Act.

(10) In addition, such information would enable more effective programs to deal with plant closures.

Analytical uses

In addition to their contribution to ongoing programs, job vacancy data, when used in conjunction with information on employment, unemployment, labor turnover, and hours of work per week, would be useful in analyzing current economic situations and in making major policy decisions dealing with manpower development, unemployment, labor shortages, and inflation. Vacancy information would have the following analytical uses:

(1) Vacancy data could be useful in predicting the occupational needs of the Nation.

(2) Vacancy statistics could serve as a leading indicator of the level of general economic activity.

(3) The Commissioner of Labor Statistics has indicated that vacancy data would aid in the preparation of regular reports to the President on current manpower shortages.

(4) Vacancy data would indicate tight labor markets and thus serve as a signal of imminent wage increases.

(5) Information on job vacancies would be an indication of the ability of the economy to undergo the stress of structural change; for example, rapid defense buildups, or layoffs in employment stemming from shifts in demand or technological developments.

(6) Vacancy data and trends in these data by occupation, industry, and area would be helpful in determining the extent to which aggregate demand could be increased without wage and price inflation. However, it seems unlikely that such information could identify the causes which led to a given stock of unemployment.

It is impossible to foretell all of the analytical uses of the vacancy data since they will be used extensively in research. As in most research, it is to be expected that there will be discussion and argument as to what constitutes "proper" use of the data.

Until a few years ago, many manpower experts were convinced, on the basis of studies of employer records and other data conducted during the 1950's, that it would not be feasible to collect information on job vacancies in the United States—at least not in a form usable for both operating programs such as manpower training, as well as for economic analysis. To be useful for such operating purposes, job vacancy information is needed on the basis of specific opportunities, by areas, occupation, and industry—rather than in terms of overall totals.

Several years ago, however, the Department of Labor decided to reexamine this premise about ability to collect these data. This reexamination was initiated partly in response to the new manpower legislation, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act, which had then recently been enacted. It also reflected the recommendations from a Presidential Committee established to appraise our employment and unemployment statistics. In its report of September 1962, this Committee labeled the lack of job vacancy statistics as one of the most conspicuous gaps in our system of manpower and employment information.

Shortly after the completion of this report, the Department of Labor's U.S. Employment Service, in cooperation with the affiliated Illinois State Employment Service, initiated a feasibility study in Chicago to test the possibility of collecting vacancy data by occupation. The favorable results of this study, conducted in 1963, led the Department to initiate a wider scale experimental program during the following year.

EXPERIMENTAL JOB VACANCY PROGRAM

This experimental program has been underway since the fall of 1964 in about 15 pilot areas. These areas include some of the largest in the country: New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Milwaukee, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Kansas City—as well as some small and medium areas to assure geographic and industrial diversity. Operated by the U.S. Employment Service and the affiliated State employment services in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this program has provided information on specific job vacancies in each of the areas for three periods: autumn 1964, spring 1965, and spring 1966. A similar job vacancy experimental survey is scheduled for the spring of 1967.

In its 2½ years of operations, this experimental program has already demonstrated:

First. That the collection of job vacancy information from employers by detailed occupation is both feasible and practical.

Second. That vacancies exist in a broad spectrum of occupations, although heaviest demand is at the highest skill levels.

Third. That differences by area in the nature of vacancies may be quite substantial.

Fourth. That this information is potentially of value for manpower planning purposes and for the operations of manpower training and development programs.

POSSIBLE EXPANSIONS IN PROGRAM

Some of these findings regarding the feasibility of compiling job vacancy information by occupation were already apparent when the Department of Labor budget request for fiscal year 1966 was being prepared. Accordingly, an appropriation request was included in the Department's budget, submitted for that year, to move from an experimental to an operational stage in the implementation of that program. This request envisioned an expansion of the program from its present 15 pilot areas annually, to 150 major metropolitan areas on a quarterly basis. This expansion was expected to cost about $3 million each year, above and beyond the approximately $350,000 now made available for the pilot program.

This appropriation request was denied by the Congress, in acting upon the Department's budget in fiscal year 1966. Again, in fiscal year 1967, the Department requested $2.5 million to finance an expansion in this program. This program expansion was somewhat more limited than requested in the previous year and was designed to cover only 75 of the country's major metropolitan areas—including at least one in every State. Again the Congress did not act favorably on this request. In both years, however, funds were provided to continue the experimental program at about its present level.

FISCAL YEAR 1968 PLANS

The Department's fiscal year 1968 request did not include a request for a further expansion of this program at this time. This omission reflected both program and budget considerations. In terms of program factors, the Department recognized that—in view of the denial by Congress of funds to expand this program in the preceding 2 years—it was unlikely that favorable action could be anticipated until further research and experimentation was completed regarding various technical questions concerning the validity of the information. Accordingly, research under this program in fiscal year 1968 will focus on providing further information regarding the behavior of job vacancies under various phases of the business cycle and in differing seasonal situations, in validating the occupational classification of the data, in identifying hiring requirements related to vacancies, and in providing more precise information on wages offered for available openings.

In terms of budgetary considerations, the omission takes cognizance of the President's directive to limit expenditures on civilian programs wherever feasible, to take account of the added burden of the Vietnam conflict. While the Department still believes job vacancy information could make a significant contribution to the efficient operations of various manpower programs, it believes already existing information sources may be adequate to do the job in the context of the current situation.

One such information source is the data—mentioned in the letter from Secretary Wirtz to Senator PERCY which was cited in Senator CURTIS' April 5 statement—on unfilled job openings held by public employment offices throughout the country. Such openings account for between one-quarter and one-third of the total vacancies in each area. More important, however, is the fact about these openings brought out by the 15-area pilot job vacancy survey; that is, that for most occupations, the Employment Service unfilled job openings are reasonably representative of total demand in the area.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete statement of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an-

other new program which will facilitate the operations of job training programs is now being established by the Department of Labor's manpower administration, in cooperation with other agencies. Known as CAMPS—cooperative area manpower planning system—this program is designed to provide for coordinated planning of State and local manpower plans throughout the country. When in full operation it should facilitate the systematic interchange of information regarding training needs and resources of various agencies and assist in coordinating and harmonizing the services of the various manpower programs.

I am confident, on the basis of my review of the situation, that even without job vacancy data these programs provide an effective mechanism for planning and implementing job training activities which can contribute to the continuing economic vitality and employment growth in all sections of the country.

EXHIBIT 1

JOB VACANCIES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a serious administrative shortcoming in the efforts of the Federal Government to come to grips with the unemployment problem through job training programs or by any other means now utilized.

I refer to revelations made by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. W. Willard Wirtz, in a letter to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], in response to questions which Senator PERCY directed to the Secretary of Labor at a hearing held by the Joint Economic Committee on February 7.

In response to the question "How many job vacancies now exist in our economy?" the Secretary of labor has just advised Senator PERCY in writing:

"We do not at present have any figures on total job vacancies in the United States. Such information is now available only for about 15 metropolitan areas, as part of a Department of Labor experimental program initiated several years ago. This pilot program, operated by the United States Employment Service and the affiliated State Employment Services in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, provided one-time job vacancy estimates for each of these areas for the fall of 1964, for April 1965 and for April 1966. Another such survey will be conducted in these areas later this spring.

"The best available indication of vacancies now at hand is the monthly lists of unfilled job openings held by public employment offices throughout the country. These total about 322,500 at the end of February (but slightly less than the year-ago level of 344,400). Unfilled job openings generally range between a quarter and a third of the total vacancies in the areas included in our pilot program."

Mr. President, it seems preposterous to me for the Department of Labor or any other Federal agency seeking to match unemployed persons with available jobs to keep extensive records on the number and types of unemployed without having any system for accurately measuring the jobs available in our economy. It is incredible, Mr. President, that any agency could operate effectively in the field of finding jobs for people or of training people for those jobs when it has no system for seeking out and finding the jobs that are available.

In the midwestern and western parlance to which I am accustomed, Mr. President, I can only picture the Secretary of Labor trying to make a horse go forward by pulling the animal's tail.

All of us are familiar with the statistical reports that are published regularly by the Labor Department showing the number of unemployed persons. I am shocked to find that the Department of Labor, which keeps such close tabs on the number of unemployed, has no idea really of the number of jobs available and the skills that are needed to fill these jobs. I do not see how the Department can run sensible job training programs without knowing the number and types of jobs available.

I became interested in this aspect of the job training problem when businessmen in Nebraska told me, during my travels in the State over the past 2 years, that they have many jobs available but no one to fill them. The managers of several plants told me they would expand their operations if they could get qualified employees to fill the additional jobs. The head of a trucking company told me that his firm cannot hire as many drivers as it needs, and that the shortage of drivers had become a critical problem.

This whole subject is of special interest to me now, because I am having a bill drafted to try to make Federal job training programs do a better job of meeting the Nation's manpower needs. My bill would give State and local governments, particularly schools, greater responsibilities in utilizing these funds.

I am pleased to report that the city government, the school system, and private organizations in Nebraska's largest city, Omaha, have launched a cooperative local effort to find jobs on a continuing basis for persons who find themselves on the unemployment rolls for one reason or another. This type of local initiative to solve problems is highly commendable. However, I regret to report that coincident with Senator Percy's receipt of Secretary Wirtz' letter a delegation from Omaha, accompanied by a member of my staff, conferred with officials of the Labor Department and found them reluctant to participate in such a practical approach to the unemployment problem.

It is my sincere hope that the Secretary of Labor and his Department will take another look at their untenuous position. Certainly they cannot do a very good job of administering funds to train people for jobs when they do not know what jobs exist. Commonsense dictates that they do as complete a job of keeping track of the available jobs as they do of computing and publicizing the number of jobless. I expect to have more to say in the future about this and related matters.

MAURY MAVERICK, JR., SPEAKS ON "THE VALUE OF DISSENT TO THE CONSTITUTED AUTHORITY"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most incisive speakers on contemporary life in Texas is Maury Maverick, Jr. A humane person with a tough, penetrating wit, Maury once convulsed the U.S. Supreme Court in laughter during a search-and-seizure case by announcing to the Court that one of the items seized as tools of crime was a dissenting opinion of the Honorable Hugo L. Black.

Maury Maverick has spoken out again for freedom, this time on freedom of dissent when the freedom is very gravely threatened.

I ask unanimous consent that a sermon delivered by Maury Maverick, Jr., entitled "The Value of Dissent to the Constituted Authority," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE VALUE OF DISSENT TO THE CONSTITUTED AUTHORITY

(Sermon by Maury Maverick, Jr., Unitarian Church, March 1967)

The topic I am to talk on is the value of dissent to the constituted authority.

An equally pertinent topic could be the value of constituted authority to those who would dissent. Professor T. V. Smith put this another way when he wrote:

"It takes radicals to instigate revolutions and to consummate them, but it takes conservatives to found new states and to consolidate them. Hamilton took the independence Jefferson proclaimed and made it into something national and solid; Jefferson took the stability and prosperity which Hamilton engineered and enjoyed the fruits of both."

"What Jefferson really did not see clearly, nor Hamilton either, was that it takes all kinds of motivations to make up the spiritual life. He did not see that it takes one kind of a man to build a polity, to envision justice, to activate the hearts of men and to found a state, and another type of man to effect compromises, to sustain cross purposes in patience, to implement the impulses of creative accommodation. . . ."

This is not to suggest that I think all dissenters are right. As a matter of fact, some are wrong, some are dangerous, and perhaps worst of all—some are bores. Furthermore, dissenters are not the only ones who serve in the vineyard of man. For while society needs people who will raise hell, it also needs people who will haul out the ashes. The imbalance, however, is unfairly against the dissenter who is more important to us than we know; yet, we track him down and destroy or silence him if we can.

Having acknowledged the value of the constituted authority to dissent, I will not dwell on it further. The constituted authority already has more than enough spokesmen who sing its praise at every turn of the road: the newspapers and television stations, chambers of commerce, the usual suburban church, the typical noon day luncheon club—the list is endless. Therefore, let us talk now about the value of dissent to the constituted authority.

As our country becomes more complicated, the threat to liberty comes not so much from the dissenter—be he a Negro reaching out for a better day, or a Bircher, or a Communist, or a Ku Kluxer, or a bearded college boy who throws himself in front of a troop train bound for combat—as it does from those who seek out conformity imposed by the constituted authority at no matter what the price.

The danger, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has pointed it out to be, is not the hard-faced men, but the faceless men, and the threat to liberty comes not so much from those who do not want others to be free as it does from those who do not want to be free themselves. "Conformity," says Schlesinger, "is a greater danger not when it is coerced, but when it is sought."

Let me give you an example of what I mean. It is an example which painfully hurt me at the time it happened and still fills me with despair. During the McCarthy era when I was in the Texas House of Representatives, a bill was introduced to remove all books from state supported libraries critical of religion, the family, American history, and Texas history. A half a dozen of us were leading the fight against the bill and we were making headway, but a day or so before the final vote the professional lobby of the school teachers of Texas laid a press release on the desk of each member of the Texas House to the effect that the school teachers' lobby favored the bill. In the final analysis, we were defeated more by good people I love than by the obvious villain.

In Mississippi or Johannesburg good people look the other way when the Negro is put down. Good people in Texas are indif-

ferent to wage demands of Mexican-American agricultural workers along the Rio Grande. In Israel, good people stood silent when orthodox rabbis caused laws to be passed which bastardize children born of a Christian and Jew, when the marriage ceremony is not performed according to the rites of the Jewish church. Good people told the Irish of Boston not to apply for work. Good people in Germany did nothing when the Jews were carted off to the ovens, and the good people in America are not really having a dialogue regarding the defoliating of crops and forests by chemicals dropped from a plane in an undeclared war.

This is not to suggest that the mass of people are not capable of greatness, but it is to suggest, that it is the dissenter who first protests, and by his protest provides the initial catalyst, which generally expands the visions of mankind.

Christ was an unpopular agitator to the constituted authority—the good people of his time murdered him. In modern times he has been made into something else—a sort of Mr. Good Guy—obviously embarrassed about being a Methodist and secretly longing to be an Episcopalian, since he moved to Terrell Hills from Harlandale, but the truth is he was a contentious radical and an outsider.

Socrates was handed his cup of hemlock by the constituted authority for asking disturbing questions. He described himself, and all dissenters of worth, when he told the jury ordering his death, "I am that gadfly which God has given the State, and all day long and in all places, I am always fastening upon you, arousing, persuading, and reproaching you. . . ."

Two Russian poets, Abram Tertz and Nikolai Arzhak, languish in a Soviet jail because they wrote poetry considered embarrassing by the constituted authority.

Gandhi, as a dissenter, demonstrated the power of love and the strength of communication between dissenters of different generations; for Thoreau talked to Gandhi, who talks to Martin Luther King.

J. Frank Dobie got himself fired from the University of Texas for defending young professors, academic freedom, Dr. Homer Rainey, and student editors against newspaper censorship, but if you visit this dissenter's grave at the state cemetery in Austin, you will sense that his spirit lives on, not because he conformed, but because he stood up to the constituted authority.

John Adams was attorney for the redcoats of the Boston Massacre. Although a revolutionary he dissented against his brother dissenters, and made the point—a man is entitled to his day in court no matter how unpopular.

On March 31, 1861, a crowd overflowed the courthouse in Brenham, Texas. Sam Houston had been invited to give his reasons for not taking the oath to the Confederacy. "Don't let him speak. Kill him! Kill him!" the spectators cried out.

The old man reminded them of the Battlefield of San Jacinto, and then said:

"The Vox Populi is not always the voice of God, for when the demagogues . . . succeed in arousing public prejudice and stilling the voice of reason, then on every hand can be heard the popular cry, 'Crucify Him, crucify him'."

"I have heard the hiss of mobs upon the streets," the old man went on, "but the hiss of the mob . . . cannot compel me to take the oath of allegiance to a so-called Confederate Government."

It was dissenters who wrote the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Texas, denouncing the excesses of organized religion and the professional military as: ". . . the eternal enemies of civil liberty, the ever-ready minions of power, and the usual instruments of tyrants . . ." Let those Texans who would impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren, or Hugo Black, or William O. Douglas for comparatively tame language on the subject of separation of church and state, first read their own historic documents.

The Grangers, as a dissenting third political party, attacked unfair railroad rates in the South. The Greenbackers demanded a graduated income tax. The Populists called for the popular election of U.S. Senators. The Socialists opposed child labor and advocated public works, old age systems, and unemployment compensation.

Communism, as a dissenting force, has swept across great portions of the world, and has, numerically speaking, acquired more people under its banner since World War I than Christianity has in over a thousand years. This is a lesson in not listening to the voices of dissent, as the Presbyterians pointed out by resolution on October 21, 1953, when they proclaimed, "Many of the revolutionary forces of our times are in great part the judgment of God upon human selfishness and complacency, and upon man's forgetfulness of man."

Now a final word about dissent in terms of Texas history. Since the time a Texan has occupied the White House, I have received more and more inquiries requesting background information on the Lone Star State.

There is some nonsense in every revolution. The Americans came to Coahuila, Texas, talking liberty, but outraged Mexico with their institution of slavery. On the other hand, the Mexican government denied religious liberty, and as the revolution began to surface, Mexico escalated its military control over Coahuila-Texas, by spending half a million dollars building military posts and garrisoning them with 1,300 troops. Stephen F. Austin, sounding like Fulbright of Arkansas, wrote the following to the Mexican government—

". . . I have informed you many times and and I inform you again, that it is impossible to rule Texas by a military system. Upon this subject of military despotism, I have never hesitated to express my opinion, for I consider it the source of all revolutions and of the slavery and ruin of free people."

The Mexicans ignored this plea and with their escalation they largely precipitated their own defeat.

As Americans, the residents of Texas share the glory of the American Revolution, but as Texans they know their people, including Lyndon Johnson's ancestors, walked a second time down the bloody road of revolution—in the face of escalation—past Gonzales, where the first shot was fired. Past the Goliad Massacre, where James Fannin and 342 of his men, prisoners of war, were murdered. Past San Antonio, where 27-year-old attorney at law, Colonel William Barret Travis, Juan Abamillo, Jim Bowie—Englishmen, Scotsmen, Irishmen, men from 18 American states, and an immigrant from Denmark, Charles Zanco, first had a fandango to the tunes of former Congressman Davy Crockett's fiddle and big John McGregor's bagpipes—and then, along with a Negro, remembered only as John, entered the walls of the Alamo to die. Finally, there was victory at San Jacinto where Sam Houston, lawyer, protected the civil rights of the hated Santa Anna.*

On March 12, 1836, at Washington on the Brazos, the Republic of Texas gave the world a Declaration of Independence which magnificently demonstrated the right of a people, even unpopular people such as the Texans were, to express their views against the established government. And this they did in the face of Santa Anna's decree; ". . . seran juzgados y castigados como piratas . . ."—The Texans shall be judged and treated like pirates.

Today, the ultimate in the right of dissent by a person, popular or unpopular, is written into the present Constitution of Texas, as contained in Section 2 of Article I of the Bill of Rights. It is an echo of the Texas Revolution, and it reads:

"All political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit. The faith of the people of Texas stands pledged to the preservation of the republican form of government, and, subject to this limitation only, they have at all times the inalienable right to alter, reform, or abolish their government in such manner as they think expedient."

I conclude now as I began. Let this be a nation of stability, but a stability which provides for the freedom of dissent.

Let us have, as an old friend of mine once put it, "a nation of liberty and groceries". Let us have the groceries which flow from a stable society, but let us also have the liberty which flows from a free people.

"All progress has resulted from people who took unpopular positions", said Adlai Stevenson, himself a dissenter.

Let us then have dissent so that we will not become faceless men and women.

* Sam Houston is my choice as the greatest Texan of all, past or present. The most readable and exciting book on him is *The Raven*, by Marquis James. The more definitive books on him, also interesting, are: *Sam Houston, the Great Designer*, by Llerena B. Friend and *Sam Houston—American Giant*, by M. K. Wisehart. You won't put The Raven down once you start it, and it could lead to the other books. Houston loved Texas, but he loved the United States more, and he is vastly underrated in American History.

U.S. RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS WILL ROB UNFRIENDLY NATIONS OF PROPAGANDA MATERIAL—LXII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the failure of the United States to ratify a single one of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery has not gone unnoticed by nations unfriendly to the United States.

In fact, our failure to ratify a single one of the Human Rights Conventions has presented certain other countries with a major propaganda coup.

An unfortunate example of this opportunity for blatant Soviet demagoguery occurred during a meeting of the U.N. Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

When the U.S. representative advocated the strengthening of the United Nations activity in the human rights field, he was subjected to a sarcastic rebuttal by his Soviet counterpart. The Soviet spokesman alleged American hypocrisy because the United States "had not ratified the Convention on the Crime and Punishment of Genocide or the Convention on Slavery."

A similar incident occurred during the 1966 meeting of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. The U.S. representative expressed our support for the creation of a U.N. Commission on Human Rights. The Soviet representative's retort was both acerbic and cynical. Here, in part, is what the Soviet delegate said:

An objective analysis of the political orientation of the proposal so ardently supported by the United States and its allies soon revealed that the proposal was designed to give world public opinion the impression of active participation in the cause of human rights by States which in practice obstinately refused to fulfill their obligations under the multilateral international conventions in the field of human rights.

He then proceeded to characterize the U.S. failure to ratify specific Conventions "as hypocritical" and "almost indecent."

Mr. President: We know these charges are false. As well, the Russians know they are false. But what about the new nations in the world—60 of them since 1943? What are they to believe?

The Senate can quite readily destroy this unfair propaganda advantage of the Russians and their satellites by ratifying the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

FISCAL POLICY AND THE GOOD ECONOMIC SOCIETY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the able chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, recently delivered an excellent and timely speech on the role of fiscal policy in contributing to the development of "the good economic society." I ask unanimous consent that Representative MILLS' remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

FISCAL POLICY AND THE GOOD ECONOMIC SOCIETY

(Address of Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS before the American Enterprise Institute symposium on Fiscal Policy and Business Capital Formation, dinner meeting, Washington, D.C., April 20, 1967)

In the last several years, the significance of fiscal policy for the performance of the American economy has received an unusual amount of attention in the press, in public forums, in the academic community, and in the business world. Very likely this emphasis is attributable to a view which has gained wide currency to the effect that the revenue productivity of the Federal tax system tends to increase so rapidly—withdrawing so much from the income flow of the Nation—that private spending will be unduly constrained if tax rates are not periodically reduced or if public spending is not increased to fill the gap. The fiscal developments of 1962, 1964, and 1965 seem to have established the validity of the view; the changes in the tax structure apparently were associated with a marked increase in momentum in economic activity until recent months. This happy congruence of appealing theory and a pleasing turn of events has resulted, as is so often the case, in a possibly greater enthusiasm for fiscal manipulation than the limited experience with it might warrant, but this is of much less consequence than the fact that we seem to be focusing on fiscal arithmetic rather than on the real aims and significance of fiscal policy in the first half of this decade.

