spect to the question of selection for the site of the atom smasher planned by the Atomic Energy Commission."

Chairman Seaborg has told members of the Illinois General Assembly that the atom smasher may still be moved because of discrimination from Weston to one of the other sites. I challenge him, as I have challenged before:

Where?

Where will this accelerator be moved in the United States, or in the world, where there is no racial discrimination?

I say that Illinois *could* pass an open occupancy statute, but that would not end discrimination in housing in Illinois, any more than similar statutes have ended discrimination in New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, or Colorado, or California.

Presently, 19 states have open occupancy statutes; 31 states have none. If I am to take Chairman Seaborg at his word, then I am to assume that the Atomic Energy Commission will spend no more money in any of the 31 states without an open occupancy statute. Furthermore, those members of Congress who subscribe to this point of view are saying that the United States Government regrets having built Cape Kennedy in Florida, the Redstone Arsenal in Alabama, the Strategic Air Command Headquarters in Nebraska, the Tennessee Valley Authority Dams in Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky, the Internal Revenue Computer Center in West Virginia, the AEC facility at Alamagordo, the Pentagon in Virginia, and that it will never again let a TFX contract to a company in Texas.

I believe that the AEC should stick to its role as a distinguished body of scientists, and should leave the political infighting over whether Illinois does or does not pass an open occupancy law to the governor and the General Assembly of Illinois. I believe the present furor has more likely postponed, rather than hastened passage of the law.

Moreover, I believe the Commission has incorrectly reported the sentiment on Capitol Hill. Most of the Members of Congress who have voiced a reluctance on the matter of the appropriation appear to be members of what might be called the Sore Losers Club. In saying that, I hasten to embrace members from the other five states who have proved that their sense of propriety is stronger than their instinct of acquisitiveness for their states.

Yours very truly,

JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1967.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CRAIG: I feel that the Atomic Energy Commission was less than candid with the communities which were considered for the location of the 200 BEV accelerator with regard to the issue of civil rights.

Chairman Seaborg led the State of California to believe that the issue of residential segregation patterns in Sacramento was "important." On July 22, 1966, in a letter to Gene A. Blanc, Coordinator, Office of Atomic Energy Development and Radiation Protection, State of California, Chairman Seaborg said the Commission "was in the process of reviewing the information of civil rights submitted earlier by Governor Brown, but I feel that you may wish to develop further the question of discrimination in the housing field, especially as a result of this recent letter." (The letter he refers to was one sent to the AEC by Sacramento civil rights leaders.)

As a direct result of Chairman Seaborg's letter, 20 members of the Sacramento Citizens Civil Rights Committee attended five meetings, spending about two and one-half hours per meeting; final meeting to adopt final reports lasted over four hours. A staff of three persons assembling and writing material invested over 600 hours. Special attention was given to apartment housing and some 160 extra secretarial hours were used for this phase of the study. The Sacramento City-County Chamber of Commerce Civic Affairs Manager conducted the technical aspect of the study of education, employment, and housing of minorities, spending evenings as well as daytime office hours on the project and hundreds of hours of time were expended by him.

Two department managers of the Chamber, the director of the Human Relations Committee and five to six secretaries spent untold time on the project. On occasion, I am told, the entire Chamber staff worked on the project. Over 4,000 letters were mailed, over 10 cases of paper, envelopes, postpaid return envelopes, and other materials were used—postage being an expensive factor.

Press reports of recent days would indicate that all of this effort in Sacramento was futile. Even more disturbing is the fact that the Illinois site is only 35 miles from one of the nation's most segregated large metropolitan areas—Chicago.

For your files, I am enclosing a copy of a recent clipping from the *Chicago Tribune* on the racial issue.

Your comments will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1967.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CRAIG: Recently, I requested in a letter to Senator Senator John O. Pastore that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy review the Atomic Energy Commission's evaluations of the Weston, Illinois site selected for the location of the 200 Bev Accelerator. In addition to the housing discrimination issue, I feel that California Sierra Foothills site was unfairly considered in regard to power costs.

The AEC, in a letter addressed to me under date of March 29, 1967, confirms that the Commission used 7.82 mills per kwh as the cost of energy to the Sierra Foothills site for the National accelerator laboratory when comparing it with other sites that had been proposed. I am enclosing an exchange of correspondence which also confirms that the AEC did not endeavor to evaluate separately Pacific Gas and Electric Company's proposal for interruptible power or the assurances conveyed by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District in its letter to Mr. Gene A. Blanc, Coordinator, Atomic Energy Development and Radiation Protection of the State of California of June 6, 1966.

The Commission's March 29 letter states: "If the Sierra Foothills site had been selected for the 200 Bev facility, AEC would have included in its negotiations with PG&E the subject of providing for interruptible as well as firm power."

I find the above logic most difficult to understand. It is obviously known by the AEC that were they to locate at the Sierra Foothills site they would not pay 7.82 mills per kwh for energy any more than they are paying this for energy at the Stanford Linear Accelerator. Instead, they would choose the 70 megawatts firm power which SMUD has agreed to release from the Bureau of Reclamation, purchasing the balance from PG&E on their so-called interruptible schedule, just as do other prime industrials who purchase from PG&E, and the cost of energy would be near *5 mills* instead of near 8 mills per kwh.

As a ranking member of the Joint Committee, it is important that you have this information.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

TWO HUNDRED BEV. GEOLOGY ISSUE RESOLVING

Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.), the ranking House Minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, said core drilling at the proposed Weston, Illinois, site of the 200 Billion Electron Volt atom smasher "has not yet turned up geological conditions which would bar construction of the scientific installation."

A total of 67 core holes are to be drilled. Forty-five have been completed, one is in progress and 21 holes remain to be drilled.

Hosmer said his interpretation of the data so far accumulated is that the glacial soils overlaying limestone bedrock at Weston "are not soft enough to make construction impossible, but not firm enough to make it easy."

Bedrock occurs at a depth of 60 to 90 feet below the ground surface, with a relatively well defined surface sloping generally 10 feet per mile to the south.

"Unless the remaining holes turn up soft spots which would boost foundations costs unreasonably, Weston seems to be 'home free' on the geology issue," Hosmer said.

The National Academy of Science Foundation Panel which established geological requirements for the 200 BEV "sweepstakes" stated "the surficial materials may contain pervious zones and pockets leading to occasional construction problems in excavation. . . . which will not require extraordinary or unusual construction procedures. . . ."

Weston was chosen from a group of "finalist" sites in Wisconsin, Michigan, Colorado, New York, California and Illinois.

Rep. Hosmer stated that Weston's current troubles on the civil rights issue "probably will be resolved in a week or so." He charged "they should never have arisen" and said they are "characteristic of the inept handling of the 200 BEV siting problem by AEC from the beginning."

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1967

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

The Very Reverend Ian White-Thomson, dean of Canterbury Cathedral, England, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Let us pray for the President of the United States, for the Members of this Senate, and for all in civil authority.

O God, by whose power alone men are enabled to live together as brethren: look upon the broken body of humanity, and grant that wherever men meet in council for the ordering of the world, Thy Holy Spirit may bring them into unity. Let Thy forgiveness make us ready to forgive and to be reconciled to those from whom we are estranged; through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Let us pray for peace, especially in Vietnam.

O Holy Spirit, through whom alone men are turned from the ways of evil to the paths of goodness, and by whose help alone our prayers can bear the pattern of God's love: we pray Thee so to move in

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

the hearts and minds