Any public policy can be appraised only in the light of its objectives. There need not, of course, be a consensus concerning the aims of a public policy, and the rating it gets, therefore, may vary not only because of differences in viewpoint about how it has performed but as well because of disagreements about what it was supposed to do. In the following remarks, then, you will find one system of preferences which, hopefully, will prove persuasive.

In very general terms, fiscal policy, just as any other element of political economy, should seek to contribute to the attainment of the good economic society. A good economic society is highly progressive; its members seek to advance their wellbeing and this desire is a strong motive force in their personal lives and is reflected in the performance of the economy as a whole. The progressive spirit leads them to venture, to look for the new, to seek out challenges to do things better—better than they've been done before and better than anyone else is doing them now. It is fashionable in some quarters these days to speak derisively about building better mousetraps and to decry the gadgetry in our lives, as if these individually inconsequential items were in competition with culturally grander things for our interest and energy. But this isn't the case and ignores the fact that our technical progress consists of the aggregation of all such little bits and pieces of better things and better ways of doing as well as the more glamorous and impressive advances.

A society that gives ample play to this impulse is a dynamic one. It is also highly diverse. Because it's dynamic, it's subject to frequent shock, but because of its diversity, relatively few of the adjustments thereto involve widespread or prolonged dislocations. Indeed, the Nation's economic history offers repeated evidence of the fact when the economy is allowed to adjust of itself to such disturbances it does so relatively quickly and smoothly.

The good economic society is efficient. It allocates the various elements of its production capability to those uses in which they will contribute most to total output and to the well-being of its people. It quickly recognizes changes in costs and in benefits and facilitates rather than impedes the rearrangement of production activity in response to those changes.

The good economic society is busy and fully employed. It avoids prolonged, involuntary unemployment of large numbers of its labor force, or their prolonged employment in submarginal uses. It recognizes, however, that the rate of use of labor, capital, and other agencies of production cannot be absolutely unchanging in a dynamic environment, and is prepared, therefore, to accept moderate deviations from "full employment" for short periods of time.

The good economic society grows. It increases its capabilities for satisfying the material aspirations of its members, while accommodating their desires for diversity and change.

The good economic society is fair and humane. It seeks to make the benefits of its advances available to all of its members by making sure that none of them are debarred from being or becoming productive participants in its activities. It recognizes differences among its members in their ability to contribute and seeks to moderate rather than to enhance these disparities, not by constraining the more productive but by increasing the productivity of the less fortunate. But where this is not feasible, the good economic society is not indifferent to deprivation. It mobilizes its resources to discover and apply enduring remedies and avoids relying on ad hoc reliefs.

Finally, a good economic society relies on its members to provide the impetus and the means for achieving these goals. It recognizes that in our highly complex economic, political, and social environment, individuals will frequently encounter problems with which they are unable to cope unaided; there is, in other words, a wide array of problems with which society as a whole must deal. But the good economic society is careful to limit its assumption of responsibility to concerns of this character and seeks always to reserve to private economic entities—individuals, households, companies—the maximum possible scope for decision-making, for initiating activity. This is the essence of economic freedom in our world today. And maximizing economic freedom is a major objective of the good society.

How may fiscal policy contribute to attaining the goals of the good economic society? The basic economic facts of life that come to bear here are (1) that every government purchase involves limiting the availability of production capability for carrying out the plans and meeting the demands of private economic entities and that (2) virtually every government levy impacts on the taxpayer's choices among economic alternatives.

The first of these facts accounts for the traditional liberal concern for limiting governmental programs. This is no doctrinaire indictment of government spending. On the contrary, as the society grows and becomes both more complex and more affluent, the extent and scope of demands for publicly afforded services must be expected to increase as well. But taking a realistic view of the likely course of government activity doesn't justify indifference to the perpetuation of programs that either have proved to be invalid or have outlived their former usefulness. Nor does it lead to ready acceptance of the ad hoc addition of new programs, often overly ambitious and impractical, no matter how glamorously named nor how worthy their objective. Nor, moreover, does it require tolerance for ill-conceived experiments which could pass a rudimentary cost-benefit test only if the benefits are measured in such ambiguous terms as "prestige". Instead, this view calls for continual reevaluation of existing expenditure programs in the light of rigorous, objective measurement of the benefits they convey and the costs they impose and the requirement that any proposed new program meet the same tests. In fact, all proposals for new expenditure programs should be received with a constructive skepticism; we should start with the assumption that the production capability to be allocated to the program would be better left available to meet demands arising in the private sector of the economy and require the program's proponents to persuade us otherwise.

There are, of course, those who are disappointed because government expenditures haven't increased more rapidly, who claim the public sector is "starved", and who assert that great public needs go unmet. It should be clear, however, that such assertions are not objective observations, but expressions of preferences. Moreover, the recent and prospective rates of gain in the magnitude of government expenditures belie the notion of an underprivileged public sector. Between 1960 and 1966, Federal expenditures in the national income accounts increased by 53 percent. In fact, during these years Federal non-defense purchases of goods and services increased twice as rapidly—96½ percent—as gross national product less Federal purchases which increased by 47 percent. And of all the major sectors of the economy, none has increased so rapidly in this period as state and local government spending which expanded by almost two-thirds. Surely these facts should give one pause about some recent, bizarre proposals concerning the fiscal relationships of the Federal and state and local governments.

Fiscal policy for the good economic society will place great emphasis on the manner in which the revenues required to defray government expenses are raised. The tax structure will be submitted to frequent reappraisal to determine whether its burdens are fairly distributed and whether it contributes to moderation of extremes in the distribution of income and wealth. Continuing efforts will be made to identify and to eliminate those elements or features of the revenue system which afford preferential treatment to some taxpayers while discriminating against others. And the same healthy skepticism with which proposals for new government spending programs are received should greet proposals for new tax differentials.

Great importance should be attached to regular, frequent, and significant reductions in tax rates. Virtually all of the objectives of the good economic society are served thereby. Certainly economic growth is enhanced by tax reduction which reduces the constraints on entrepreneurship, on risk-

taking, on launching new ventures, and on all sorts of productive effort. Surely the dynamic character of the economy and the efficiency of use of production capability is enhanced by tax rate reduction which moderates the tax advantages or disadvantages of particular groups of taxpayers and thereby reduces tax-induced distortions in the allocation of resources. And beyond doubt, economic freedom is bolstered by general tax reduction which broadens the command of private economic entities over the society's productive resources.

If this view of the good economic society and the fiscal policy which is appropriate thereto is appealing, one can only regret the circumstances which are deemed to forefend a long-range program of periodic tax reduction. Our attention has been called over and over again of late to the growth in our tax system's revenue productivity which accompanies the growth of the economy. There may be competing claimants for this potential increment in revenues, but if the goals presented in this discussion are to be sought, tax reduction should be the preferred course.

A few years ago, it appeared that the Nation was firmly committed to this course. Taxation developments in 1962 made some constructive changes in the revenue structure, and the Revenue Act of 1964 and the excise reductions legislated in 1965 seemed to indicate that the Nation had made a commitment to a long-range fiscal policy stressing tax reduction and curbs on the growth of Federal expenditures. Indeed, this was made explicitly clear, as stated in my press release of September 16, 1963:

"The purpose of this tax reduction and revision bill is to loosen the constraints which present Federal taxation imposes on the American economy. The results of these tax reductions and revisions will be a higher level of economic activity, fuller use of our manpower, more intensive and profitable use of our plant and equipment; and with the increases in wages, salaries, profits, consumption, and investment, there will be increases in Federal tax revenues. Increases in economic activity, in the use of our resources, in personal and business incomes, and in Federal revenues might be also realized if, instead of reducing taxes, the Congress and the Administration increased expenditures of Government. In other words, there are two roads the Government could follow toward a larger, more prosperous economy—the tax reduction road or the Government expenditure increase road. There is a difference—a vitally important difference—between them. The increase in Government expenditure road gets us to a higher level of economic activity with larger and larger shares of that activity initiating in Government—with more labor and capital being used directly by the Government in its activities and with more labor and capital in the private sector of the economy being used to produce goods and services on Government orders. The tax reduction road, on the other hand, gets us to a higher level of economic activity—to a bigger, more prosperous, more efficient economy—with a larger and larger share of that enlarged activity initiating in the private sector of the economy—in the decision of individuals to increase and diversify their private consumption and in the decisions of business concerns to increase their productive capacity—to acquire more plant and machines, to hire more labor, to expand their inventories—and to diversify and increase the efficiency of their production.

"Section I of the bill is a firm, positive assertion of the preference of the United States for the tax reduction road to a bigger, more progressive economy. When we, as a Nation, choose this road we are at the same time rejecting the other road, and we want it understood that we do not intend to try to go along both roads at the same time.

"The further meaning of Section I of the bill is that no Government activity is to depend for its justification on the amount it contributes to the total spending of the economy, because we prefer to reduce taxes and allow individuals and business concerns in their own right to make that contribution. On the contrary, any and all activities of the Government have to be justified on their importance in serving other essential goals of the Nation. There is no further justification for an indifferent attitude toward wasteful, inefficient Government activities merely because they incidentally give employment—tax reduction will also create job opportunities and in lines of activity which better satisfy the character and demands of the people for an enriched life. There is no more justification for half-hearted efforts or outright failure to eliminate Government programs that have outlived their usefulness just because they also contribute to the total spending stream of the economy—that contribution will be better realized by increasing the purchasing power of consumers and investors through tax reduction. Finally, there is no further occasion for using the additional revenues which will be generated by the expansion of the economy as a result of tax reduction and revision to finance additional Government expenditures, solely because those additional expenditures might add further to expansion of economic activity. If such additional expansion is desired or needed, tax reduction will achieve it just as surely and through vigorous and progressive forces of the private sectors of the economy."

For a brief period after the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, the pace of expansion of Federal expenditures did indeed appear to have moderated, but only briefly. The increase of military efforts in Viet Nam, of course, accounts for a significant part of the subsequent acceleration of expansion of Federal outlays, but two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures from calendar 1963 through 1966—as measured in the National income accounts—is accounted for by non-defense spending. Moreover, as projectd in the January 1967 budget message, over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in outlays from fiscal 1966 through fiscal 1968 is to be in non-defense programs.

It is, of course, impossible to turn back the clock and one must, therefore, acknowledge that it will be difficult indeed to bring this rapid acceleration of public spending under control. But unless we are prepared to forego the course of tax reduction for an indefinite period into the future, we should at the least attempt to achieve a pause in the current enlargement of Federal spending.

This discussion has focused on the broad, long-term objectives of fiscal policy, and little has been said about using fiscal policy, or more specifically tax policy, to offset short-term fluctuations in the rate of expansion of total economic activity. The emphasis in the past year and a quarter has been on tax changes for short-run stabilization objectives. Questions can certainly be raised as to whether this has been a very happy chapter in the Nation's fiscal history. The request for the suspension of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation last fall and for their reinstatement this spring has been a fiscal experience from which, hopefully, it has been learned that taxes should not be raised and lowered from season to season like the hemlines of women's skirts and dresses. It is also to be hoped that those who have so enthusiastically advocated frequent, short-term tax rate changes have been sobered by the turn in the economic indicators and the question as to whether they have properly discerned the major tendencies in the economy. In my view it is questionable whether the mechanical application of fiscal arithmetic contributes to good public finance.

Fiscal policy has an important assignment, but in recent years its press agents have invested it with more power to determine the size, shape, and character of the economy than it has or should have. Let us hope that fiscal policy will soon be refocused on contributing to the attainment of the good economic society.

UNITED STATES SHOULD EXPRESS CONCERN TO GREECE FOR PAPANDREOU

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I have dispatched a letter to Secretary Rusk regarding the safety of Andreas Papandreou, of Greece. Among his many accomplishments, he has had a distinguished career as an economist, trained in this country, and served in our Armed Forces during World War II. He relinquished his American citizenship to return to his native land.

I think it is most important for this Government to make known to King Constantine and the present Premier our active concern for the safety of this eminent man. The letter reads as follows:

APRIL 27, 1967.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write to request that the United States Government should make strong representations, through the Ambassador in Athens, to King Constantine and to Premier Constantine V. Kollias on the concern of people in the United States about the safety and wellbeing of Andreas Papandreou.

The suspension of civil liberties by the military junta in Greece has, I am sure, shocked you as much as it has shocked me. I am aware, too, of the extremely difficult position of the King. But it seems to me that the United States has an opportunity to express its concern about a political prisoner whose abilities are so well known to us. On the intellectual side, he has had a distinguished career as an economist at Harvard and Berkeley and, more recently, in Greece itself. But we ought not to forget that he served during World War II with our naval forces, and that it was to return to his native land that he relinquished his American citizenship.

The basis of my plea is the ground of common humanity and the belief that Greece cannot afford to ignore the talents of Andreas Papandreou. Hopefully, the Greeks will recognize in the active concern of the United States our own abiding detestation of political repression and our resolve to assert human rights.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Chairman.

THE ADDRESS OF GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND BEFORE A JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS—THREATENED RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I listened to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] with respect and high regard for his views, as I always do. But I stand on every single word I said earlier.

I did not have the privilege of hearing General Westmoreland this afternoon, but I read his speech before he made it. The reason I did not hear it was that I was doing an emergency job for the President of the United States during the period of time General Westmoreland was addressing the session of Congress. It was my duty to present to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public

Welfare the results of the administration deliberations regarding the railway dispute we shall be considering next week. I want to say that I read the general's speech——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oregon goes into that, will the Senator yield? I believe he was discussing the resolution on the labor difficulties in the railroad industry.

Mr. MORSE. I was going to end by offering that resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. I read the general's speech before the joint meeting of the Congress this afternoon. In light of the statements the general has made, since he has been back in the United States, to private groups, to the press, and to the newspaper publishers, I would characterize his speech this afternoon as a case of the general being on a forensic dress parade. It was interesting that when he got before those of us who have legislative responsibilities, he did not talk in the same terms he talked to the press and talked to the newspaper editors, but when he talked about "resolve"—and it was to that language, the word "resolve," that I addressed the thrust of my remarks—it was perfectly obvious what one of his duties happens to be in this country. It is to sell the American people on this war.

When I refer to those who talk about restraint, I do not refer to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], because I know of no one who is a greater defender of the right to dissent in this country than the Senator from Florida. He has been on the minority side on too many issues during his service in the Senate not to know the importance of dissent. But some of us in the Senate who from the very beginning—and we have had some new recruits since—have recognized this war as unjustifiable and have had the courage to tell the American people the facts as we find them in regard to its unjustifiability have been speaking with restraint.

However, there are many who, when they use the word "restraint," really mean that those of us who dissent should not really disagree. This crisis is so serious to the destiny of this Republic that I consider it my duty, when a military officer is brought back to the United States and is directed—and we well recognize the consent was had in advance—to make the statements that General Westmoreland has made to the press, in his interviews and formal speech, to say that the situation is exactly as I have described it in my speech.

If General Westmoreland is to become a propagandist for the administration in this war, let him take off his uniform and come back in civilian life. Let him become a candidate for public office. We have a very precious constitutional right that we must maintain. It is that there must be no trespass upon the principle that the foreign policy of this Republic shall be run by a civilian government, and not by the Pentagon Building.

Therefore, I stand on what I have said of General Westmoreland's activities here. I shall continue to reply to him as long as he carries on his forensic tour that obviously the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense have called him back to perform.

It is a pretty precious right in this country that the military stay within its military duties and leave the problems of running the civilian government and the determination of foreign policy to the civilians, and not to the military.

I shall talk about this whenever, in my judgment, the conduct of General Westmoreland or that of any other officer in the Military Establishment, while still in uniform, trespasses upon the constitutional guarantee that the civilian affairs of the Government will be determined by the civilian government and not by the military.

RAIL STRIKE RESOLUTION

I would like to have had the opportunity of hearing General Westmoreland. I have a very high regard for him as a military officer. He is no soldier-statesman, but he is a great soldier. It was impossible for me to hear him because I really was working for the President of the United States at the time General Westmoreland was making his speech, preparing for a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at 2 o'clock.

I did not ask for the assignment. It reveals no secrets to say that the distinguished majority leader, along with the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare sort of entered into a collusive arrangement this morning. They put me in a position where I was fulfilling the function which I began performing in a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In fact, I performed it without even taking time off for lunch. I ate my lunch in the committee meeting.

At the Cabinet Room this morning the President briefed us on the oncoming railroad strike. He outlined for us the various legislative proposals that could be made by the White House as a solution of the problem. He made clear that no final decision has been reached as yet on a legislative proposal which the administration will send to Congress early next week.

However, typical of the President, I want to say again what I said not so many days ago when I talked about the consultation process. The President, prior to his going to Punta del Este with regard to his obligations to meet with the heads of state at Punta del Este, consulted 40 Members of Congress working in the field of foreign policy, including the bipartisan leadership of both Houses of Congress. This is a policy of President Johnson's that I highly commend. In my judgment, that consultation policy carries out the very important principle in the Constitution of advise and consent.

So again today he consulted before the fact. He consulted with us to obtain our advice about what legislative remedy should be proposed. We reached an understanding among ourselves this morning, Mr. President, that the President should send to Congress a recommendation for a joint resolution. I read the proposed joint resolution:

S.J. RES. 79

Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 90-10 (Ninetieth Congress, S.J. Res. 65), April 12, 1967, is hereby amended by striking out "prior to 12:01 antemeridian of May 3, 1967" and inserting "prior to 12:01 antemeridian June 19, 1967."

As a result of the position taken by the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL]—and I made clear that I thought either one or both of them should take the assignment—they were in no small measure, in my judgment, responsible for the White House asking me to present this resolution to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I prepared for that meeting; I presented the resolution; and the resolution was discussed—the present Presiding Officer (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair), who attended that meeting, discussed it for some time—and reported it out.

Therefore, I ask to have this original resolution, initiated by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this morning, and which was reported out of that committee this morning by a unanimous vote, received at the desk at this time for printing in the RECORD, and that permission be granted to file the committee's report on the resolution before midnight tonight.

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

Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original joint resolution (S.J. Res. 79) to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, and submitted a report thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the joint resolution was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at two meetings at the White House this week—one with members of the Cabinet earlier in the week, while the President was in Germany attending the last rites for the late beloved and respected Chancellor of that country, Konrad Adenauer, and the one this morning—the question as to what should or could be done to meet this urgent problem was discussed.

At those meetings, I stated quite emphatically, I must say, that we ought to fall back upon the experience—which stretches back over almost four decades—of the distinguished Senator from Oregon as to procedures which might appropriately be followed.

We must all be aware of the fact that if no action is taken, come 12:01 Wednesday morning next, the strike which is threatened will become a fact. At that

time, if there is no agreement between the railroads and the shop crafts in the meantime, the President will be bereft of any means by which he, as the Chief Executive of this country, could face up to the situation and offer possibilities for meeting it.

Therefore, there is no choice but for the matter to be referred to Congress; and as much as I dislike any labor legislation of this kind being referred here, I can see no alternative.

It is my understanding that the Board which was created after Congress agreed to a 20-day extension—a Board headed by a very distinguished retired jurist, Judge Charles Fahey, with two equally distinguished colleagues—was able to bring closer, the area of agreement, but not sufficiently to satisfy at least one particular union. It therefore appears at the moment that negotiations are at an impasse and that something must be done. Something must be done not only to take care of the domestic economy of this country, but, regardless of one's feelings, something must be done because of the situation in which we find ourselves in Vietnam.

I can think of no better guide, adviser, or counselor in the field of management-labor relations than the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who has served as the dean of the Law School at the University of Oregon, who has served on many mediations boards, and whose experience, I reiterate, goes back many years.

So I look to him for——

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that I may finish this first.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator permit me to insert the War Labor Board, so ably headed by the Senator from Oregon, as a very great service?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely; and there have been other boards as well. Unfortunately, I do not have the list at my disposal. But, to repeat, I can think of no better qualified man to advise, guide, and counsel the Senate, Congress, and the unions and management as to the course which should be followed at this time. Because if something is not done, at 12:01 Wednesday morning next, the railroads will stop, and the difficulties which would ensue are too awesome, at the moment, to even contemplate.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], all members of the committee, and all Senators that as far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, it is his intention to call this resolution up on Monday next. I feel quite certain that in that respect I will receive the cooperation and approval of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the distinguished and able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the distinguished and able senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], all of whom have a vital interest in what will be the pending legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the interests of brevity, I associate myself with the remarks of the majority leader in respect to the need for legislation and in respect to the catastrophe that would be created in this country if we do not find a way to prevent that strike at 12:01 next Wednesday morning.

In spite of what the majority leader says, what the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] says, or what others may say Senator MANSFIELD heard me explain to the President this morning that I seek to perform my duties only as a member of the team, under the leadership of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Alabama. I will only carry out my obligations as a member of the committee, but as far as the leadership responsibility is concerned, I shall continue to look to them and support their leadership.

Mr. President, the President gave us a letter which he had written to the Speaker of the House and to the Vice President of the United States. I shall close my comments by reading the letter, because it sets forth the unanswerable argument which calls for the legislation which we shall seek.

The letter reads as follows:

APRIL 28, 1967.

Mr. SPEAKER.
Mr. VICE PRESIDENT.

A rail strike would bring industrial distress to America. It would disrupt our commerce, cripple our industries, create shortages of food. It would adversely affect the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country.

Such a strike would be a gross disservice to our valiant men in Vietnam who are making sacrifices greater than any of us are called upon to make.

The public interest demands that every practical step be taken to avert a strike, now scheduled for 12:01 A. M., on May 3.

Since my return from Germany on late Wednesday, I have consulted with the bipartisan leadership of the Congress, and with the ranking Members of the Senate Labor and the House Commerce Committees. They join with me today in urging that the Congress extend the no-strike period for an additional 45 days.

I am submitting herewith a joint resolution to accomplish this.

This additional period will give the Congress time prudently to consider legislation which will protect the public interest in this case.

I shall recommend such legislation to the Congress within a few days.

An additional 45 days period may enable the parties to press forward with their search for accord or reach an agreement themselves.

I hope and believe, in the interest of all Americans, the Congress will want to act promptly.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Not only do I associate myself with the statement of the President as to the need for legislation, but I also want to make a plea to the parties in the dispute.

In my judgment the carriers and the unions involved have a grave responsibility, owed not only to the American people but also to our free economy, to proceed to make free collective bargaining work.

There is not the slightest excuse or justification for the carriers and the brotherhoods to put the President and Congress in the position in which they are now placing the President and Congress as a result of the collapse of their collective bargaining negotiations.

The answer for the settlement of a labor dispute should not be found in Congress, but around a collective bargaining table in negotiations participated in by the parties.

I hope that between now and the time that Congress finally comes to the passage of legislation, these parties will live up to their responsibilities of industrial statesmanship and settle this case. For, let me say to both sides that as I have studied the case to date, and as I have listened to their representatives who appeared in public hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, this case involves not only a threatened strike but, in a real sense, also a threatened lockout.

It is perfectly obvious, as we listen to them, that the carriers, from the beginning of the negotiations, have taken the adamant position that unless these six craft unions would go along with the patterns for the most part that the carriers have laid down, they would then seek legislation.

Furthermore, there is no doubt that these carriers have, by design, been seeking compulsory arbitration for quite some time. And as I said to them in the public hearings, and as I said to the President and his associates in the Cabinet room this morning:

Here is one Senator who will never vote for compulsory arbitration.

I shall always point with pride to the vote I cast in 1963 when I was one of the two Members of the Senate that refused to vote for compulsory arbitration at that time.

How well I remember the chiefs of the railroad brotherhoods sitting in that top row in the gallery after they had made their demands and put on their lobbying pressure upon the Senate for a vote for compulsory arbitration because they had suffered a lapse of good judgment and thought that compulsory arbitration was the answer.

Instead of accepting the sound proposal from President Kennedy that they accept voluntary arbitration, they came along with their political pressure on the Hill and we ended up with that nefarious compulsory arbitration bill. It is rather interesting that in recent days one of those chiefs has put out a report condemning that arbitration and saying that they lost 17,000 railroad jobs among the firemen as the result of that arbitration. However, he was one of the chiefs that pleaded for votes for that arbitration bill.

He did not approve of me at the time. Perhaps now he thinks I do not have the horns that he thought I had at the time.

As I have been heard to say so many times: if we start to set up compulsory arbitration boards or give that authority to what some refined propagandists term labor courts, we will turn the economy of this country over to the discretionary judgment of arbitrators. If they can fix wages and conditions of employment, they can fix prices and rules of management.

That cannot be reconciled with a free enterprise system. That is why I served

notice in the committee the other day to the parties, and served notice in the Cabinet room this morning, that if there is any proposal to have compulsory arbitration, you can be sure of one vote against it, because I will not be a party to it. I close with a plea on my lips. I hope that the parties to this dispute will proceed to recognize—and I use a term they may not like advisedly that so long as this war is being fought, there can be no interruption in the shipment of supplies to those men in Vietnam. Nor can there be any interruption in our economy, so vital in maintaining a war economy.

I therefore say to them on both sides in this dispute: "It is your duty to settle this dispute by collective bargaining without making it necessary for Congress to pass legislation and the President to sign it."

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ENDORSES TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Small Business Administration has recently submitted a report to the Banking and Currency Committee on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. The Small Business Administration strongly favors the objectives of S. 5 and believes the measure is necessary not only to protect consumers but legitimate businessmen as well. As the guardian of small business, it is particularly encouraging that SBA is supporting truth in lending, since many people have felt the bill might have an adverse impact on small business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the SBA report be inserted in the RECORD.

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

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of January 26, 1967, in which you request our comments on S. 5, a bill "To assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit."

On a number of occasions the President has emphasized the need for such legislation. A measure of this kind is necessary not only to protect consumers against deception but also to protect legitimate enterprises against unscrupulous competitors who seek to gain business by misrepresenting credit costs.

Accordingly, we strongly favor the objectives of S. 5. With respect to the technical aspects of the bill, however, we would be guided by the views of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests and of the Federal Trade Commission.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

THE PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Punta del Este summit was basically a conference for and by the people of Latin America, in which we participated. I believe that to help to understand the real meaning of this Conference to the people of Latin America a look at recent public and press statements of Latin Americans would be useful. Such a look indicates that the Conference was a very significant success on a number of planes.

I do not wish to imply that the reaction of the press or the public in Latin America has been uniformly positive in glowing terms about the accomplishments of this Conference. Of course, there are many who have expressed dissatisfaction or disappointment of one kind or another. But, the mainstream of Latin American thought has reacted very favorably to the Presidents' actions at Punta del Este, and I should like today to mention a few salient points.

First, there was a general realization of the importance of getting together to assess common problems. This aspect was well summed up by Brazil's O Jornal, which stated:

> Only in this Hemisphere would it be possible to convoke and make effective a conference of this sort. It would not be practicable in Europe, Asia, or Africa for many historical and political reasons. The ideal of continental solidarity does exist here and is perfectly realizable.

President Belaunde of Peru felt that the fact that Presidents were able to come together for such a substantive meeting was in itself a "historical act." He termed the meeting an expression of an optimistic America, not a complaining one in which something positive had been accomplished.

Perhaps the best general summary of the spirit of cooperation which infused the Conference appeared in the communique issued by Brazil's President Costa e Silva on his return from the summit:

> I have already at Punta del Este expressed my satisfaction with the results of our work. I say our work, encompassing all the chiefs of state present, whose viewpoints coincided to such an extent in relation to the vital problems of our countries, that I can affirm the inauguration of a new era for Latin America. We explored objectively our common problems, for each one of which reasonable solutions were at least indicated, to be applied from now on with that sense of urgency perceived and emphasized by the President of the United States.

A general feeling of accomplishment flowed from this meeting: President Frei of Chile issued a statement in which he described the summit as "extraordinarily positive," and described the Presidential talks and bilateral contacts as very profitable.

President Ongania of Argentina told reporters that the Conference had been a "great success" and that his Government would cooperate enthusiastically in the task of Latin American integration.

In Santo Domingo, Listin Diario qualified the Conference as a very important one which would "open new paths for essential progress . . ."

Probably the most important agreement which emerged from the Conference was the determination to work toward a hemispheric-wide common market.

Colombia's President Carlos Lleras Restrepo stated on television that:

> The conference at Punta del Este was a success . . . because the multilateral character of the Alliance for Progress was demonstrated, and given vigorous impetus . . . because the idea of the common market was given official sanction . . . because an atmosphere of international understanding was fostered.

President Mendez of Guatemala characterized hemispheric integration as one of the most visionary steps taken since Latin American independence and asserted that the American nations have now begun to direct their steps toward continental unity. He also emphasized the value of the face-to-face conversations among the chiefs of state which brought about a greater comprehension of our mutual problems. And he saw the summit as resulting in a coordinated plan to spur economic and social development throughout the hemisphere.

In Rio, O Globo published an interview with several leading Rio businessmen supporting the common market. Its headline reads, "Businessmen Support Declaration of Punta del Este and Want Market."

In El Salvador, moderately conservative Prensa Grafica referred to the declaration of the Presidents in a headline as, "An Appointment With the Future of Latin America." To fulfill this major commitment, principles, goals, and objectives had been set which, the paper said, require the full cooperation of all:

> In the declaration, one of its most concrete clauses is concerned with the establishment of a common market. Throughout the world there is a tendency and movement toward forms of integration. An isolated country is one which lives on the periphery of progress.

Perhaps the key reason why the summit was felt by its participants to be a success was the realization of the necessity of self-help which ran through the statements both of the Presidential participants and the press of their countries.

President Trejos of Costa Rica assessed the results of the summit with "greatest optimism" and said the Presidents' declaration had "enormous value." He described President Johnson's speech as "very important and conceptual." Most important is the realization that Latin America must decide its own destiny. He stated:

> We know now that we must act on our own behalf and this is a positive element.

He said the declaration contained goals and indicated means to attain them which are of highest importance for the future of Latin America. Unstated in the document, but universally recognized is the idea that the final results will depend on the willingness of the hemisphere's political leaders to apply the principles and goals of the declaration.

He stressed the remarkable identity of views expressed in the speeches of the Latin American Presidents, notably: need for joint Latin American action; urgency of such joint action; better prices for Latin American commodities; and recognition that the future of Latin

America depends on Latin American actions rather than on external aid.

President Guerrero of Nicaragua termed the conference and the declaration of American Presidents "of transcendential importance," and stated that:

In general, I am optimistic that great strides can be made in the march toward progress which has begun on this date and which places the American continent on the path of work and prosperity. In short, the Alliance for Progress, a democratic and practical program, has reaffirmed its goal of improvement of living condtions of the Latin American people.

And in this context he continued:

Nicaragua would need to look to self-help as well as to external aid, and called on all Nicaraguans to work to give meaning to the Punta del Este accord.

President-elect Sanchez of El Salvador stated at an airport press conference held on his return from the summit that he considered the Alliance for Progress to be not just a matter of U.S. aid, but rather a program of joint and cooperative action, success of which depends above all on the effort of each country.

President Leoni of Venezuela noted the importance of the commitments by the Latin American chiefs of state together with the United States to execute programs agreed to at the summit.

This realization was reiterated forcefully in the press. El Mercurio of Santiago judged that:

The foundations of the Punta del Este declaration rest upon salutary realism—that the Latin American countries should not in the future expect everything from foreign aid, but rather put individual effort to work.

President Johnson—

The paper said—

has also signaled such a new attitude realistically . . . He did not hold out unattainable expectations . . . The principal North American contribution might be to specific projects and mixed-economy enterprises backed jointly by North and South Americans.

Colombia's El Tiempo stated that the most important thing was then "eminently Latin American character" the meeting took.

Buenos Aires left-of-center El Mundo observed that "each President must be thinking of how he can immediately begin the work which will crystalize the agreements and compromises of the action program adopted at Punta del Este."

Brazil's O Jornal, after praising the Declaration of Punta del Este, asserted:

Latin America should listen to the advice given by U.S. Congressmen, diplomats, and Administration spokesmen that a nation develops only if it decides to use all its energies towards progress without depending on aid from without.

In another issue it wrote:

The summit has been more than rhetoric, just as the conference which launched the Alliance for Progress created more than words. It is fair to hope that something practical will come from the meeting . . . if not more financial help from the U.S., at least a new kind of experience for those who pin their hopes more on the efforts of others than on their own.

While the Jornal do Commercio concluded:

No help from abroad, no hand extended can save us unless we save ourselves, unless we collaborate for the good of all. Punta del Este posed a challenge to Latin Americans which they must face.

Similarly, in Mexico, moderately conservative Novedades maintained:

No matter how the Alliance for Progress refines its efficiency and no matter how plentiful the aid of the Inter-American Development Bank may be, the vices of the Latin American economy will remain unless all governments accept the fact that they cannot solve their problems except from within.

While at the same time, leftist El Dia described the creation of a Latin American common market as "the only solution to the economic problems of our time."

While I believe that it has been rightly said that the conference was a Latin American one, it was, nevertheless, interesting and important to get the latin's assessment of the U.S. role. I believe it can fairly be said that the conference was not only a triumph for the nations of the hemisphere but also a personal one for President Johnson.

Argentina's mass circulation Clarin solicited views of three Presidents on President Johnson's address to the conference and reported as follows:

1. Costa e Silva, Brazil . . . "Marvelous, with the necessary measure of discretion and realism."

2. Lleras Restrepo, Colombia . . . "Showed a great will and desire to give practical meaning to the vague language of the summit declaration."

3. Frei, Chile . . . "It set forth a large area in which we can work."

In Brasilia, Correio Brasiliense carried the complete text of President Johnson's address and an editorial titled "Support of Johnson."

It cannot be denied that all the nations of Latin America won a victory at Punta del Este. President Johnson recognized the series of demands which were formulated and which constituted the agenda for the meeting.

Although this does not represent a total victory, . . . nevertheless it serves as a great advance in U.S. understanding of the problems of this continent.

The agreement of President Lyndon Johnson to the principal demands takes on great importance, for without U.S. help and collaboration it will be impossible to satisfy them within the time limits set.

While in Rio, left-of-center Correio da Manha called the speech:

Undoubtedly positive . . . It can be expected to mark the beginning of effective action that will harmonize the multilateral interests between the U.S. and Latin America.

Perhaps of equal importance were the efforts on the informal plane. President Ongania of Argentina, in a message to President Johnson stated:

I am convinced that the results of the meeting of chiefs of state, in the preparation for which Your Excellency played such a distinguished role, are of major importance to our countries. I also believe that the holding of conversations in the future, like those yesterday with Your Excellency, will be essential to the success of the common task we have undertaken and to better relations among the American Republics for whose government we are responsible.

El Salvador's President-elect Sanchez described the meeting held between Central America's Presidents with President Johnson as very satisfying.

In Chile, the semiofficial La Nacion ran a front page commentary on President Johnson's "unprecedented" act of leaving his seat to walk over to Frei and speak with him. The paper said:

In the last two years, meetings have shown a new spirit, culminating in the summit. This new spirit and new style are without a doubt one of the most positive aspects of this meeting because they constitute a psychological climate and a more adequate instrument for building a united Latin America conscious of its peculiar interests and of the role it must play in the history of our times.

And, it is of interest that despite his criticism of the summit as containing shortcomings, Ecuador's President Arosemena, in his speech before the Presidents, praised President Johnson's work on behalf of the hemisphere's progress, and his deep sense of cooperation in the "development of our peoples."

In Argentina, Clarin's correspondent commented:

President Johnson seems to acquit himself well in these small gatherings.

Such meetings were referred to "as important as the conference itself, if not more so," and claimed positive benefits were derived from them.

And, in Caracas, conservative El Universal saw President Johnson's activities as "breaking the ice," and found "his tone gave birth to growing optimism."

Whether the summit will in fact prove to be a success, of course, remains to be seen. For its future will naturally depend not on rhetoric or expectation, but on the determination of all those involved to carry out the difficult common objectives pledged. Nevertheless, I think it can be said that in Latin America there is a feeling that the first step in an important new chapter in Latin America's development has been taken, that the conference was not merely an event, but rather a beginning.

GREAT SALT LAKE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in a few days, the Senate will be asked to consider a bill creating a new national monument in Utah. The bill, S. 25, was introduced by me in early January. It is very similar to a measure reported to the Senate last fall by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but not finally acted upon due to the lateness of the session.

Mr. President, the bill would establish a national monument on and surrounding a historic island near the southern end of the Great Salt Lake in Utah. The island, known now as Antelope Island because of the antelope which used to graze there, is one of the few areas remaining in Utah which have not been changed by the pressures of a growing, mobile population.

The Great Salt Lake, which surrounds the island, is a unique body of water. Its density supports a swimmer with no effort on his part. The lake is the last

remaining portion of the prehistoric Lake Bonneville, which once covered some 20,000 square miles. The Great Salt Lake presently covers about 100 square miles.

Creation of a national monument on Antelope Island will provide tourists, geologists, and others with a platform from which to view and interpret geologic and biologic phenomena of the Great Salt Lake and the Salt Lake Valley.

Antelope Island presently is nearly all in private ownership. In S. 25, I propose that the National Park Service be authorized to purchase all of the island to preserve its scenic and historic beauty and to develop it as one of America's newest outdoor recreation areas.

Over the past several years, the National Park Service has published a considerable amount of information concerning this proposal. I might add, before detailing development plans for the island, that the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and other interested Federal agencies are in full support of my bill. In addition, the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at its 48th meeting in 1963, recommended the establishment of a national monument on Antelope Island.

The National Park Service has carefully surveyed Antelope Island so that proper trails, roads, and visitor facilities could be established from which the maximum use could be made of the island without any detrimental effects due to development.

The plan calls for many improvements, including access to the island from its northern and southern tips. On the northern approach to the island, the citizens of Davis County, Utah, have taken the initiative to construct most of a causeway to Antelope Island so that passenger vehicles will someday be able to reach the island. In accordance with this local effort, the National Park Service preliminary plans for facilities on the island show an entrance station and bathing beaches immediately adjacent to the terminal point of the northern causeway.

Other facilities for visitor use would be constructed by the Park Service to best serve an estimated 300,000 visitors annually.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate can quickly and favorably pass on my bill. The people of Utah have waited for many years for the concrete development of what really is one of our greatest natural resources, the Great Salt Lake. The State of Utah has been severely handicapped by a lack of local funds with which to begin the construction of tourist facilities on Antelope Island or anywhere on or near the Great Salt Lake. We once enjoyed Saltair Resort on the lake, but since the water has receded, the resort lost its appeal and fell into disuse and disrepair. A private group is now attempting to secure financial backing to rehabilitate the resort, but they have met with very limited success.

From Utah's point of view, and in assessing the national interest in preserving the outstanding recreational historic and scientific values of the Great Salt Lake, the Federal Government must enter into a partnership with the State of Utah to provide, for mutual benefit, a new national monument, as called for in my bill.

There is, in my view, limited opposition from those who plead that a delay is needed in any possible Federal action. I say, Mr. President, that those who plead for the delay do so only to prevent the passage of the bill.

The testimony in the hearings on the bill during the 86th, 89th, and 90th Congresses shows wide support in Utah for my position. The Governor of Utah; the Great Salt Lake Authority, which is a State agency charged with recreational and technical responsibilities on the lake; chambers of commerce, newspapers published in Utah, county commissions, municipal officials, and scores of private citizens have all urged quick action by the Congress to establish the Great Salt Lake National Monument.

The opposition, however, says that it is unwise to act at this time. It is unwise, according to the opposition, for the Federal Government to act in the national interest to establish, according to the recognized high standards of the National Park Service, a new national monument which would forever provide for all of the people a singular facility.

I do not imply that the State of Utah would be barred from the development or management of the State's resources in the Great Salt Lake. It is clearly understood that the State of Utah will be granted concession leases by the Secretary of the Interior for certain visitor facilities on Antelope Island should my bill be enacted. The State of Utah has this option, but such an agreement will not be forced on the State.

Mr. President, there is such wide support for this legislation that the Senate should not delay any longer in its consideration and passage.

WEST VIRGINIA NEWSPAPER SUPPORTS VOTE FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS—SENATOR RANDOLPH CITES EDITORIAL IN MORGANTOWN DOMINION-NEWS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a recent editorial in the Dominion-News, a daily newspaper published in Morgantown, W. Va., with reference to legislative proposals to gain vote for 18-year-old American citizens.

The editor of this newspaper, Gerard Sherry, comments forcefully on this issue, when he says:

> Eighteen-year-olds are as mature as their talents and resources will let them be. Often they are much more sensible and responsible than their adult counterparts. If they are mature enough to assume legal responsibilities in obeying the law, then they should have the right to vote on such laws.

Mr. President, since Mr. Sherry's editorial, "Let's Give Vote to 18-Year-Olds," expresses so well my own convictions, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial, "Let's Give Vote to 18-Year-Olds," was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GIVE VOTE TO 18-YEAR-OLDS

Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia is one of those legislators who has been battling for the right of 18-year-olds to have the vote in federal elections. He's been working at it in Congress since 1942 and has had many of his colleagues join him in the fight.

The war in Vietnam and the other added burdens we put on our young people, has again brought the subject up for serious discussion. If we expect so much of 18 year-olds why can't we give them a right to choose their destiny through the ballot box.

These young people share with their elders the obligation of fighting in the nation's wars.

They have to pay taxes.

They are treated as adults in courts of law.

They are permitted to marry and have the legal responsibilities entailed in the welfare and conduct of the families.

As long as they have the money, they can make out wills, sign for insurance and can be sued for the financial consequences of their own actions.

They are not children and we want to treat them as adults. They are therefore entitled to all the privileges of adulthood, including the vote.

Eighteen-year-olds are as mature as their talents and resources will let them be. Often they are much more sensible and responsible than their adult counterparts. If they are mature enough to assume legal responsibilities in obeying the law, then they should have the right to vote on such laws.

We hope Congress will eventually amend the Constitution and extend the franchise to those 18 years old.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion recently over the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities. The House has slashed the appropriation for the humanities endowment by 42 percent, from the budget request of $6 million down to $3.5 million. This action has come about partly because of objections to an $8,769 grant for a study of the history and political impact of comic strips and cartoons, and partly because of a $12,000 grant for a University of Texas Folklore Archive.

This is exactly the sort of thinking that was anticipated when Congress passed the Arts and Humanities Act in 1965. Indeed, in Senate Report No. 300, 89th Congress, accompanying S. 1483, the bill establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported to the Senate that—

> It is the intent of the committee that in the administration of this act there be given the fullest attention to freedom of artistic and humanistic expression. One of the artist's and the humanist's great values to society is the mirror of self-examination which they raise so that society can become aware of its shortcomings as well as its strengths.
>
> Moreover, modes of expression are not static, but are constantly evolving. Countless times in history artists and humanists who were vilified by their contemporaries because of their innovations in style or mode of expression have become prophets to a later age.
>
> Therefore, the committee affirms that the intent of this act should be the encouragement of free inquiry and expression. The committee wishes to make clear that conformity for its own sake is not to be encouraged, and that no undue preference should be given to any particular style or

school of thought or expression. Nor is innovation for its own sake to be favored. The standard should be artistic and humanistic excellence. While evaluation in terms of such an abstract and subjective standard wil necessarily vary, the committee believes such a standard to be sufficiently identifiable to serve the broad purpose of the act and the committee's concern with the cultural values involved.

Mr. Barbary Keeney, the distinguished chairman of the National Foundation on the Humanities, was, so far as I can determine, fully carrying out the legislative intent of the Congress when he made this grant. If there is any artist or humanist who raises "the mirror of self-examination so that society can become aware of its shortcomings as well as its strengths," it is the comic strip artist, the political cartoonist, the caricaturist. Anyone who has read "Peanuts," "Pogo," "Little Orphan Annie," "Little Abner," "Herblock," "Bill Mauldin," or "Jules Feiffer" or who has seen the work of Thomas Nast or Daumier cannot help being aware of the ability of cartoonists to show us clearly and forcefully who and what we are.

As for the importance of folklore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an incisive discussion of the value and place of folklore in a civilization, taken from the introduction to "Folklore Research Around the World," edited by Richard M. Dorson.

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

By its very nature the study of folklore requires an international breadth of vision. The materials of folklore transcend all barriers of language and culture, traversing continents and spanning oceans in vast leaps and drifting across borders in easy stages. "Cinderella" has circled the globe. The "Shanghai gesture," popular among American schoolboys as a thumb and finger wiggle of derision, roamed all over Europe in the past four centuries. One extended family of water goblins unites the Japanese *kappa* with the Scottish kelpie.[1] In ballad and legend, romance and epos, the same protean hero performs the same sequence of marvelous exploits. Proverbs and riddles glide from one tongue to another to settle comfortably in a new idiom.

Yet in seeming paradox folklore studies have developed most energetically along national lines. Individual scholars of eminence, such as Archer Taylor and Stith Thompson in the present volume, have pursued their researchers in a truly international spirit, following their materials wherever they wander. But the galvanic force behind concerted, subsidized, and firmly organized folklore studies is the force of nationalism. Folklore has served national interests of various sorts: the anxious pride of the small country seeking its cultural identity; the *hubris* of the racist state, glorying in the solidarity of the *Herrenvolk;* the aspirations of an emergent nation, hoping to crystallize its myths; the ideology of the socialist state, extolling the creative powers of the anonymous masses. The same impulses that have led to the self-study of national history and national literature have urged the pursuit of national folklore. Today the well-equipped political state possesses its accredited historical records, its approved literary masterpieces, and its classified folklore archives.

The present collection of essays builds a picture of the international folklore scene through successive comments on the status of folklore research in various parts of the world. At the summer 1958 Folklore Institute of America held at Indiana University, the writer arranged a seminar on "International Relations in Folklore," in which visiting and resident faculty members spoke on folklore scholarship in countries and continents of their special interest. This volume is an outgrowth, with additions, of those lectures.[2] The seminar was designed to pool information gathered by American folklorists abroad, and to examine the character of folklore studies as they have developed on the five continents. Thanks to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, Senator Fulbright, and the State Department, American professors, including folklore scholars, have enjoyed unprecedented opportunity for foreign residence, study, and travel, in a dispersion recalling the Victorian age of the British Empire. England's colonial administrators, missionaries, and travelers are now matched by America's cultural attachés, visiting professors, and specialist lecturers. While the Victorians produced many volumes of collected texts, made possible by their long tenures overseas, Americans stay usually one or two years abroad, and cannot undertake comparable fieldwork. Furthermore the situation has radically altered in countries where Englishmen were once pioneer collectors, and the American visitor today is confronted by an impressive pile of publications and a mass of archival manuscripts. The problem now is to locate the folklorists, not the folklore.

International communications among folklorists have improved over the past forty years, from the nadir when scholars in the United States knew virtually nothing of European developments. Stith Thompson tells of the unawareness among his Harvard mentors in 1914 of the Type-Index by Antti Aarne published four years earlier in Finland. Consequently Thompson had to execute his doctoral dissertation and subsequent research on the intrusion of European tales among the North American Indians without benefit of a major tool. When he did establish contact with the Finnish folklorists in 1926, Kaarle Krohn suggested he revise the Aarne index, and the edition of the Aarne-Thompson *Types of the Folk-Tale* published two years later—currently in press for its second expansion—attests the fruitfulness of transoceanic cooperation in folklore scholarship. But the problem of maintaining exchange of monographs, field collections, and journals becomes evermore insistent, particularly with the extension of folklore investigations to other continents besides Europe. The *Internationale Volkskundliche Bibliographie,* valiantly prosecuted by Robert Wildhaber in Basel, lags half a dozen years behind the current year. Exchange of books may well be less rewarding than exchange of persons, for if one knows the dedicated folklorists in a given country, he can become oriented far more readily, and safely, than if he forages for himself in the library. The Irish Folklore Commission is the creation of James H. Delargy, the Japanese Folklore Institute of Kunio Yanagita, the Swedish Folklife Research Institute in Stockholm of Sigurd Erixon.

The plan for the lectures, and the essays into which they grew, called for an account by the American observers of the resources—bibliographical, physical, and human—open to the student of folklore in a given country. References to and comments upon representative works would serve to lead the interested student further into the scholarly literature. Physical resources could include folklore archives, museums, institutes, and libraries. Identification of leading folklorists and their research interests should also assist the outsider. The picture that emerged would reveal something of the character of folklore studies in the national state or culture area.

This character can be viewed from a double perspective: the point reached by folklorists in their progression from field collecting to systematic study of folk materials, and the direction taken by the mature study. On the first score, we may divide the world along the lines roughed out by anthropological and humanistic folklorists. The anthropologists investigate cultures predominantly oral and traditional, cultures in which the concept and self-conscious examination of indigenous folklore (or oral literature) are not yet understood, although the raw materials are present in flourishing abundance. In the following pages, Luomala for Polynesia and Herskovits and Crowley for subSaharan Africa report on such culture areas. Australia presents a special case, neatly divided betwen aboriginal and colonial folk literatures, unlike Latin America where the Indian and the European—with an admixture of the African—have effected a partial blend. Quite appropriately, the commentator for Australia, Greenway, himself is trained both as anthropologist and as humanist. In the countries of Europe, where long established distinctions of social classes have produced a peasant "folk" readily identifiable by scholars, literati, and intellectuals generally, the folklorists delve into the customs and beliefs of their submerged countrymen. Nineteenth century collectors frankly referred to the folk at home as "the lower orders," and the folk of uncivilized (i.e. non-European) societies as "savages." Theoretical schools have waged their controversies to explain the ancestry of folk ideas, but all, whatever their positions—celestial mythologists, Indianists, survivalists, ritualists, Freudians—shared a common premise, that the culture of the folk differed from and trailed behind the culture of civilization, to which it adhered like a picturesque fungus. Even in the United States, with its more mobile population and its democratic doctrine, the same notion of a backward, backcountry folk, dwelling chiefly in the southern mountains, has governed much of the fieldwork. Childlike savages are available both in aboriginal and imported African stocks. French Canada, whose folklore work is described herein by Lacourciere, is a European folk culture transplanted wholesale into the wilderness.

Folklore as studied in Europe and North America embodies a quite different conceptual approach from that employed by American ethnologists in Asia and Africa.

---

[1] See Marian R. Cox, *Cinderella* (London, 1897), and Anna Birgitta Rooth, *The Cinderella Cycle* (Lund, 1951); Archer Taylor, *The Shanghai Gesture,* FF Communications, Vol. LXVI, No. 166 (1956); Eiichiro Ishida, "The *Kappa* Legend," *Folklore Studies,* IX (Peking, 1950), 1–152.

[2] The only seminar lecturer not represented in the present volume is the late R. D. Jameson, who spoke on "Folklore in China."

After the International Congress of Western and European Ethnology held at Stockholm in 1951, I talked with W. Edson Richmond, editor of *Midwest Folklore,* about a series of short surveys on folklore research abroad, to be written by folklore scholars of their respective countries. The following articles have since appeared in that journal: Demetrios Petropoulos, "The Study of Ethnography in Greece," II (1952), 15–20; Eeva Makela-Henriksson, "Recent Folklore Research in Finland," II (1952), 151–158; Brita Gjerdalen Skre, "Folk Life Research in Norway," II (1952), 221–228; Naoe Hiroji, "Post-War Folklore Research Work in Japan," III (1953), 213–222; K. D. Upadhyaya, "A General Survey of Folklore Activities in India," IV (1954), 201–212; Salvatore Nania, "A Glimpse at the History of Folklore in Italy," V (1955), 153–158; J. Podolak, "The Development of Ethnography in Slovakia," VIII (1958), 69–84.

The anthropologists deal with the total culture, and their approach is holistic; the traditions of the unlettered belong to the entire society, for there are no lower illiterate orders. Hence the controversy between anthropological and humanistic folklorists over the content and usefulness of the term "folklore," and its restriction by the ethnologists to the verbal arts. In the nonliterate society the entire institutional structure and cosmogonical system involve traditional "custom" and "belief." Even the intellectual classes of Asia and the Middle East stay close to their folk inheritance; the gulf between industrialized and traditional cultures has not yet riven their societies; the aspiring folklorists from Thailand, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Egypt are usually informants as well as collectors.

The romantic haze that surrounded the folk in the nineteenth century has given way to pragmatic and political attitudes in the twentieth. The folk serve as repositories of the ancient language and popular traditions of the nation, and this legacy must be firmly recorded and made known to the citizens of the modern state. What kind of Finn is ignorant of the *Kalevala?* What good Norwegian who does not treasure the tales of Asbjornsen and Moe? Publishing the national folklore in the school primers acquaints each youthful citizen with selected hero-tales and hero-songs that glorify the national genius. Recognizing the propaganda potentialities in folklore, the totalitarian states have decreed the erasure of the nineteenth century theory of *gesunkenes Kulturgut* and compelled their scholars to advance the party line through folklore. In Nazi Germany, the folklorists of the Third Reich abandoned the concept of peasant folklore for a racial theory of Germanic *Volksüberlieferung* uniting Teutonic peoples everywhere in a mystic kinship of blood and lore. Instead of dividing Germans into classes, folklore would weld them into a whole. In Soviet Russia, and her satellites, the folk—i.e., the people—have replaced the decadent aristocracy and bourgeoisie as originators of folkstuff, by party decree of 1933. Folklore is the vigorous creative expression of a revolutionary people against the landlords, the tsars, and the factory bosses, and it is the spontaneous hymn of praise—stimulated by prize competitions—to the Red Army generals and Kremlin leaders.

Folklorists from the United States visiting Europe accordingly are faced with a far different situation from anthropologists prospecting in Africa. The reporter in the European country meets an established and honored field of inquiry. Because ties between folklorists in Scandinavia and the United States have been close in recent years, our information about the active scholarship in those four countries is reasonably full and up-to-date. But of developments in, say, Turkey or Spain, neither well represented at the Stockholm and Kiel international congresses of 1951 and 1959, we have received little word, and the papers by Jansen and Gillmor now reveal considerable interest and activity there in folklore research. Contrary to the general impression, Spain is indeed folklore-minded, so much so that Gillmor found the man and woman in-the-street thoroughly conversant with the word "folklore."

Even allowing for the difference in treatment required for countries in different stages of research, the editor has not sought a rigid uniformity in the essays that follow. Some, like those of Simeone for Italy, Richmond for Finland, and Luomala for Polynesia, survey the growth of the field in historical perspective. Others have given impressionistic accounts of their visits. The history of humanistic learning can profit greatly from the autobiographical asides which scholars tend to suppress as unscholarly. Yet the chance encounter, the casual suggestion, the gift of serendipity, may very well determine the destiny of the creative scholar, and particularly of the folklorist who depends so heavily on his associates in his undermanned field. Cecil Sharp learned of the ballad riches in the southern mountains from a bundle of manuscripts brought him on his sickbed in Lincoln, Massachusetts. Thompson began his life's work when Kittredge in a Harvard seminar suggested he examine northeast Indian tales for instances of European intrusions.[3] Rarely indeed does a chatty volume such as the *Memories* of Edward Clodd sketch in the network of personal relationships that give vitality and spark to a field of learning. Any student of the English folklore movement soon appreciates the interdependence of the active London group, but only Clodd actually set down vignettes of his discourse with Lang and Gomme and Hartland. The late R. M. Dawkins of Oxford and André Varagnac of the Sorbonne told me a revelatory anecdote about Frazer. The serious-minded young scholar was accustomed to dine at the same Parisian restaurant with friends; to pull his leg, they informed him that Frazer's gallantries had smitten the waitress, who now believed herself compromised. The courteous Frazer wedded the waitress, but his companions suffered the consequence, for she barred the door to all his soulmates and made him sit at his desk writing his books. Accordingly he never received any new ideas, and while he wrote many books, they were all identical.[4] Like the visible crack in the tale of the tame trout, who fell through a crack in the bridge and was drowned, Sir James's volumes uphold the story.

The present symposium records some personal associations and impressions gained by American folklorists abroad during the past decade, along with more formal facts, and so offers a new chapter to the history of international folklore studies.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, what this attack adds up to is an attempt by a small group to do a hatchet job on the Humanities Foundation. By cutting the budget request by 41 percent Congress supposedly will be expressing its disapproval of the way the Foundation was operated last year.

But what is Congress disapproving? Mr. Keeney first of all carried out the intent of Congress. But he went further than that. He did a brilliant job.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the First Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—FIRST ANNUAL REPORT, FISCAL YEAR 1966

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 15, 1967.

The Honorable THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit herewith the Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1966 of the National Endowment for the Humanities for submission to the Congress as required by the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. As this is the first annual report of an entity which came into creation largely as a result of your personal interest, I commend it particularly to your care.

Respectfully,

BARNABY C. KEENEY,
Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities.

I. FOREWORD

This is the first annual report of the National Endowment for the Humanities. It describes the beginning of an enterprise unique in the history of the United States, and an agency unique in the Federal Government.

On September 29, 1965, President Johnson, bringing to fruition his long-standing interest in the humanities, signed P.L. 89–209, creating the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, containing two separate but closely cooperating entities, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. On November 18, 1965, Henry Allen Moe, the distinguished former president of the Guggenheim Foundation, was appointed by the President to serve an interim term as chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities until July 1, 1966. Shortly thereafter, on January 27, 1966, the President appointed the 26 distinguished private citizens who comprise the National Council on the Humanities. (For list of members see Appendix A.) The Chairman and the Council had their first meeting on March 3–4, 1966, and immediately began planning for programs and staff. When the Endowment's chairman, Barnaby C. Keeney, former President of Brown University, was appointed in early July, some major staff appointments had been made, and the Chairman, the staff, and the Council had developed broad program outlines. By the end of the 1966 fiscal year, a few grants had been made and others were pending, but the bulk of the original appropriation of Congress remained intact. To this was added the Congressional appropriation for fiscal 1967, which comprised $1,800,000 for fellowships, $100,000 for a study of educational television, and $100,000 for a talking books program. The Endowment, therefore, decided to pool the original appropriation with the funds appropriated for 1967, giving it a program budget of $4,500,000 for fiscal 1967.

Thus, an annual report dealing only with the 1966 fiscal year would be largely a report on the Endowment's legislative and administrative beginnings, while a report which dealt with very much of fiscal 1967 would be a prediction of the future, rather than a report on the past. Therefore, this report deals with the 12-month period from September 1965 through September 1966, a point at which the directions of the Endowment were emerging, the staff was operative, and programs were cast into their initial patterns.

The following report of the National Endowment for the Humanities records such matters of fact as should formally be made available in a public document. It shows what the Chairman and his staff, with the approval and cooperation of the Council, and with the advice of many humanists, have accomplished in a period of roughly eight months.

These eight months have been a period of developing, with the scholarly community and those generally interested in the humanities, programs which will achieve both immediate results and suggest long-term directions for Endowment activity. Details of the programs will be found in following sections of the report. It is appropriate here to make some general comments about the importance that the Endowment succeed in its efforts.

A striking point of the last decade of American life has been the growing frustra-

[3] A. H. Fox Strangways and Maud Karpeles, *Cecil Sharp* (2nd ed., London, New York, Toronto, 1955), pp. 129–130; Stith Thompson, "Folklorist's Progress" (1956, typescript, 320 pp., Folklore Library, Indiana University), pp. 59–60.

[4] This pleasantry is supported by the ringing critique of Frazer in Edmund R. Lesch, "Golden Bough or Gilded Twig?," *Daedalus* (Spring, 1961), 371–387.

tion in public life as realization developed that our wealth, our superb technical and material skills, our undifferentiated desire for the superlative across the gamut of our national existence, created as many, perhaps more, problems than they solved. As though to mock our material progress, darkening problems of urbanization, of lacerating political and social division, and of aimless discontent grow with our progress. It is perhaps not too much of an exaggeration to say that the country is passing through a crisis of confidence in its achievements and its aspirations—indeed; itself.

It is in response to this climate that the Endowment faces its most challenging opportunity—to increase the interest in and use of the humanities by our citizens, and to improve their access to them. Other things can make us wealthy and powerful; the humanities are to make us wise, and they lead us to apply our wisdom in ways which can heal both private and public life. It is urgently in the national interest to make available to the broad public as well as the scholarly community the attitudes of mind, the methods of assessing value, the self-knowledge and civic knowledge which are the ultimate contributions of the humanities to public and private life. If a broad public can be encouraged to appreciate and understand the humanities, they may habitually use this knowledge in making their public and private decisions. It is impossible to calculate the beneficial national effect of "being scientific"; but few would question that such an outlook has been of fundamental importance in achieving our present material good fortune at home and our leadership abroad. We are persuaded that "being humanistic," both in our schools and colleges and outside them, is equally necessary for solutions to our national anguishes, to maintain our leadership abroad, and to represent to the world what the quality of human life can be. No less than this is the ultimate objective of the Endowment, and we believe that it was as an expression of such hopes and convictions that the President and Congress established the Endowment. The need, as the President put it, is "not only in enriching scholarship but in enriching life for all people."

BARNABY C. KEENEY,
Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities.

II. THE ENDOWMENT AND ITS YEAR IN REVIEW

Both the newness and the novelty of the Endowment mean that the nature of the agency and its activities is not well known. Therefore it seems appropriate to include in the first annual report a summary of the background of its creation, the tasks with which it is charged, its structure, and its policies and programs.

A. Legislative background

The creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities and its advisory group, the National Council on the Humanities, by the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 represents the first major step by the government of the United States to support research, planning, and programs in the humanities.

The Endowment was not created in a vacuum, however. Several Federal agencies and departments had programs which included the humanities, or facilities which scholars in the humanities could use, prior to the creation of the Endowment. The National Historical Publications Commission had been created in 1934 as part of the legislation establishing the National Archives. Originally a coordinating and advisory agency, it has in recent years provided support for editors of major collections of documents relating to American history. Multi-volume collections of the edited papers of the Adamses, Franklin, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison are currently under way under the auspices of the National Historical Publications Commission. Since 1935, the Department of the Interior, under the Historic Sites Act, has been able to preserve and maintain historic and archaeological sites and sponsor museums at National Parks. Certain programs of the National Science Foundation, established in 1950, have been open to scholars in some fields of the humanities and social sciences. Several programs administered by the United States Office of Education provide support for the humanities. Chief among them are those authorized by the Cooperative Research Act of 1954, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and its subsequent amendments, the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1963 (which also enables the Department of State to provide some support for a limited number of scholars in the humanities), and of course the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act, both passed in 1965. Finally, the facilities and services of the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution have been of significant value in humanistic scholarship.

Useful as all these programs were, they shared one of two detriments so far as the humanities were concerned: either they were not designed to provide broad support to all fields of the humanities, or they were designed to provide support to much more than the humanities alone, with the consequent tendency to have a focus which was too diffuse to produce major support for the humanities. In short, the various legislative mandates either covered too little or too much; support of the humanities was either partial or peripheral.

The successful legislative effort to create a unified Federal program of support for the humanities began in 1964, partly in response to a report by the Commission on the Humanities for the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. The Commission stressed two fundamental points: (1) that expansion and improvement of activities in the humanities are in the national interest and consequently deserve financial support by the Federal Government; and (2) that Federal funds for this purpose should be administered by a new independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation. The first Congressional proposal came in August 1964, when Congressman William S. Moorhead introduced a bill, on which no action was taken, to establish an independent agency for the advancement of culture. In a speech at Brown University a month later, President Johnson endorsed the idea:

"The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skills of our technical and scientific age. And I look with the greatest of favor upon the proposal . . . for a national foundation for the humanities."

In his state of the Union message to the 89th Congress the following January, the President again endorsed the concept of a national agency for the arts and humanities. Three months later, on March 10, 1965, he transmitted the Administration's recommendations for a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to Congress, with the statement that:

"The humanities are an effort to explore the nature of man's culture and to deepen understanding of the sources and goals of human activity. Our recommendations recognize this effort as a central part of the American national purpose, and provide modest support to those whose work offers promise of extending the boundaries of understanding."

The result of Presidential and Congressional interest was P.L. 89-209, creating the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, which passed the Senate June 10 and passed the House of Representatives, with minor amendments, September 15, the Senate agreed to the House version of the bill September 16, and the President signed the bill into law September 29, 1965.[1]

B. Legislative charges

The Endowment has a broad legislative mandate with regard to its activities. The charge is found in Section 7(c) of P.L. 89-209, which authorizes the Endowment to—

(1) develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of progress and scholarship in the humanities;

(2) initiate and support research and programs to strengthen the research potential of the United States in the humanities by making arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) with individuals or groups to support such activities;

(3) award fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals for training and workshops in the humanities. Fellowships awarded to individuals under this authority may be for the purpose of study or research at appropriate nonprofit institutions selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time;

(4) foster the interchange of information in the humanities;

(5) foster, through grants or other arrangements with groups, public understanding and appreciation of the humanities; and

(6) support the publication of scholarly works in the humanities.

C. Council and staff

To accomplish the functions vested in the Endowment by law, Congress established a Chairman of the Endowment, who appoints the staff, and who is also Chairman of the National Council on the Humanities, an advisory group of 26 distinguished private citizens appointed by the President for staggered terms. Membership on the Council includes university presidents; faculty members; heads of professional societies; and leaders in business, labor, religion, architecture, writing, and journalism.

The function of the National Council is to advise the Chairman and his staff on policy and grants. In fiscal 1966 the Council met with the staff three times, and three meetings will be held in 1967. In order to assure thoughtful assessment of Endowment activity, the Council is subdivided into committees which meet with staff members to discuss policies and grants in the various subdivisions of the Endowment. There are four such committees, corresponding to the staff structure: Committee on Planning and Analysis, Committee on Fellowships and Stipends, Committee on Research and Publication, Committee on Educational and Special Projects.

The chief executive officer of the Endowment is the Chairman. Final decisions upon policy and grants rest with him, after he has received the recommendation of the Council. The Chairman is assisted by a staff divided into three operating divisions, corresponding to the present major activities of the Endowment (Fellowships and Stipends, Research and Publication, Educational and Special Projects), and the Office of Planning and Analysis, which does not operate grant-making activities, but coordinates the overall planning of the Endowment and advises the Chairman on long-range activities and directions. (For list of staff, see Appendix B.)

D. Policies and procedures

Programs for the Endowment have come from ideas suggested by the Chairman, by

[1] The legislative background of the National Endowment for the Arts will be found in their Annual Report. Although by the law the two Endowments are separate but cooperating entities together comprise one agency designated the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, the legislation also provides for separate annual reports by the two Endowments.

the staff, by the Council, by consultants appointed by the Chairman to make specific recommendations, and by the academic and general communities.

All applications for support are screened by the division staff in the first instance to determine their eligibility for Endowment support, they are then reviewed either by outside consultants or panels of outside reviewers—in many cases both—to arrive at an assessment of their substantive merit; further review follows by the staff, which makes recommendations to the Council; the Council and its committees then review the proposals and make recommendations to the Chairman, who ultimately bears responsibility for commitment of Endowment funds.

Both in regard to development of programs and in regard to support of applications, the Endowment has sought to avoid duplication of Federal or private activity. Therefore, in the development of programs a critical question is the ability of other Federal agencies, or private groups or individuals, to support such activity. In support of applications, joint funding with other Federal or private sources of support is the Endowment's goal whenever possible. A few such joint funding ventures have been undertaken, and the Endowment expects the number to increase in the future.

As a matter of policy, the Endowment has sought close working relationships with other Federal agencies in the field of education. Chief among these are the United States Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Historical Publications Commissions, and of course, the National Endowment for the Arts.

Section 11(b) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 provides for matching with Federal funds gifts made by private individuals and organizations for the purposes of the Endowment. The result is that the private donor is able to double his gift through the matching provision. The Council and staff have as a matter of policy resolved to seek private support to augment the Federal appropriation; but in fiscal 1966 no such gifts were received. Naturally, added funds as a result of private gifts would enable the Endowment to increase the effectiveness of its programs more rapidly than a single source of support permits.

E. Endowment programs

The legislative mandate of the Humanities Endowment is sufficiently broad, and the humanities themselves are so broad, that the chief task of the first eight months has been to identify areas of need, and define methods of dealing with them. The Endowment, in its initial stages, decided to concentrate upon three broad and closely-related objectives.

The first objective is the development of individuals as scholars, teachers, and practitioners of the humanities throughout the country in order that they may more effectively bring what is known and thought to students in schools and colleges and to adults who are not formally registered in educational institutions, and incidentally to increase the store of knowledge and wisdom by their own researchers. The program initially consists of fellowships and stipends. Details of the programs will be found in the following section of this report.

The second objective is the development and dissemination of knowledge of the humanities through research and other scholarly activities in order to increase our national resources in the humanities. Obviously, some of this is done through the award of fellowships mentioned above. A distinction between the development of individuals and the promotion of scholarship is that the primary purpose of the second is the increase in knowledge and understanding, whereas the primary purpose of the first is the development of the scholar who may, in the course of his development, or subsequently, increase knowledge and become more capable of disseminating it through teaching and other activities.

The subjects of the studies supported will cover the whole range of humane studies, and will range from rather restricted and precise studies of particularly important points in the various fields to broad syntheses based in part upon new research, but also based in part upon work already done.

The development of knowledge also includes aids to scholarship which are essential preliminaries to scholarly research. It includes the improvement of means of access to knowledge through encyclopedic compilations, bibliographies, new methods of compiling bibliographies, and of access to libraries. Details of the programs will be found in the following section of this report.

The third objective of the Endowment is the improvement of the teaching of the humanities in schools, colleges, and universities and also among the public at large in order to infuse our present activities with the wisdom that is the product of the humanistic outlook. This is probably the most important of the objectives of the Endowment, since it brings the humanities to bear on important questions; but it is also the most difficult to accomplish. It is necessary that inspiring teaching in schools and colleges excite the initial interest of citizens in the whole subject of man and his activities and their best expression. Initial efforts include programs aimed at the schools, programs aimed at improving teaching in the colleges and universities, experimental programs in developing the humanities in educational situations where they are weak or nonexistent, and programs aimed at the general public through museums and historical societies, television, talking books, and journalism. Details of the programs are in the following section of this report.

III. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS

The programs described below represent the activities of the Endowment frozen at a point in time. New programs which extend the effect of the present ones will be funded in the near future and over the long term. Patterns will evolve and change. Therefore, this report must be taken to indicate methods which the Endowment has chosen to ameliorate some obvious and pressing needs in the humanities, and to sketch in broad outline the general areas in which the Endowment intends to operate.

Each of the three broad objectives mentioned in the preceding section of this report has become the concern of a division of the Endowment staff: development of individuals is supported through the Division of Fellowships and Stipends; development and dissemination of knowledge is supported through the Division of Research and Publication; and improvement of teaching and programs aimed at the general public are supported through the Division of Educational and Special Projects. A description of their activities follows.

A. Division of Fellowships and Stipends

The initial programs to support development of individuals consist of three fellowship programs. The decision to establish these programs was based upon the staff's and the Council's view that one of the most pressing needs in the humanities was to provide a method whereby scholars whose formal training was completed could nonetheless have the time and means to continue their development, and bring it to fruition. Fellowships in the sciences have played a major role in the development of the nation's pool of qualitatively superb scientists; similar efforts in the humanities will produce similar results.

Of the three fellowship programs, one provides support to senior scholars and the other two are directed toward the younger scholar who is not yet in a position to compete with men of established reputation, but whose need is particularly great because he is going through a critical period in his development. One of the programs for younger scholars provides support for a period of six to eight months (that is, for one semester or for a semester and a summer); the other, for a summer only.

The senior fellowships will provide to individuals of already distinguished achievement as humanists a year of uninterrupted study and writing and necessary travel to enable them to make contributions of major significance to their fields. The amount of fellowship support presently available to senior humanistic scholars capable of using it productively falls short of the amount needed, but the Endowment's program will constitute an appreciable increase in the support available and should give a considerable boost to morale and vitality in the humanities. The awards will carry a maximum stipend of $15,000, but may not exceed the individual's current salary. In addition to his stipend, a fellow may receive, when justifiable, a travel allowance.

The critical period in the development of a young scholar-teacher occurs during the first five years after his full entry into professional life. If he has the satisfaction of sustaining his intellectual growth and winning recognition and esteem, he may be expected to exert, as a teacher and scholar, that leadership which flows from substantial achievement. Unfortunately, during these early years teaching assignments are at their heaviest and opportunities for sustained study and writing are rarely available. The Endowment's fellowship and summer stipend programs for younger scholars provide such opportunities. The number of awards to be made during fiscal year 1967 is short of the number needed, but, again, the programs provide recognition of the need and should have important psychological effects beyond helping the recipients themselves. For example, by eliciting applications for summer stipends, the Endowment's program should increase the awareness in the academic community of the need and utility of such awards, and should serve to bring institutional programs into existence or cause their expansion where they already exist.

In administering the programs for younger scholars, the Endowment is taking particular care to seek out worthy individuals in the less prestigious institutions and in geographical locations where the means of scholarly development are less accessible. Application review committees have been established in each region, composed of members drawn from the region's own colleges and universities, so that good applicants from smaller, less well known institutions will not be overlooked. In order to ensure that an applicant have a bright future as a teacher as well as a scholar, he must be nominated by the institution at which he is teaching, on the basis of his ability as a teacher as well as his promise as a scholar.

As in the senior fellowship program, the awards carry stipends intended to match the recipients' current salaries. The stipend for the summer awards will be two-ninths of the individual's current nine-month academic year salary, and the stipend for the regular six- to eight-month fellowships will be the salary actually to be received by the individual for the comparable months during the current year.

The Endowment has budgeted $2,000,000 for these programs during the 1967 fiscal year which will permit the award of approximentely 50 senior fellowships, 100 six- to eight-month fellowships for younger scholars, and 200 summer stipends, if such a distribution seems appropriate in the light of the relative quality of the applications received. Brochures announcing the fellowship programs were published and given broad distribution in August. The deadline

for applying for these first fellowships was mid-October, 1966, and the Endowment intends to announce the awards shortly after selections are recommended by the Council at its meeting in January, 1967. Most awards will be held during the 1967–68 academic year, but some will probably become effective as early as the spring of 1967.

The Endowment's long-range objective in its programs for the development of individuals is to establish a variety of fellowship and other programs which can dramatically increase the national pool of human resources in the humanities. Accomplishment of this objective will entail developing mutations and hybrids of the three basic programs in an experimental way over a period of years; the level of funding of the basic programs must increase sufficiently to permit experimentation. In the near future, it may be desirable for a program to be offered aimed at broadening the competence of the individual by offering support which enables him to study systematically a field tangential to his specialization, thereby strengthening his insights and understanding. Other programs which may be established over a period of time include ones aimed at the faculty members of small colleges, and ones aimed at increasing the contact between university faculties and college and junior college faculties.

The fellowship programs which have been devised during the first eight months of the Endowment's existence aim at providing an initial contribution to the development of the individual scholar; but a major purpose of supporting such development is to enable him to be more effective in his scholarship, and to make a greater contribution to our knowledge of the humanities.

B. Division of research and publication

Programs of support for the development and dissemination of knowledge in the fields of the humanities were given a high priority by both staff and Council during the first months of the Endowment's operations. In part this reflected the very specific language of the act establishing the Endowment: "initiate and support research and programs to strengthen the research potential of the United States in the Humanities." In part it represented the staff and Council view that since knowledge of the humanities has both intrinsic and pragmatic value, the extent and sophistication of such knowledge must grow through increased support for research.

Three programs of support have been established in the initial phase of the Endowment's operations. One is for support of research projects and research aids; the second is for support of international aspects of scholarship; and the third is for support of publication, at present primarily for editions of major American authors.

The program for support of research projects and research aids is aimed at providing an initial contribution to scholarly enterprise in the humanities. Individual scholars and groups of scholars are eligible for support, and while an academic affiliation is usual, it is not required. The support of research projects is open to all fields of the humanities, and can range from rather restricted and precise studies of particularly important points in the various fields to syntheses based in part upon work already done, but also based upon new research. The Endowment is resolved to bear in mind the national interest in the development and strengthening of research potential in the humanities, but it cannot be expected that all such knowledge will be of immediate use any more than all scientific knowledge is of immediate use.

Aids to research (bibliographies, indexes, and catalogues, for example) are essential preliminaries to scholarly research, and the continuous production of these scholarly aids becomes more important as knowledge expands and information multiplies—and, indeed, becomes more important *because* knowledge expands and multiplies. At the present the production of aids to research in the humanities is lagging. The American Council of Learned Societies found in 1966 that approximately 65 major projects for creation of aids to research in the humanities were of immediate use and in immediate need of funding. The Endowment expects to contribute to support of research aids in the present year, but limitations of funds make it unlikely that the initial contribution will have a major effect. Both portions of the program for research will have to be expanded in a major way in subsequent years.

Another of the Endowment's initial actions was to devise a program of support for the production of "pure" texts of the major American authors. The rationale for such a program seemed manifest. Emerson is the most revered non-Asiatic philosopher-writer in Asia; in Europe, Whitman is credited with freeing poetry from the shackles of verbal and technical conventions; Twain and Melville are counted among the world's greatest novelists. That uncorrupted texts of the works of such men do not exist is a diminution of their stature and an impoverishment of the American cultural and literary heritage. Their works are monuments; yet the monuments are defaced and eroded. Both staff and Council thought it desirable to support restoration through a program for editions of pure texts. As the 1966 fiscal year progressed, it became clear that there were additional responsibilities in the general area of support for publication, and the Endowment's intentions, though not its funds, were expanded. Athough it has not been possible to fund direct support of publication in the programs for 1966 and 1967, planning is underway to expand the program to support a broader range of needs in subsequent years.

The third program established to support development and dissemination of knowledge is aimed at permitting American scholars to maximize their effectiveness in the international context. In its initial stages, the program has been restricted to a modest level of support for travel and providing partial support for archaeological excavations.

Many American humanistic scholars of international reputation fail to exercise leadership in international scholarly societies simply because they cannot find funds to attend the meetings. A parallel concern is that many international scholarly societies which would like to have their meetings in the United States fail to do so because their American members can find no funds to cover the expenses of serving as host. The Endowment hopes by a program of support to create circumstances in which American scholars and scholarship shine more brightly in an international context, and in which foreign scholars are able to sample the American scholarly climate and bring their particular contributions to the large body of American scholars who can afford to attend international meetings held in this country. The interplay will enliven both groups.

The other portion of the program, which provides partial support of archaeological excavation, springs from the fact that virtually no Federal funds are available for support of classical and European archaeology; yet these areas are the cradles of American civilization. The age of the wealthy private patron is passing. If we have no respect for the remote past, we shall have no respect for the immediate past—nor shall we learn from it. It has been pointed out that to the present generation of college students, Hitler is as dead as Julius Caesar. And if we are loath to learn about Caesar's civilization, we may fail to understand Hitler's aberrations. There were, of course, practical reasons for the Endowment's entry into support of archaeological research; such research is not only important in itself, but is also important in the training of a new generation of archaeologists, classicists, historians, and art historians. Therefore, it seemed a high priority to begin a program of support, even though only modest funding was possible. In fiscal 1967, funding will be from the general funds for scholarly research and research aids.

As the 1967 Congressional appropriation was earmarked for fellowships, educational television, and talking books, the staff and Council decided late in fiscal 1966 to allocate $1,500,000 of the funds appropriated when the agency was established to support the programs of research. $1,100,000 was committed to scholarly research and aids to research (including archaeology); $350,000 was committed to suport of publication, primarily for editions of American authors; and $50,000 was committed to support of scholar's travel. Thus, of the Endowment's effective 1967 budget of $4,500,000, one-third is committed to funding of the development and dissemination of knowledge. Initially, the Endowment set a fall, 1967 deadline for applications for support of research; more recently, this policy has been revised to eliminate the requirement that applicants conform to a deadline. The staff and Council view was that administrative efficiency as well as convenience to the scholarly community suggested handling the programs in a continuum rather than peaking them around necessarily arbitrary deadlines.

The long-term objective of the programs for the development and dissemination of knowledge is to increase dramatically the effectiveness and relevance of humanistic scholarship. In the near future, the basic programs which are already in operation will be expanded. Larger funds for their present purposes will be sought; and new purposes will develop. It may prove desirable to establish programs of support for specific fields in the humanities; the needs of American scholars may require funding of American facilities abroad; the computer's role in humanistic scholarship may need exploration, and after exploration, expansion. These activities, or others, will reflect the Endowment's experience in its present programs, the advice of the academic community, and a commitment by the academic community and the Endowment to create a climate in which research in the humanities is a major national resource, and is recognized as relevant not only to the scholar, but also to the student and the general public.

C. Division of Educational and Special Projects

The programs established to support the improvement of teaching in the humanities are intended to deal with education in its broadest sense—to cover formal and informal instruction at all levels of education, and to include those instruments by which the general public is informed and entertained. The nature of the task is formidable, because the variety of possible programs is immense.

The initial months of staff and Council activity were devoted to exploration of the projected fields of operation, with the particular aim of avoiding duplication of activities already supported by Federal, state, local and private agencies. By fall, the structure of the initial programs was determined; they fall into three areas: programs dealing with structured education, programs dealing with extramural education, and a program designed to study the feasibility of a center or centers in which the entire range of the humanities would be included.

In the area of structured education, the Endowment has established a program for curriculum dissemination, a program for teaching internships, and a program to support institutional cooperation. In each program the Endowment seeks to play an innovative, supportive, and evaluative role, and each program places a consistent emphasis upon encouraging cooperation between in-

stitutions which traditionally operate at different levels and with different conceptions of their scope and purpose.

Significant public and private financial support already exists for the development of curricula affecting the humanities; consequently the Endowment program is designed primarily to spread knowledge of these developments and to encourage experimental applications of new and important techniques in the teaching of humanistic subjects. Ideally, the program will bring the secondary school teacher into a continuing relationship with college and university personnel, so that they will together contribute to the development of new and effective methods of teaching humanistic subjects. The typical vehicle for such an operation is the summer institute or workshop, but as the program develops, support will be given not only for summer contact between professors and teachers, but for mechanisms for continual give and take between the innovator and the practitioner, which also allow for the geographical distribution of successful innovations.

In general, universities tend to excel in research, while colleges tend to excel in teaching. Consequently, a teaching internship program was established which uses the college environment as a training ground for potential university instructors. A small number of colleges will design experimental courses in which a committed younger university teacher can participate for one or two years under the guidance of a master teacher. It is expected that the resident teacher will return to a university department with an increased capacity for imparting his knowledge of humanistic subjects to undergraduate students. An evaluation of this program after its first year of operation is planned for the summer of 1968. If successful, this general program would then be made available to a significantly larger number of colleges and universities.

The program for institutional cooperation is planned to encourage colleges and universities in the same vicinity to take mutual advantage of their respective facilities. In this manner, research interests of college faculty would be kept alive and a cross-fertilization of teaching ideas could take place. The Endowment will make a few small grants to groups of colleges and universities who have experience in joint planning. Exchanges of faculties and students, reciprocal use of libraries, joint colloquia and departmental seminars, joint planning, research, teaching and similar activities will be encouraged as a means to more effective teaching in the humanities.

The Endowment's programs in extramural education deal with television, talking books, the press, and museums and historical societies. The aim is to improve qualitatively those media which customarily bring the subject matter of the humanities into direct contact with the general public, and to deepen the level at which contact between the public and the media takes place.

In recognition of the increasingly important role played by television in education, Congress appropriated $100,000 to the Endowment in 1967 for "the study of educational television and radio." With this mandate, the staff and Council have focused on educational television and have prepared a program encouraging educational broadcasters to produce video-taped models of what may be considered presentations of exceptional quality dealing with humanistic subjects. With model presentations in hand, the Endowment might expand the program in subsequent years. Eventually it may provide support not only in the area of educational television, broadcast over public channels, but also in the area of commercial television, classroom use of video tapes, and instructional films.

Congress also appropriated for the 1967 fiscal year $100,000 for the development of talking books based on humanistic subjects. New legislation enabling the Library of Congress to provide talking books for handicapped persons other than blind, will make it unnecessary for the Endowment to continue the program past this year. The Endowment has designed a one-year program aimed at encouraging a wider range in the selection of talking books, and a dissemination of the product to handicapped individuals in institutions not previously covered by similar services. The program includes an emphasis on dissemination and evaluation.

In the field of journalism, the Endowment has devised a pilot program aimed at involving journalistic critics in a deeper appreciation of the humanistic environment and history. As the program develops in subsequent years, its aim will be to improve the quality of critics, thereby providing the public with a more stimulating and informed basis for reacting to activities in literature, the performing arts, scholarship, and education under the purview of journalistic critics.

Recognizing the museums and historical societies of the nation as a major untapped source of humanistic understanding, the Endowment has designed programs aimed at responding to the most critical need in the museum world: the upgrading of the competence of curators and professional staff. The staff and Council agreed to support three categories of activity. Funds were earmarked for existing cooperative programs between universities and museums which were seeking to bring new and better trained individuals into the museum world. Other funds were designated for an internship program which would bring full-time curators from smaller museums into the environment of a larger teaching museum where they could, for a designated interval, deepen their subject matter knowledge and improve the skills necessary to impart this knowledge effectively through collections and exhibits. In order to encourage better communication between individuals presently involved in museum work, the Endownment also established a category of grants which would bring together historical society and museum personnel in a series of institutes and seminars.

The final program presently funded under the objective of improvement of humanistic education is support of a study to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing a center or centers in which outstanding or promising people from the whole range of the humanities and the arts are included. In such a setting, the relationship between the various fields could be explored, and the interplay of disciplines heightened. The center would be an instrument of education by its mere existence. The hope is that such a center would be a place where the relevance of the humanities to public and private life would be displayed both in the interests of its members and in the dissemination of their teaching and scholarship. If a reasonable plan for such a center or centers can be devised, its support may become a major activity of the Endowment in future years.

As in the programs for support of scholarly research and publication, the Endowment initially set a fall, 1967 deadline for applications for support under the programs for improvement of humanistic education. This has subsequently been revised for the same reasons which led to the elimination of the deadlines in the scholarly research and publication programs. The total fiscal 1967 budget for the programs under the objective of improvement of humanistic education is approximately $800,000. Of this, $200,000 was appropriated by Congress for educational television and talking books in fiscal 1967, while approximately $600,000 was allocated by the staff and the Council from the appropriations granted when the agency was established. This is a small portion of the Endowment's total budget of $4,500,000 for 1967; it reflects the Endowment's desire to spend a small amount well in an exceedingly complex area where Federal and other public agencies, as well as private agencies, have large and various programs. It also reflects the staff and the Council view that experience is the best guide to expanded programs. However, the Endowment expects to develop that experience quickly—indeed, it began the process in the period covered by this report—and in future years very major increases in funding will be required merely to operate the present programs at an effective level.

At the conclusion of its initial planning of programs, the Endowment saw no need or benefit in drawing a firm line circumscribing future activities in the area of improvement of teaching. Preparations for activity in a number of additional areas are underway, albeit their exact definition cannot be attempted until additional experience has been accumulated and additional funding concretely anticipated. With the general aim of accepting good ideas, wherever they can be found, that will promote the public recognition of the meaning and importance of the humanities, the Endowment is exploring the possibility of programs dealing with the needs of culturally deprived students, interdisciplinary innovation in the humanities, support of junior college activities, the infusion of humanistic content into vocational, professional and adult education, and the development of experimental approaches to particular segments of the population.

When the legislative mandate is to "foster public understanding and appreciation of the humanities," and when the importance of such understanding and appreciation is so great, any neat attempt to draw a line and say the job is done would not only be craven, but criminal. For what is at stake is the attitude of two whole American generations, one of which presently faces national and international complexities which cry out for a broadly humane view, the other, and younger, of which will have to face such problems soon.

IV. THE FUTURE

A Federal agency charged with support of the humanities must have as a primary concern the state of its constituency. The state of the humanities is difficult to read at present. On the one hand, there is more activity and innovation than in any past period in this country; on the other hand, there is considerable discontent with some of the paths which humanists are traveling. There are more teachers of the humanities than ever before (well over 50,000 in the colleges and universities, and growing at the lower levels at the rate of 1,000 new Ph.D.'s a year), but there are increasing doubts as to the quality of their training, and some concern about the direction of their interests. It is said that they are monolithically trained for research, and that such training is not appropriate for many of our college teachers. It is further argued that their training predisposes them to concentrate on research rather than on teaching. The claim is that more teachers are teaching less. Yet counter claims are made that the average mature humanistic scholar is not as productive in research as the average university scientist, and that unless the imbalance between humanistic research and scientific research can be righted, the humanities will decline as vital subjects. Recent Government reports have stressed the massive Federal funds available for scientific research, and the meager amount (less than 0.5% of all Federal funds for support of research in 1965) for the humanities.

There are two contrasting solutions to this dilemma. One solution is to provide funding for programs that will draw humanists away from research and into teaching. Such

a solution would be disastrous. If the humanities are relevant to life (they are), our knowledge of them must grow both in extent and sophistication; this means support of research. The other solution is to provide funding for programs that make humanistic research more effective, by developing the individual humanist, by helping humanists to work cooperatively on major research projects, and by encouraging the humanist to emphasize the relevance of his research to the nature of life. Such a solution is incomplete. It ignores the necessary dissemination of his knowledge, whether orally in a classroom, or through works aimed at the general public. However serious the plight of the humanities in the colleges and universities, it is far more serious in the schools and in the public at large. Indeed, it can be said that the one place where the humanities are thriving is the colleges and universities, and that the relative lack of efforts to improve them in the schools and in the broader public context reflects the fact that humanistic excellence has concentrated on the campus. The contrast here with the state of the sciences is instructive. The general public appreciation of science has never been as high as it is today. The science programs of the secondary schools have never been so imaginative, so effective, and so sophisticated as they are today. Since the Second World War, there has been a revolution in the teaching of science at all levels. No such phenomenon can be observed in the humanities.

The Endowment intends to develop programs aimed at improving qualitatively the teaching of the humanities in the schools, and aimed at achieving the same effect on those instruments of the humanities useful in reaching the general public—television, films, the newspapers, the museums and historical societies. Support of basic research in the humanities is the keystone around which such efforts must be built in order to achieve a lasting effect. It serves no purpose to instill a high school student with a driving interest in history, then send him into a college where his history professor has not been able to sustain his own interests. It serves no purpose to create public interest in the humanities, if those who must serve that interest are so poorly trained that they quench what great effort has ignited.

In the next several years, one may hope that new approaches to teaching and research at all levels of the humanities will create the possibility of a genuine breakthrough. It is also entirely likely that increasing numbers of students, competition for funds, and the absence of a focused national effort to up-grade the humanities will cause such an opportunity to be missed. The Endowment expects to encourage as many promising avenues of qualitative improvement at all levels and in all fields as its funds permit. It hopes to serve as a leaven to draw attention to the needs and the satisfactions of the humanities. But it is well aware that the break-throughs must come in the final analysis from the scholars and citizens who labor to understand what the humanities can teach.

APPENDIX A—MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

Henry Allen Moe, *Interim Chairman*, November 18, 1965–June 30, 1966.[2]

Barnaby C. Keeney, *Chairman*, July 1, 1966 to present.

Terms expiring in 1968

Gustave O. Arlt, *President*, Council of Graduate Schools of the United States, Washington, D.C.

[2] On July 1, 1966, Barnaby C. Keeney became Chairman of the Council; and Henry Allen Moe, who served as interim chairman, was appointed by President Johnson to Mr. Keeney's seat on the Council.

APPENDIX A—MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES—continued

Terms expiring in 1968—Continued

Robert Goheen, *President*, Princeton University.

Emil W. Haury, *Director*, Arizona State Museum; *Professor and Head*, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona.

Adelaide Hill, *Research Associate, African Studies Program; Assistant Professor of Sociology*, Boston University.

John W. Letson, *Superintendent of Public Schools*, Atlanta, Georgia.

Robert M. Lumiansky, *Professor of English*, University of Pennsylvania.

G. William Miller, *President*, Textron, Inc., Providence, Rhode Island.

John Courtney Murray, S.J., *Professor of Dogmatic and Sacred Theology, Woodstock* College, Woodstock, Maryland.

Meredith Willson, *Music Director, Conductor and Composer*, Los Angeles, California.

Terms expiring in 1970

Germaine Bree, Institute for Research in the Humanities, University of Wisconsin.

John Ehle, *Writer*, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Emily Genauer, *Art Critic*, New York Herald Tribune.

Emmette S. Bedford, *Professor of Government*, University of Texas.

Barnaby C. Keeney,[2] *President*, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

David Mason, *Professor of Law*, University of Montana.

James Cuff O'Brien, *Director*, Committee on Older and Retired Workers, United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D.C.

Ieoh Ming Pei, *Architect*, I. M. Pei & Associates, New York, New York.

Robert Spike,[3] *Professor*, Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Terms expiring in 1972

Edmund Ball, *Chairman of the Board*, Ball Brothers Company, Muncie, Indiana.

Kenneth Clark, *Professor of Psychology*, City College of New York.

Gerald F. Else, *Chairman*, Department of Classics, University of Michigan.

Robert Bower, *Director*, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Paul Horgan, *Director*, Center for Advanced Studies, Wesleyan University.

A. W. Levi, *Professor of Philosophy*, Washington University.

Sola Mentschikoff, *Professor of Law*, University of Chicago.

Charles E. Odegaard, *President*, University of Washington.

APPENDIX B—MEMBERS OF THE STAFF OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES[4]

Chairman: Henry Allen Moe,[5] Barnaby C. Keeney.

Deputy Chairman: Philip S. Broughton.[6] Wallace B. Edgerton.

Special Assistant to the Chairman: John B. Gardner.

Office of Planning and Analysis: Gladys Keith Hardy, Director; John H. Barcroft, Assistant to the Director.

Secretary, National Council on the Humanities: Anne von der Lieth.

Division of Fellowships and Stipends: James, H. Blessing, Director.

Division of Research and Publication: J. Saunders Redding, Director.

Division of Educational and Special Projects: Robert H. Walker, Director; Stanley S. Ghosh, Program Officer; Joan W. Rafter, Program Analyst.

[3] Deceased.

[4] Staff as of the date of this report, rather than as at the end of fiscal 1966.

[5] Dr. Moe served until July 1, 1966; Mr Keeney is the present incumbent.

[6] Mr. Broughton served until July 1, 1966; Mr. Edgerton is the present incumbent.

APPENDIX B—MEMBERS OF THE STAFF OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—continued

Staff Members of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts:

Charles B. Ruttenberg, General Counsel; Robert W. Cox, Director, Office of Administration; Richard H. Hedrich, Director, Office of Grants; Sureva Seligson, Director, Office of Research.

APPENDIX C

Financial report, National Endowment for the Humanities

PART I—FISCAL YEAR 1966[7]

Receipts: Appropriated for fiscal year 1966	$2,500,000
Obligations: Grants made in fiscal year 1966	[8] $39,000
Unobligated balance carried forward	2,461,000

PART II—FISCAL YEAR 1967 (PROGRAM ESTIMATES)[9]

Receipts:	
Appropriated for fiscal year 1967	$2,000,000
Unobligated balance from fiscal year 1966	2,461,000
Total availability	4,461,000

[7] In fiscal year 1966, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities was appropriated $5,700,000 for the expenses necessary to carry out the functions under Public Law 89–209. Of this amount, $2,500,000 was made available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for carrying out section 7(c) of the Act.

In fiscal year 1966, the funds expended for purposes of administering programs of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities totaled $597,028.

OPERATING COSTS

National Endowment for the Humanities (expenditures from December 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966)	$64,030
National Endowment for the Arts (expenditures from July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966, including obligations by the National Council on the Arts prior to the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, September 29, 1965)	335,277
Shared expenditures of the two Endowments	197,721
Total operating costs of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	$597,028

[8] The National Council on the Humanities advised approval of eight projects totalling approximately $450,000 at its June, 1966 meeting; however, only two specific grants were negotiated and funded (for a total of $39,000) in fiscal 1966.

[9] At the end of the 1966 fiscal year, the bulk of appropriated funds remained intact (see Foreword). To this was added the Congressional appropriation for fiscal 1967, which comprised $1,800,000 for fellowships, $100,000 for a study of educational television, and $100,000 for a talking books program. The Endowment therefore decided to pool the funds granted by the legislation establishing the agency with the funds appropriated for 1967, giving it a program budget of $4,461,000 for fiscal 1967. This schedule shows the Endowment's estimates of its program expenditures for the current fiscal year.

Financial report, National Endowment for the Humanities—Continued

PART II—FISCAL YEAR 1967 (PROGRAM ESTIMATES) [8]—Continued

Allocations of program funds:	
Development of individuals:	
Postdoctoral fellowships	750,000
Summer stipends	300,000
Senior fellowships	750,000
Additional fellowship funds	200,000
Subtotal	2,000,000
Development and dissemination of knowledge:	
Scholarly research	1,086,000
Scholarly travel	25,000
Publication	350,000
Subtotal	1,461,000
Improvement of teaching and public understanding:	
Structured education	224,000
Extramural education	508,000
Center study	50,000
Subtotal	782,000
Development and planning:	
Subtotal	218,000
Total program allocations fiscal year 1967	4,461,000

Mr. YARBOROUGH. These are not frills, Mr. President. This money has been used for fellowships in history, social science, literature, philosophy, music, classical studies, linguistics, and art, for instructural television, for a talking books pilot project for the blind, for a study program to bring young arts critics to New York for a year of study, for programs for State historians and historical agencies, for an international writing program for research projects, for support of publications, for a program to produce "pure" texts of major American authors, for archeological excavations, for a project to upgrade the competence of museum curators, and for many other worthwhile projects.

We are faced with a blind, unreasoning slap at a program which, in its first year of existence, has performed a most worthwhile service to the American people. A little group now wants to make drastic slashes in this important program because they object to a few grants which amount to only a tiny fraction of the total amount of grants made by the agency. What is more, although they may protest with all the demagogic indignation they can muster, the grants in question seem to have been made in complete concurrence with congressional intent.

Of course, I am not prepared to defend the wisdom of every grant which was made. But neither do I believe that I have the knowledge, the wisdom, or the right to set myself up as the sole arbiter of what is suitable for a grant. I would urge this attitude on others. The fact some things do not strike us as fully justified may indicate a defect in our wisdom rather than justification for attacking those who approve of the grant.

There is another and perhaps a larger issue at stake. That is the question of whether we are a sufficiently mature nation to undertake a program of this kind. I hope that the Senate will reaffirm this Nation's commitment to support for arts and humanities, by appropriating the full amount requested by the National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LAW SCHOOL CELEBRATES 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on April 13, the University of Houston Law School held its 20th annual Spring Honors Banquet, commemorating the 20th year of its founding. During these 20 years of its existence, it has grown into a major law school, and stands today as one of the fine law schools of that area.

It was my privilege, as a member of the State of Texas Board of Law Examiners in 1947, when this law school was founded, to pass upon its credentials, and to certify its students for examinations to take the State bar. So I have more than average pride in seeing the success of this school.

The 500 students at the University of Houston School of Law have attended 91 different colleges, and give to the student body of the law school a large and varied background. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the different schools which were attended by the University of Houston law students be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

Colleges represented by students of University of Houston College of Law, 1966–67

Abilene Christian College	1
Alvin Junior College	1
Arlington State University*	8
Austin College	1
Baylor University*	7
Bradley University*	1
Brevard Engineering College	1
Brigham Young University*	1
Contenary College	1
Cornell University	1
Duke University	1
Emory University	1
East Texas State University	1
Georgia Institute of Technology	1
H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College	1
Harvard University	1
Howard Payne College*	2
Indiana University	1
Iowa State University*	1
Lamar State College of Technology*	16
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute*	1
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	5
Lubbock Christian College*	1
Marquette University*	1
Midwestern University	1
Millsaps College	1
New York City Community College	1
North Texas State University*	15
Northwestern State College	1
Northwestern University*	2
Oklahoma Baptist University	1
Oklahoma State University	1
Omaha Baptist College	1
Pan American College	1
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College*	1
Rice University*	11
Roosevelt University	1
Rutgers University*	1
Sam Houston State Teachers College*	14
Spring Hill College	1
Southeastern Oklahoma State College	1
Southeastern Louisiana College	1

See footnote at end of table.

Colleges represented by students of University of Houston College of Law, 1966–67—Continued

Southern Methodist University*	7
St. Edward's University*	3
St. Louis University*	2
St. Thomas University*	6
Stanford University	1
Stephen F. Austin State College*	6
Sul Ross State College	1
Tarleton State College*	2
Texas A. & M. University*	26
Texas Christian University*	6
Texas College of Arts and Industries*	3
Texas Technological College*	12
Texas Wesleyan College*	2
Texas Western College*	7
Texas Woman's University	1
Trinity University*	2
Tulane University	4
United States Coast Guard Academy	1
University of Alabama*	2
University of Arkansas*	3
University of Cairo	1
University of Chicago	1
University of Corpus Christi*	2
University of Cincinnati*	1
University of Florida	1
University of Houston*	115
University of Kansas*	2
University of Maryland	2
University of Massachusetts	1
University of Michigan*	1
University of Notre Dame	3
University of Oklahoma	3
University of the South	1
University of Southern Mississippi	1
University of Southwestern Louisiana*	2
University of Texas*	67
University of Tulsa	2
University of Virginia	1
University of Wisconsin*	1
University of Washington	1
Vanderbilt University*	1
Villanova University	1
Virginia Military Institute*	1
Wake Forest College*	1
Washburn University	1
Wellesley College	1
West Texas State University*	5
West Virginia University*	1
University of Missouri*	1

*Represented by new students.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I salute the Houston College of Law on this important milestone in its growth and congratulate Dean John Neibel and the members of the law school faculty on a job well done.

I was afforded the great privilege of delivering an address at the banquet. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks "Crime in the Streets: What of the Victim?" and a program from the banquet be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CRIME IN THE STREETS: WHAT OF THE VICTIM?

(Excerpts of remarks by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH at the Spring Banquet of the University of Houston College of Law, Rice Hotel, Houston, Tex., Apr. 13, 1967)

Mr. President, Members of the Faculty, Distinguished Guests, Members of the Student Body. It is indeed an honor to have been asked to address this Twentieth Annual Banquet of the University of Houston College of Law. Having been a member of the State Board of Law Examiners for four years (1947–51), I worked often with Dean White and your then young law school. Even in those early years of your law school, you had a high standard of excellence and

achievement. I read your papers for four years, so I am in a position to know.

My law school experience having included some work as a quiz-master at the University of Texas Law School, and my law experience having included four years as Assistant Attorney General of Texas and five years as a District Judge, and a Directorship of the National Association of Law Examiners, a brief period as a lecturer in land law at the University of Texas Law School, I have never lost my interest in law school work. Great opportunities came to me in life because of my association with a law school. I took advantage of some of them.

Tonight, I want to discuss briefly with you a subject in legislation, not yet to the stage of litigation or adjudication.

There are, I am sure, many legislative proposals now pending before the 90th Congress which are of significant interest to you as lawyers, and students of the law, dealing with crime, taxes, property rights, civil rights, and transportation.

A legislative area in which I am greatly interested is that of compensation for victims of criminal violence, as proposed in my bill S. 646 now pending before the Congress.

The importance of this bill cannot be read alone in the dollars and cents which it would provide to the victims of crimes of violence—important as this goal is. This bill records for the American people a milestone in the quest for a humane and socially responsible treatment of innocent people brutalized by acts of violence. With this bill, we can demonstrate that a wealthy nation which can spend millions to bring to justice the perpetrators of crime is not indifferent to the plight of their victims.

The innocent victim of crimes of violence has until recently been the forgotten person of our society. The danger today is that as we devote greater attention to crime detection and prevention and the rehabilitation of the criminal, the enormity of our neglect of the victims of criminal violence will be magnified.

In recent years compensation programs have been adopted by the countries of New Zealand and Great Britain, and in this country by the States of California and New York. Several other States and the District of Columbia are reported as having taken some action looking to the adoption of compensation programs. New York City is reported as having adopted, as of December 29, 1965 a so-called "Good Samaritan Law" under which payments may be made by the city to persons injured or killed in the prevention of crimes.

S. 646, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1967, which I introduced on January 25, 1967 is now pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Joining me as sponsors of this proposal are Senators Bartlett, Clark, Dodd, Gruening, Hart, Inouye, Magnuson, and Mondale and Bible.

I first introduced this compensation proposal on June 17, 1965 as S. 2155 of the 89th Congress. This was after the adoption of the New Zealand plan which became effective on January 1, 1964, and the British plan which came into force on August 1, 1964. It was, however, before the adoption of the California plan in 1965, and the New York plan in 1966. I like to think that possibly my bill and the discussion of the subject generally may have made some contributions to the favorable consideration of the proposals adopted by these two most populous states in the Union.

I have made several refinements in my present proposal as compared with the bill as first introduced. These changes appeared desirable after study and consideration extending over a two-year period, during which I circulated the bill to all the law schools of the country. Many law school publications commented on it. I invite your continuing advice and comments on it.

S. 646 the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1967 would compensate the victims of crimes of violence for injuries to the person. It does not cover loss of property. It is applicable only to cases in which the injured person is the innocent victim of a crime and injury. It is applicable only to the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, including the District of Columbia, American ships on the high seas and international waters, and other areas under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

The bill would create a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which would be a three-man tribunal appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for 8-year staggered terms. The chairman, who would be a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State for at least eight years, would be designated by the President.

The principal office of the Commission would be in or near the District of Columbia, but Commission powers could be exercised by an authorized representative in any place.

Injury or death resulting from eighteen offenses which possibly may be grouped under the headings of homicide, assaults, and sexual offenses of violence, occurring in areas where the Federal Government exercises general police power would be compensable.

It is the Commission's function and duty to examine the evidence presented to it both to determine what level of compensation should be granted and whether, in fact, the person making the claim is truly an innocent victim.

The Commission may order the payment of compensation to three categories of persons: (1) to or on behalf of the injured person; or (2) in the case of the personal injury of the victim, where the compensation is for pecuniary loss suffered or expenses incurred by any person responsible for the maintenance of the victim, to that person; or (3) in the case of the death of the victim, to or for the benefit of the dependents or closest relation of the deceased victim, or any one or more of such dependents.

The absence of a criminal intent is not an essential factor for determining entitlement to compensation. A person shall be deemed to have intended an act or omission notwithstanding that by reasons of age, insanity, drunkenness, or otherwise he was legally incapable of forming a criminal intent. The Commission may, however, consider any circumstance it determines relevant, including the behavior of the victim which contributes directly or indirectly to his injury or death, unless such injury or death resulted from the victim's lawful attempt to prevent the commission of a crime or to apprehend an offender. The Commission must find that the act or omission complained of did occur, and that injury or death resulted therefrom.

The authority of the Commission to award compensation dependent on the prosecution or conviction of the accused for the offense giving rise to the injury. The Commission may, however, upon application of the Attorney General or the person or persons alleged to have caused the injury or death suspend proceedings until such application is withdrawn or until a prosecution for an offense arising out of such act or omission is no longer pending or imminent.

The payment of compensation may be ordered for: (1) expenses actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the injury or death of the victim; (2) loss of earning power; (c) pecuniary loss to the dependents of the deceased victim; (d) pain and suffering of the victim; and (e) other pecuniary loss resulting from the personal injury or death of the victim which the Commission determines to be reasonable.

Application for compensation must be made within two years of injury or death and compensation shall not be awarded in an amount in excess of $25,000.

Compensation will not be awarded in two situations: (1) if the victim was at the time of the injury or death living with the offender as his wife or her husband, or (2) in situations when the Commission, at its discretion, feels unjust enrichment to or on behalf of the offender would result.

Any order for the payment of compensation may be made on such terms as the Commission deems appropriate, and any payments received by the victim from the offender shall be deducted from any payments awarded by the Commission.

The Commission may institute an action against a person convicted of an offense giving rise to an award for compensation for recovery of the whole or any part of such compensation.

In the matter of the attorney's fees, the Commission may allow whatever is reasonable under the circumstances.

Orders and decisions of the Commission are reviewable on appeal but no trial *de novo* of the facts determined by the Commission shall be allowed.

Injury is defined to include actual bodily harm, pregnancy, and mental or nervous shock.

The term "victim" means the direct and immediate victim of the offense—a person who is injured or killed by an act or omission of any other person which is within the description of any of the offenses specified in the bill.

The heart of the proposal is found in section 301 which deals with the award of payments of compensation. Where any person is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of offenses of the bill, the Commission may make an order for the payment of compensation to or for the benefit of the injured person or to any person responsible for the victim's maintenance. In the case of the death of the victim, the payments are to be to or for the benefit of his dependents or closest relations. The Commission has wide discretion in making awards, subject of course to the $25,000 limitation.

The Commission's right to consider behaviour of the victim which contributed directly or indirectly to his injury or death should provide insurance against unmeritorious claims.

It is not intended that any victim should receive double benefits or be better off by reason of the crime than he would otherwise have been, and therefore, in assessing the compensation to be paid, the Commission is required to deduct any payment received by the victim or by any of his dependents from the offender or from any person on behalf of the offender, or from the United States (except those received under this bill), a State or any of its subdivisions, for personal injury or death compensable under this legislation.

In the past year or so, much has been said about the rights of offenders and alleged offenders, and the Supreme Court has handed down a number of extremely important opinions on the subject of due process of criminal law. We must talk about and understand these decisions. But we must not let that discussion obscure an equally important subject which has been greatly neglected—the status of the victim of the crime. The trend of crime statistics in the United States is ever upwards. Year after year the official graph for crime violence inches higher. Collectively, the victims of these crimes and their survivors constitute the largest forgotten minority in the Unit-

ed States. Their attackers, if apprehended, are generally defended by lawyers, examined by psychiatrists, and treated by physicians—all at the expense of the State. If sent to prison they are fed and educated out of the public treasury. As for the victim, his family and those dependent upon him for support, society generally has shown no similar concern. The history of crime and punishment reveals a steadily increasing concern with the treatment of criminals and an almost total lack of attention to the situation of the victim.

My proposal would not, of course, extend to all cases of criminal violence. By its terms it is applicable only to those areas of the country where the Federal Government exercises general police power. I hope that this legislation would encourage States additional to California and New York to adopt similar compensation plans. Of course, I would hope that Texas would be one such state providing compensation for this neglected group, the victim of crime.

Law schools have been the traditional greenhouses that bring to flower our finest developments of law toward more adequate justice for the people. I urge you as you face your existing second 20 years to join in this expansion of legal remedies to the forgotten class of innocent victims of crime.

THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON COLLEGE OF LAW, 20TH ANNUAL SPRING HONORS BANQUET, APRIL 13, 1967

PROGRAM

Dinner.

Welcome and Acknowledgments: John F. Nichols, President, University of Houston Bar Association.

Toastmaster: Arthur Terrell, President, Houston Bar Association.

Introduction of Honored Guests: Arthur Terrell.

Presentation of Special Awards to Outstanding Students: John B. Neibel, Dean, University of Houston College of Law.

1. Outstanding Garwood Award.

2. Malcolm McDermott Award.

Howard Pollock Award: Hon. Howard W. Pollock, United States Congressman from Alaska.

Introduction of the Principal Speaker: Arthur Terrell.

Principal Address: Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough, Senior United States Senator from Texas.

Conclusion.

STUDENT BAR ASSOCIATION OFFICERS, 1966–67

President: John F. Nichols.

Vice President: D. Neel Richardson.

Secretary: Homer Price.

Parliamentarian: James Parsons.

Treasurer: Richard Fielder.

Historian: James McRae.

Spring Banquet Co-Chairmen: John T. Schneider, Larry Wynn Bass.

Class Presidents

Senior Day: Joe Glen Thompson.

Senior Night: Steve Peterson.

Midlaw Day: Bill Schaffer.

Midlaw Night: Bob Donaho.

Freshman Day: George Karem.

Freshman Night: Jim McKibben.

Law Senator: John Maurice O'Quinn.

HOUSTON LAW REVIEW OFFICERS, SUMMER-FALL 1966

Editor-in-Chief: John Maurice O'Quinn.

Managing Editor: Alvin Louis Zimmerman.

Articles Editor: Robert Melburn Hopson, Ann Adams.

Comment Editor: Stanley L. Blend.

Note Editor: Tom Miller.

Review Editor: Larry Wynn Bass.

COLLEGE OF LAW FACULTY

Burton C. Agata, Associate Professor of Law, A.B., J.D., Michigan; LL.M., New York.

Newell H. Blakely, Professor of Law, B.A., Ouachita Baptist College; Ph.M., Wisconsin; LL.B., Texas; LL.M., Michigan.

Robert H. Bowmar, Assistant Professor of Law, A.B., M.A., Boston U.; J.D., Northwestern.

Raymond L. Britton, Associate Professor of Law, B.A., Pennsylvania State; LL.B., Southern Methodist; LL.M., Harvard.

James S. Covington, Jr., Assistant Professor of Law, B.B.A., LL.B., Texas.

John L. Cox., Jr., Associate Professor of Law, B.S., LL.B., Houston.

Alan D. Cullison, Assistant Professor of Law, B.S., Chicago; J.D., Iowa; LL.M., Yale.

Richard W. Ewing, Assistant Professor of Law, B.A., Texas A&M; LL.B., Houston.

Joseph E. Hensley, Assistant Professor of Law, and Assistant Dean, College of Law, A.B., LL.B., Kansas.

John Mixon, Professor of Law, B.B.A., Stephen F. Austin State College; LL.B., Houston; LL.M., Yale.

John B. Neibel, Professor of Law and Dean, College of Law, B.A., LL.B., Houston; LL.M., Michigan.

Thomas C. Newhouse, Assistant Professor of Law, B.A., Notre Dame; LL.B., Univ. of Tulsa; LL.M., N.Y.U.

Dwight A. Olds, M.D. Anderson Professor of Law, A.B., LL.B., Kansas; LL.M., Michigan.

Daniel L. Rotenberg, Associate Professor of Law, A.B., LL.B., Indiana.

A. A. White, Law Alumni Professor of Law, B.S., North Texas State; LL.B., Southern Methodist.

James H. Wright, Associate Professor of Law, B.S., LL.B., Houston; LL.M., Michigan.

Larry W. Bass, Lecturer in Law, B.S., Texas Tech. University.

Stanley L. Blend, Lecturer in Law, B.A., Tulane University.

Thomas J. Miller, Lecturer in Law, B.S., Univ. of Houston.

John M. O'Quinn, Lecturer in Law, B.S., University of Houston.

Alvin L. Zimmerman, Lecturer in Law, B.S., University of Houston.

WEST GERMAN GOVERNMENT'S PART IN PROPOSED STEEL PLANT IN COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, according to a dispatch to the New York Times from Bonn, the West German Government is deeply concerned over the prospect of the withdrawal of American strike aircraft from Europe.

In a moment, Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be published.

Before doing so, however, I would like to make this comment:

More than a year ago the West German Government—by official action—guaranteed the financing of a steel plant for Communist China. As a result of a resolution adopted by the Senate of the United States, this action was stayed. But now talk has been renewed.

Communist China—as Germany knows and as we know—is supplying weapons to the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, which armaments are being used against Americans in South Vietnam.

Yet the West German Government, by official action—I am not speaking about individual businessmen, but I am speaking about the official action of the West German Government—has guaranteed the financing of a steel plant in Communist China.

At the same time, the American people, whose sons are fighting in Vietnam, also have 225,000 sons in Europe to protect the West Germans from communism.

The Germans are upset because there is talk of reducing this European force.

In determining what American aircraft to leave in West Germany, the executive branch of our Government would do well to demand the cancellation of the West German Government's part in the proposed steel deal with Communist China.

By a recorded vote of 56 to 33 the U.S. Senate on August 1, 1966, said that this action of the West German Government "is a grave blow to the common defense of the free world and to the safety of American and allied troops in Vietnam."

The U.S. Senate has done its part; now it is up to the executive branch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the New York Times article datelined Bonn, April 22.

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

BONN FEARS UNITED STATES WILL INCLUDE PLANES IN REDUCTION OF FORCES

(By William Beecher)

BONN, April 22.—The West German Government is upset over the prospect of the withdrawal of a significant number of American strike aircraft in addition to ground forces.

The Bonn Government first heard of the possible aircraft redeployment last weekend during discussions here with American representatives.

West German officials say that matter is so important that Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger may bring it up when President Johnson comes here next week for Konrad Adenauer's funeral.

Bonn sources said that a two-hour conference is tentatively planned between the two heads of state Wednesday morning. Among other things that are expected to come up: East-West relations, the state of the Atlantic Alliance and the treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, the sources added.

Bonn officials say that the proposed United States Air Force redeployment, which caught them completely by surprise, worries them even more than troop reductions because of the nuclear capability of the fighter-bombers.

HALVING OF POWER REPORTED

"Our military tell us you want to reduce your tactical air power in Germany by one half, more or less, and that really worries us," a senior official said.

German and American sources declined to cite the specific number of aircraft involved in the United States proposal. Some sources fixed the number at 144 planes more.

The total number of American fighter-bombers based in West Germany is classified.

German officials say that they are unhappy about the Air Force cutback because it may diminish the deterrent power of the nuclear strike forces in Western Europe and because they fear it may be a step toward the denuclearization of Germany and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

On the other hand, American planners have long worried about the vulnerability of aircraft on crowded European bases during the early, nonnuclear stages of a possible

war. The situation was significantly worsened when France withdrew permission for the use of airbases on its territory.

By removing some aircraft to fields in the United States, and running the planes across the Atlantic often on training exercises, these planners have argued, the aircraft obviously would not be affected by a surprise attack in Europe and could be flown to the battle area quickly. Small forward elements would remain in western Europe.

This procedure, known as dual basing, is currently in effect for certain squadrons assigned to bases in both the United States and Great Britain.

"Your Government says the aircraft would be less vulnerable in the United States and that, if war comes, they can fly back here in a few days or several days" one German official said. "That might be fine in terms of fighting the war. But our point of view is different. We want to deter war, not fight it. How much of Germany will be overrun while you're deciding when to send the planes back here?"

Another official, asked why he was concerned about denuclearization when there are more than 7,000 tactical nuclear warheads in Western Europe, put it this way:

He said the German Government believes a debate is underway in the United States over how many nuclear targets in Europe ought to be covered by Strategic Air Command missiles and bombers instead of tactical bombers and missiles in Western Europe.

For the last year and a half, he said, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has been trying to get the West German Government to develop a nonnuclear capability for its F-104G fighter-bombers. This has been looked at by some Germans as a step toward denuclearization since, if the four squadrons of planes were committed in the early, nonnuclear phase of the war, many would be shot down and thus would be unavailable for use in the later, nuclear phase of the war.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate that certain of my colleagues have told me of telephone calls and telegrams which they are receiving, indicating that someone is passing out the information that unless the Long amendment is adopted next Tuesday, the investment tax credit will be in jeopardy. One Senator, within the last hour, told me that he had had a call today saying that they needed only one more vote to assure the passage of the Long amendment and the passage of the investment tax credit bill.

I should like to set the record straight. The bill before the Senate contains only two provisions: First, restoration of the investment tax credit; second, repeal of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966. Without amendment, the bill is ready to be passed, and it would pass overwhelmingly and be speeded to the House of Representatives; and, with an expeditious conference, could go to the President to become law before the week ends. But the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, not the senior Senator from Tennessee, has offered an amendment to that bill. If this amendment should be withdrawn or if this amendment should be defeated, then the bill would be ready for final enactment.

Who, Mr. President, has procrastinated? Who has been dilatory? Not the senior Senator from Tennessee and the senior Senator from Delaware. We have repeatedly asked for votes, asked for passage of the bill. We have said to the Senate that we will accept the results of the vote next Tuesday, that we will not engage in dilatory practices and procrastination. We are prepared to pass the bill and send it to the House of Representatives. Yet, someone is passing out misinformation in order to mislead American businessmen that, somehow or other, it is the senior Senator from Tennessee and the senior Senator from Delaware who are holding up passage of the pending bill.

The situation is quite to the contrary. Only one amendment is pending. Neither the senior Senator from Tennessee nor the senior Senator from Delaware is the author of that amendment. We will have a vote on that one pending amendment at 3 o'clock next Tuesday. This already has been ordered.

I am glad to report that the Senator who told me of this instance within the last hour said that he carefully explained to his constituent that misinformation had been given him, that a rollcall vote has already been ordered for 3 o'clock next Tuesday, and that this issue could be brought to speedy conclusion.

Mr. President, I shall accept the decision of the Senate.

We debated this issue for a long while, and there comes a time in our democratic society when majority will should prevail. I believe that it will prevail next Tuesday, and I surely am prepared to accept it, whether it is as I wish it or not.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m., Monday, May 1, 1967.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28, 1967:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Carl E. Bagge, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1972 (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code; date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Abraham, William D.
Adams, Thomas F.
Albright, John S., II
Arbeit, Ferde P.
Archibald, Alexander M., Jr.
Ardis, David G.
Arnold, Hendrick J., III
Ashbrook, Owen O.
Atkinson, Obbie T.
Badell, Patrick C.
Bailey, Gregory P.
Baker, Robert R., Jr.
Ballard, James R.
Bannwart, James L.
Barhaugh, John H.
Barnes, Judson C.
Barnes, Robert P.
Barnes, William H., Jr.
Barnett, Thomas D.
Barnum, Robert J.
Bartlett, John R.
Bauer, Christian A.
Baxter, Dale E.
Beattie, Charles W.
Beatty, Lyle D.
Bebee, Richard C.
Beck, Larry R.
Bell, William J., Jr.
Berzins, John J.
Besbikos, Charles S.
Bettinger, Sterling P., Jr.
Bettner, Ronald A.
Bissett, Kenneth R., Jr.
Blaha, Frank R.
Bliss, George F., III
Bloom, Michael J.
Blum, Ronald E.
Blystone, John B.
Boettcher, Thomas D.
Boisture, Worth W., Jr.
Boose, John A.
Bosiljevac, Michael J.
Boston, Ronald G.
Bostrom, Stuart G.
Bradley, Ronald G.
Brazil, Douglas L.
Brende, Otis A.
Broadway, Terrance M.
Budinger, Fred W., Jr.
Bunnell, Harold T.
Burbank, Deane A.
Burke, Joseph W.
Burman, Steven W.
Burnett, Paull C.
Burns, Danny R.
Burski, Michael L.
Bush, Andrew K.
Calvanelli, Thomas J.
Carleton, Roger E.
Carlson, Roger T.
Carney, John M., Jr.
Carpenter, Adelbert W.
Carroll, Terry M., Jr.
Cason, Robert D.
Cathcart, Richard J.
Caudle, Joseph E.
Cerak, John P.
Cerny, Leonard J., II
Chace, Harvey D.
Chambless, Rubyen M., Jr.
Chorlins, Richard D.
Chuba, Francis C., Jr.
Clements, Charles L.
Cobb, Charles G., II
Cobb, George N.
Cockrell, Gerald L.
Coffey, Roger K.
Cole, George P., Jr.
Coleman, James E.
Colgrove, Roger T.
Connolly, Robert J.
Cook, Douglas F.
Cormany, Gerrit C.
Cormney, Laney K.
Corwin, Gerald W.
Cox, Sherwood C.
Crandall, Daniel L.
Crane, Barry D.
Crawford, Charles S. Jr.
Croft, David R.
Crosby, Warney L., Jr.
Cunningham, Edward E.
Cunningham, Thomas L.
Czonstka, Steven J.
Daines, Alan R.
Damron, Lynn B.
Daniel, Edward L.
Davies, James D., II
Davis, Daniel R.
Davis, John L.
Deboe, David
Delaplane, William K., III
Dellafiora, Thomas E.
Deluca, Brian L.
Denham, Charles A.
Destaffany, Nelson D.
Deturk, Robin A.
Dimmick, Paul H., Jr.
Don, Bruce W.
Donahue, Morgan J.
Donovan, Brian J.
Dougherty, John L., Jr
Dougherty, Llewellyn S.
Dowling, Emmett P., III
Drabant, Robert E.
Draper, Robert A.
Duggan, Cornelius T., Jr.
Duncan, Lloyd F.
Durbin, James E.
Duross, Thomas P.
Dysart, Christopher J.
East, James R.

East, Wilbur W.
Edgerly, Walter G.
Edwards, Jerry W.
Egan, John J., III
Elliott, George D.
Elm, Stephen R.
Englebretson, Robert E., II
Ennis, Edgar W., Jr.
Ermak, Donald L.
Evans, Thomas F.
Fancher, Richard B.
Faris, William L.
Fedel, Gary A.
Fee, Jerry W.
Felker, Richard I.
Fellows, Ray E., Jr.
Femrite, Ralph B.
Ferguson, Dennis E.
Ferguson, Douglas D.
Fink, Donald E.
Finnegan, Patrick W.
Fisher, Arthur R.
Fite, John L., Jr.
Folz, Eddie J.
Fontaine, Peter A.
Forester, Kenneth C.
Fortin, Robert F.
Francisco, Michael C.
Franck, Raymond E., Jr.
Freeman, Bruce M.
Freix, Greogry D.
Frushour, George V., Jr.
Fry, Howard J., Jr.
Fuller, John H., Jr.
Gable, Howard C., Jr.
Gabriel, Lester D.
Geoghegan, William T.
George, James G.
Gerber, William J.
Gibson, Daniel J.
Gibson, George C.
Giles, Michael N.
Gilmore, James R., Jr.
Gilmore, Robert W.
Gnall, John S.
Grandmason, John L.
Green, Gary J.
Greene, Melville L. Jr.
Gresham, Charles B. Jr.
Griesser, Thomas W.
Grosick, Frederick E.
Grow, Robert A.
Guerrina, Frederick B.
Gunter, Edwin D., Jr.
Hager, Hoyt E., III
Hagey, James F.
Hahn, Bernard L.
Halliday, John M.
Hammonds, Veneble L., Jr.
Hanson, Paul E.
Harkey, John B., Jr.
Harp, Thomas P.
Harris, Gregory J.
Hartley, Gerald G.
Hassemer, Donald W.
Hastedt, Douglas J., Jr.
Hawkins, Douglas S.
Hayner, Michael S.
Haynes, Richard W.
Heckert, Donald W.
Heffron, Charles H., Jr
Heflebower, Charles R.
Heiser, Richard L.
Henderson, Hal K.
Hendrickson, Wylie C.
Henry, George D., Jr.
Henry, Paul F.
Hepner, Thomas C.
Hickman, Donald E.
Hicks, Jonathan L.
Hierlmeier, Glen T.
Hill, Dennis H.
Hill, Roger H.
Hoekstra, Dale V.
Hogarty, James P.
Holbrook, Joseph C.
Hollstein, John A.
Holmen, Gary L.
Holohan, Stephen W.
Hoskins, Charles L.
Houser, Conrad B.
Houston, Charles E.
Howerton, Clarence L., Jr.
Howerton, Glenn F., Jr.
Hudson, Hal C.
Hugdahl, Peter O.
Hughes, Richard L.
Hunter, Allen M., II
Hurley, William C., III
Hurt, Jeffrey W.
Icenhour, James O., Jr.
Imler, David A.
Jackson, Don E.
Jackson, Fred S.
Jackson, John E.
James, Samuel L.
Jared, Roy A., II
Jaszczak, Casmier
Jensen, Leslie C.
Johnston, Ronald A.
Jordan, Henry S., Jr.
Kellenberger, James W.
Kelly, Terry J.
Kent, Jesse H., II
Kirwin, Thomas J., III
Knepell, Peter L.
Knobloch, Robert E.
Knox, David K.
Koldyke, Gary L.
Kornemann, William E., II
Kowalchuk, Charles J.
Kozma, William J.
Kramer, Ronald L.
Kreer, James R.
Kronbach, Henry E.
Kruger, William, III
Kruzel, Joseph J., Jr.
Kunciw, Roman S.
Laetz, Curtis J.
Laforgia, Anthony B.
Lamothe, Richard R.
Landers, John S.
Langston, Michael J.
Lanier, Ronnie D.
Larosa, Benedict D.
Larsen, Paul J.
Lasater, Norman E.
Lawrence, David A.
Leach, Arthur S.
Lee, John R.
Legasey, Edward E.
Lenne, Marshall A.
Leonard, J. R.
Leonard, Michael C.
Leopold, Raymond J.
Leslie, Ralph S.
Letcher, Michael W.
Lewis, John R.
Lhommedieu, Charles S.
Lindahl, Thomas B., Jr.
Lines, Russel W.
Locke, William J.
Lolas, Anthony J.
Lord, William R.
Lorenz, Gary R.
Loser, Gregory A.
Lowe, William B., Jr.
Lumbard, Michael B.
Lund, Glenn W.
Lundberg, Allen B.
Lupia, Eugene A.
MacCarroll, Michael J.
Macur, Roger L.
Magee, Claybourne S., II
Mahaffey, Michael J.
Maleckas, Aldon F.
Mann, Robert W.
Mansell, Dennis N.
Markey, Jeffrey H.
Marquette, Ronald M.
Marshall, Kenneth R.
Mass, Robert C.
May, Gary M.
McAdam, Theodore J., Jr.
McBroom, John M.
McCarty, David C.
McCleary, James E.
McComb, Jack F.
McCrillis, John M.
McCulloch, Robert S.
McDermott, James H.
McDonald, Robert B., Jr.
McFadzean, Bruce W.
McGill, Richard M.
Medeiros, Paul A.
Menza, Thomas F.
Messerly, John A.
Messinger, Jan
Messner, David A.
Midkiff, Richard M.
Milanovich, Fred P.
Miller, Dennis A.
Miller, Jonathan P.
Miller, Richard B., Jr.
Miller, Roy P.
Milne, George P.
Minshall, Billy W.
Mitcham, Robert S.
Moix, Peter P.
Monda, Emil
Mook, Gilbert D.
Moore, Donald R., Jr.
Moore, Michael H.
Morgan, Jesse D., Jr.
Morishige, Ronald I.
Morris, Leonard P.
Mueller, Allan E., Jr.
Mueller, Garry S.
Mulcahy, William F.
Mulch, Gordon L
Muldrow, Robert
Munninghoff, Ivan
Murray, Russell M.
Naguwa, Stanley M.
Najera, Ramon A.
Neate, Richard E.
Nelson, James W.
Nelson, Mervin L.
Nesbitt, Patrick M.
Neyman, Jesse E., Jr.
Nolly, George E.
Nowlin, David V.
O'Brien, Kent J.
O'Grady, Michael E.
Olive, John F.
Orton, Ronald C.
Owen, Don H.
Paajanen, Wayne A.
Page, Lex F.
Painter, Donald T.
Palmer, Ralph B.
Park, Benjamin S.
Parris, Russell E., Jr.
Pastusek, Robert R.
Patterson, William E.
Pawka, Michael H.
Pechek, Phillip J.
Peddrick, Joseph W.
Peterson, Gary G.
Peterson, James F.
Peterson, William A.
Pfeifle, David L.
Pichon, Allen A. Jr.
Pigg, Kenneth E.
Piper, Danny
Pletcher, John H., Jr.
Powley, Herbert W.
Price, Clinton R.
Pritz, Ray A.
Prizner, David J.
Provini, Guerin J.
Pugh, Dennis G.
Pumfrey, Marion A.
Putnam, Robert S.
Quinn, William E., Jr.
Rafferty, Gerald J.
Rathke, Frederick A., Jr.
Ratliff, Larry K.
Ray, William D.
Reid, Jarve G.
Reitan, Richard M.
Resling, Robert A.
Retelle, John J., Jr.
Reynolds, Robert W., III
Riess, Michael T.
Ritter, Donald R.
Roberts, James S., III
Roberts, James S.
Robinson, Daniel G.
Roby, Thomas B.
Rock, Thomas E., Jr.
Rodriguez, Enrique M.
Roper, Daniel L.
Rosen, Max E.
Ross, Alan B.
Rounce, Ronald W.
Rowan, Richard A.
Rowe, Allan W.
Rudiger, Burnley L., Jr.
Ryan, Joseph E.
Ryan, Michael O.
Safford, Steven J.
Sams, Monroe S., Jr.
Sarda, Peter J.
Saunders, William P., Jr.
Savage, William E.
Scheimer, Gary L.
Schlichter, Paul M.
Schmidt, Alan E.
Schmidt, John R., III
Schmitt, Richard W.
Schofield, Jeffrey E.
Schrott, John W., III
Scott, Charles F.
Scott, Michael T.
Seigler, Stephen S.
Seiver, David J.
Seiwert, Raymond M.
Selke, Robert K.
Sellers, Donald P.
Sexon, William R.
Shaw, Frank A.
Shaw, James A., Jr.
Shay, Donald E., Jr.
Showalter, Larry D.
Shriver, Loren J.
Sikora, Charles R.
Simmons, Cleatous J.
Simpson, Tipp
Slusher, Frank B.
Smith, Eugene A.
Smith, Gregory F.
Smith, James L.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Warren W., Jr.
Snow, Johnny R.
Sovitsky, George A.
Sowada, Daniel E.
Spector, Jonathan M.
Spiegelhauer, Milton A., Jr.
Sprague, Christopher B.
Sproul, Kennard B.
Stadjuhar, Edward C.
Stagno, George C.
Stansbury, Bentley P., Jr.
Steadman, James E.
Stelling, Henry G., Jr.
Stickler, Edward A.
Stoval, Dale E.
Straw, William E.
Streets, James B.
Strickland, James R.
Stroud, William P., III
Stuart, Robert K.
Stugart, Mark T.
Svanoe, Kennard E.
Swartwood, Richard V
Sweatland, Keith K.
Szczepanek, Matthew J., Jr.
Tackabury, Paul D.
Tait, Arthur F., Jr.
Tan, Arnold W.
Tashnick, Walter D.
Taylor, William W.
Tebay, Richard D.
Templin, Roger T.
Terry, John R.
Thal, Lawrence S.
Thomas, Robert J.
Thompson, John W.
Thompson, Michael K.
Thompson, William E., III
Thorson, Eric M.
Tilden, Thomas V.
Trapuzzano, Michael P.
Triggs, Dennis R.
Turbiville, Harry P., Jr.
Twomey, Daniel I.
Twomey, Thomas A.
Vance, Harvey J.
Vanhoy, Larry N.
Vanriper, Donald W.
Vanwagenen, George E.
Vernamonti, Leonard R.
Vincent, Randolph C.
Visinsky, Walter L., Jr.
Voight, Ronald O.
Wakefield, Harry A., III
Warren, Robert H., Jr.
Watts, Raymond K.
Weber, Kenneth R.
Weeks, Rodney O.
Weizenegger, Richard E., Jr.
Wells, Charles R., III
Wells, Charles R., III
Wenner, Gerald M., Jr.
Wetzler, Harry P.
White, James H., Jr.
Wiedenmann, Gary N.
Wilbanks, Ronald T.
Willett, Richard M.
Williams, Alan O.
Williams, Earl R., II
Williams, Frederick M.
Williams, Victor, M., Jr.
Willis, Gary N.
Willis, Richard K.
Willke, Theodore L.
Wilson, Lawrence W.
Wingfield, John R., III
Wirth, Michael C.
Withers, Douglas R., Jr.
Wolfe, Richard E.
Wondolowski, John J.
Wood, Stuart B.
Wooddell, Royce G.
Wright, Donald B.
Wright, John A.
Wyman, Stephen S.
Yates, David L.
Young, Clark S., Jr.
Zajac, John J.
Zangri, Alfred G.

The following cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment to the regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code; date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Alverson, Michael E.
Ankener, Richard A.
Biltoft, Christopher A.
Davie, Robert N., Jr.
Foley, William P.
Harmon, George L.
Kline, Richard W., Jr.
Kunselman, Robert A.
Mullane, Richard M.
Nolan, Robert J.
Purcell, Roger J.
Saxon, Vernon P., Jr.
Younkin, Derek L.

The following midshipmen, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 1, United States Code; date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Bost, James L.
Buettner, Terry W.
Bush, Frederick E., Jr.
Christensen, James E., Jr.
Cooper, David G.
Daniels, Charles C.
Dash, George H., Jr.
Gautschi, Frederick H., III
Hawes, Patrick C.
Matthews, Douglas G.
Stevenson, Thomas A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1967:

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address of the Honorable Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas, at the American Enterprise Institute Symposium on Fiscal Policy and Business Capital Formation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS] delivered an exceptional speech before the American Enterprise Institute Symposium on Fiscal Policy and Business Capital Formation.

In his address, "Fiscal Policy and the Good Economic Society," Mr. MILLS pointed out that fiscal policy should seek to contribute to the good economic society. This good economic society is characterized by a progressive spirit, which leads the citizeny to seek out new challenges, he said.

Perhaps the most thought-provoking remark of the gentleman from Arkansas was the following:

> The good economic society is careful to limit its assumption of responsibility to concerns of this character (those with which society as a whole must deal) and seeks always to reserve to private economic entities—individuals, households, companies—the maximum possible scope for decision-making, for initiating activity.

Mr. MILLS rightly notes that—

> This is the essence of economic freedom in our world today. And maximizing economic freedom is a major objective of the good society.

Commenting on the demand for increases in governmental services as the society grows and becomes both more complex and more affluent, Mr. MILLS notes that—

> All proposals for new expenditure programs should be received with a constructive skepticism; we should start with the assumption that the production capability to be allocated to the program would be better available to meet demands arising in the private sector of the economy and require the program's proponent to persuade us otherwise.

Noting the expansion of governmental spending, particularly at the State and local levels, Mr. MILLS recommends caution about "some recent, bizarre proposals concerning the fiscal relationships of the Federal, and State and local governments." It is here that I must enter a strong reservation to the distinguished gentleman's remarks. Surely, as he so eloquently pointed out, the very essence of our federal system is the principle of subsidiarity; that is, letting the lowest political unit provide the services which are demanded by the citizenry. This is a basic precept of our federal system. Thus, it is certainly consistent with Mr. MILLS' call for a "good economic society" which limits its assumption of responsibility to those concerns in its own domain, and not usurp those which can be better performed by lower units of government and of society.

Another noteworthy point which the gentlemen mentioned was that—

> Great importance should be attached to regular, frequent, and significant reductions in tax rates.

The reasons for this are several, as the chairman points out, but perhaps overriding is the fact that—

> Economic freedom is bolstered by general tax reduction which broadens the command of private economic entities over the society's productive resources.

Mr. Speaker, this address is worthy of consideration by every Member of this body. It is thought provoking, and its logic, I think, is convincing. It is another in a long list of outstanding contributions which the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas has made to our understanding of economic policy, and to the well-being of the Nation. I salute him for it, and I include the text of his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

FISCAL POLICY AND THE GOOD ECONOMIC SOCIETY

(Address of Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS before the American Enterprise Institute Symposium on Fiscal Policy and Business Capital Formation, dinner meeting, Washington, D.C., April 20, 1967)

In the last several years, the significance of fiscal policy for the performance of the American economy has received an unusual amount of attention in the press, in public forums, in the academic community, and in the business world. Very likely this emphasis is attributable to a view which has gained wide currency to the effect that the revenue productivity of the Federal tax system tends to increase so rapidly—withdrawing so much from the income flow of the Nation—that private spending will be unduly constrained if tax rates are not periodically reduced or if public spending is not increased to fill the gap. The fiscal developments of 1962, 1964, and 1965 seem to have established the validity of the view; the changes in the tax structure apparently were associated with a marked increase in momentum in economic activity until recent months. This happy congruence of appealing theory and a pleasing turn of events has resulted, as is so often the case, in a possibly greater enthusiasm for fiscal manipulation than the limited experience with it might warrant, but this is of much less consequence than the fact that we seem to be focusing on fiscal arithmetic rather than on the real aims and significance of fiscal policy in the first half of this decade.

Any public policy can be appraised only in the light of its objectives. There need not, of course, be a consensus concerning the aims of a public policy, and the rating it gets, therefore, may vary not only because of differences in viewpoint about how it has performed but as well because of disagreements about what it was supposed to do. In the following remarks, then, you will find one system of preferences which, hopefully, will prove persuasive.

In very general terms, fiscal policy, just as any other element of political economy, should seek to contribute to the attainment of the good economic society. A good economic society is highly progressive; its members seek to advance their wellbeing and this desire is a strong motive force in their personal lives and is reflected in the performance of the economy as a whole. The progressive spirit leads them to venture, to look for the new, to seek out challenges to do things better—better than they've been done before and better than anyone else is doing them now. It is fashionable in some quarters these days to speak derisively about building better mousetraps and to decry the gadgetry in our lives, as if these individually inconsequential items were in competition with culturally grander things for our interest and energy. But this isn't the case and ignores the fact that our technical progress consists of the aggregation of all such little bits and pieces of better things and better ways of doing as well as the more glamorous and impressive advances.

A society that gives ample play to this impulse is a dynamic one. It is also highly diverse. Because it's dynamic, it's subject to frequent shock, but because of its diversity, relatively few of the adjustments thereto involve widespread or prolonged dislocations. Indeed, the Nation's economic history offers repeated evidence of the fact when the economy is allowed to adjust of itself to such disturbances it does so relatively quickly and smoothly.

The good economic society is efficient. It allocates the various elements of its production capability to those uses in which they will contribute most to total output and to the well-being of its people. It quickly recognizes changes in costs and in benefits and facilitates rather than impedes the rearrangement of production activity in response to those changes.

The good economic society is busy and fully employed. It avoids prolonged, involuntary unemployment of large numbers of its labor force, or their prolonged employment in submarginal uses. It recognizes, however, that the rate of use of labor, capital, and other agencies of production cannot be absolutely unchanging in a dynamic environment, and is prepared, therefore, to accept moderate deviations from "full employment" for short periods of time.

The good economic society grows. It increases its capabilities for satisfying the material aspirations of its members, while accommodating their desires for diversity and change.

The good economic society is fair and humane. It seeks to make the benefits of its advances available to all of its members by making sure that none of them are debarred from being or becoming productive participants in its activities. It recognizes differences among its members in their ability to contribute and seeks to moderate rather than to enhance these disparities, not by constraining the more productive but by increasing the productivity of the less fortunate. But where this is not feasible, the good economic society is not indifferent to deprivation. It mobilizes its resources to discover and apply enduring remedies and avoids relying on ad hoc reliefs.

Finally, a good economic society relies on its members to provide the impetus and the means for achieving these goals. It recognizes that in our highly complex economic, political, and social environment, individuals will frequently encounter problems with which they are unable to cope unaided; there is, in other words, a wide array of problems with which society as a whole must deal. But the good economic society is careful to limit its assumption of responsibility to concerns of this character and seeks always to reserve to private economic entities—individuals, households, companies—

the maximum possible scope for decision-making, for initiating activity. This is the essence of economic freedom in our world today. And maximizing economic freedom is a major objective of the good society.

How may fiscal policy contribute to attaining the goals of the good economic society? The basic economic facts of life that come to bear here are (1) that every government purchase involves limiting the availability of production capability for carrying out the plans and meeting the demands of private economic entities and that (2) virtually every government levy impacts on the taxpayer's choices among economic alternatives.

The first of these facts accounts for the traditional liberal concern for limiting governmental programs. This is no doctrinaire indictment of government spending. On the contrary, as the society grows and becomes both more complex and more affluent, the extent and scope of demands for publicly afforded services must be expected to increase as well. But taking a realistic view of the likely course of government activity doesn't justify indifference to the perpetuation of programs that either have proved to be invalid or have outlived their former usefulness. Nor does it lead to ready acceptance of the ad hoc addition of new programs, often overly ambitious and impractical, no matter how glamorously named nor how worthy their objective. Nor, moreover, does it require tolerance for ill-conceived experiments which could pass a rudimentary cost-benefit test only if the benefits are measured in such ambiguous terms as "prestige". Instead, this view calls for continual re-evaluation of existing expenditure programs in the light of rigorous, objective measurement of the benefits they convey and the costs they impose and the requirement that any proposed new program meet the same tests. In fact, all proposals for new expenditure programs should be received with a constructive skepticism; we should start with the assumption that the production capability to be allocated to the program would be better left available to meet demands arising in the private sector of the economy and require the program's proponents to persuade us otherwise.

There are, of course, those who are disappointed because government expenditures haven't increased more rapidly, who claim the public sector is "starved", and who assert that great public needs go unmet. It should be clear, however, that such assertions are not objective observations, but expressions of preferences. Moreover, the recent and prospective rates of gain in the magnitude of government expenditures belie the notion of an underprivileged public sector. Between 1960 and 1966, Federal expenditures in the national income accounts increased by 53 percent. In fact, during these years Federal non-defense purchases of goods and services increased twice as rapidly—96½ percent—as gross national product less Federal purchases which increased by 47 percent. And of all the major sectors of the economy, none has increased so rapidly in this period as state and local government spending which expanded by almost two-thirds. Surely these facts should give one pause about some recent, bizarre proposals concerning the fiscal relationships of the Federal and state and local governments.

Fiscal policy for the good economic society will place great emphasis on the manner in which the revenues required to defray government expenses are raised. The tax structure will be submitted to frequent reappraisal to determine whether its burdens are fairly distributed and whether it contributes to moderation of extremes in the distribution of income and wealth. Continuing efforts will be made to identify and to eliminate those elements or features of the revenue system which afford preferential treatment to some taxpayers while discriminating against others. And the same healthy skepticism with which proposals for new government spending programs are received should greet proposals for new tax differentials.

Great importance should be attached to regular, frequent, and significant reductions in tax rates. Virtually all of the objectives of the good economic society are served thereby. Certainly economic growth is enhanced by tax reduction which reduces the constraints on entrepreneurship, on risk-taking, on launching new ventures, and on all sorts of productive effort. Surely the dynamic character of the economy and the efficiency of use of production capability is enhanced by tax rate reduction which moderates the tax advantages or disadvantages of particular groups of taxpayers and thereby reduces tax-induced distortion in the allocation of resources. And beyond doubt, economic freedom is bolstered by general tax reduction which broadens the command of private economic entities over the society's productive resources.

If this view of the good economic society and the fiscal policy which is appropriate thereto is appealing, one can only regret the circumstances which are deemed to forefend a long-range program of periodic tax reduction. Our attention has been called over and over again of late to the growth in our tax system's revenue productivity which accompanies the growth of the economy. There may be competing claimants for this potential increment in revenues, but if the goals presented in this discussion are to be sought, tax reduction should be the preferred course.

A few years ago, it appeared that the Nation was firmly committed to this course. Taxation developments in 1962 made some constructive changes in the revenue structure, and the revenue Act of 1964 and the excise reductions legislated in 1965 seemed to indicate that the Nation had made a commitment to a long-range fiscal policy stressing tax reduction and curbs on the growth of Federal expenditures. Indeed, this was made explicitly clear, as stated in my press release of September 16, 1963: "The purpose of this tax reduction and revision bill is to loosen the constraint which present Federal taxation imposes on the American economy. The results of these tax reductions and revisions will be a higher level of economic activity, fuller use of our manpower, more intensive and profitable use of our plant and equipment; and with the increases in wages, salaries, profits, consumption, and investment, there will be increases in Federal tax revenues. Increases in economic activity, in the use of our resources, in personal and business incomes, and in Federal revenues might be also realized if, instead of reducing taxes, the Congress and the Administration increased expenditures of Government. In other words, there are two roads the Government could follow toward a larger, more prosperous economy—the tax reduction road or the Government expenditure increase road. There is a difference—a vitally important difference—between them. The increase in Government expenditure road gets us to a higher level of economic activity with larger and larger shares of that activity initiating in Government—with more labor and capital being used directly by the Government in its activities and with more labor and capital in the private sector of the economy being used to produce goods and services on Government orders. The tax reduction road, on the other hand, gets us to a higher level of economic activity—to a bigger, more prosperous, more efficient economy—with a larger and larger share of that enlarged activity initiating in the private sector of the economy—in the decision of individuals to increase and diversify their private consumption and in the decisions of business concerns to increase their productive capacity—to acquire more plant and machines, to hire more labor, to expand their inventories—and to diversify and increase the efficiency of their production.

"Section I of the bill is a firm, positive assertion of the preference of the United States for the tax reduction road to a bigger, more progressive economy. When we, as a Nation, choose this road we are at the same time rejecting the other road, and we want it understood that we do not intend to try to go along both roads at the same time.

"The further meaning of Section I of the bill is that no Government activity is to depend for its justification on the amount it contributes to the total spending of the economy, because we prefer to reduce taxes and allow individuals and business concerns in their own right to make that contribution. On the contrary, any and all activities of the Government have to be justified on their importance in serving other essential goals of the Nation. There is no further justification for an indifferent attitude toward wasteful, inefficient Government activities merely because they incidentally give employment—tax reduction will also create job opportunities and in lines of activity which better satisfy the character and demands of the people for an enriched life. There is no more justification for half-hearted efforts or outright failure to eliminate Government programs that have outlived their usefulness just because they also contribute to the total spending stream of the economy—that contribution will be better realized by increasing the purchasing power of consumers and investors through tax reduction. Finally, there is no further occasion for using the additional revenues which will be generated by the expansion of the economy as a result of tax reduction and revision to finance additional Government expenditures, solely because those additional expenditures might add further to expansion of economic activity. If such additional expansion is desired or needed, tax reduction will achieve it just as surely and through vigorous and progressive forces of the private sectors of the economy."

For a brief period after the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, the pace of expansion of Federal expenditures did indeed appear to have moderated, but only briefly. The increase of military efforts in Viet Nam, of course, accounts for a significant part of the subsequent acceleration of expansion of Federal outlays, but two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures from calendar 1963 through 1966—as measured in the National income accounts—is accounted for by non-defense spending. Moreover, as projected in the January 1967 budget message, over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in outlays from fiscal 1966 through fiscal 1968 is to be in non-defense programs.

It is, of course, impossible to turn back the clock and one must, therefore, acknowledge that it will be difficult indeed to bring this rapid acceleration of public spending under control. But unless we are prepared to forgo the course of tax reduction for an indefinite period into the future, we should at the least attempt to achieve a pause in the current enlargement of Federal spending.

This discussion has focused on the broad, long-term objectives of fiscal policy, and little has been said about using fiscal policy, or more specifically tax policy, to offset short-term fluctuations in the rate of expansion of total economic activity. The emphasis in the past year and a quarter has

been on tax changes for short-run stabilization objectives. Questions can certainly be raised as to whether this has been a very happy chapter in the Nation's fiscal history. The request for the suspension of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation last fall and for their reinstatement this spring has been a fiscal experience from which, hopefully, it has been learned that taxes should not be raised and lowered from season to season like the hemlines of women's skirts and dresses. It is also to be hoped that those who have so enthusiastically advocated frequent, short-term tax rate changes have been sobered by the turn in the economic indicators and the question as to whether they have properly discerned the major tendencies in the economy. In my view it is questionable whether the mechanical application of fiscal arithmetic contributes to good public finance.

Fiscal policy has an important assignment, but in recent years its press agents have invested it with more power to determine the size, shape, and character of the economy than it has or should have. Let us hope that fiscal policy will soon be refocused on contributing to the attainment of the good economic society.

The 175th Anniversary of Westford Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and most pleased to bring to the attention of the House the 175th anniversary of Westford Academy, the noted school located in Westford, Mass., in my district, which is celebrating this noteworthy birthday event with impressive exercises on April 28 and 29.

In honor of this anniversary celebration, I was privileged to send to the class of 1967 an American flag which has flown over the Capitol, the cornerstone of which was laid 1 year after the founding of Westford Academy.

I know that my colleagues join me in commending the school officials and the citizens of Westford for arranging the special anniversary program to mark the founding of Westford Academy on April 30, 1792, and at the same time extend heartiest felicitations upon this great, historic event along with best wishes for the future.

This anniversary celebration is indeed a most impressive occasion in the life of the Westford community and our State and Nation, and I extend warm greetings to Westford Academy and all those associated with it as well as heartiest congratulations upon the superb contributions of this outstanding school throughout the years toward the education of the young people in the Westford area and in that way strengthening the posture of our national life.

Looking back upon the achievements of this renowned school down through the years since early colonial days, and in the present generation, it is most appropriate that we should express our pride and gratitude for the unselfish service of the dedicated leaders and teachers at Westford and the high-minded citizenship, lofty ideals, and civic interest of the founders and subsequent trustees, directors, and all others associated with this fine institution.

As the U.S. Representative in Congress of the beautiful town of Westford, I am proud on this 175th anniversary to hail and salute in this House, Westford Academy and the Westford community for all they have done to promote the spiritual ideals, moral truths and lofty principles that have helped to make this Nation great.

May the good Lord continue to bring His choicest blessings upon the students and instructors at Westford Academy, so that its superb educational work and achievements may continue to be an inspiration and challenge to all of us for many years to come.

Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD a letter of congratulations which I sent to the graduating class of Westford Academy:

MARCH 20, 1967.

GRADUATES,
Westford Academy,
Westford, Mass.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: It is with great pleasure that I extend to you—the 1967 graduates of Westford Academy—my heartiest congratulations upon the successful completion of your course and very best wishes for the future.

As you join the many other graduates of your historic, outstanding school, you may well feel a sense of justifiable pride in the fulfillment of your splendid educational objectives.

It is my fervent hope that you will continue with your higher education, because these days the boundaries of human knowledge are truly unlimited, and new horizons are looming up with startling rapidity.

However, the values of our way of life are basic. The principles of freedom, the moral precepts, and the spiritual ideals, which have played such a great part in shaping this nation and projecting our incomparable progress, will always be the cornerstone of our American system.

Whether you enter upon your life's work or continue your education, the opportunities before you are virtually boundless. It will be up to you to embrace them eagerly, and with the same willingness to work hard, the same idealism, enthusiasm, dedication and courage which have marked your years at the Academy.

Your responsibilities as leaders of the future will be great and will require your best efforts. The extent to which you succeed in reaching your goals will depend largely upon yourselves—the way you tackle the tasks at hand, and the firmness of your resolution not to be deterred by temporary setbacks, but to strive with all your hearts, energies and minds until you have reached your chosen objectives.

Your parents and your teachers have done their part and they will continue to counsel, assist and encourage you. The rest will be up to you. The doors of opportunity are open for you. If you remember with our great New England poet that "there is no such word as 'fail' in the lexicon of a bright youth," and order your lives accordingly, you will then be in the best possible position to realize the high goals you set for yourselves in life.

Always remember the lessons you have learned in your homes, in your classrooms, and in your spiritual lives.

Stick tenaciously to your principles and your tasks.

Keep your eyes fixed on the stars and your feet firmly planted on the ground.

Then, as the Bard of Avon said, "It must follow, as the night the day, Thou can'st not then be false to any man."

Above all, remember the duty you owe to those who have made your success to date possible, to continue to follow their precepts and counsel, to recognize that, in the best sense, the greatest rewards you can secure will lie in the realization that you have not lived for yourselves alone, but that you have sought to serve to help your fellow human beings and that you have contributed your full part to making yours a better community, this a better nation, and a better world.

As your Congressman, I want you to know that I am very proud of you and have complete faith that you will go on to higher achievements. I wish for you all, continued, good health, every measure of success in your endeavors, and real happiness and peace for many years to come.

Warm regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1967

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

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

We bow before Thee, O God, in quest of that still small voice within that speaks in moments of silence. Help us for this minute to be quiet in thought and spirit that we may be aware of the presence of the source of all life.

Come to these hearts and minds in a spirit of peace, that peace may be found and shared.

Enter into the lives of our leaders with the spirit of love for God, for a world in need of love, and for a nation that has been blessed with love.

Give to all the desire for the spirit of truth that new insight, understanding, and solution to problems might be gained from the proceedings of this important day.

Renew us in Thy love, O Lord, our strength and Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 28, 1967, was dispensed with.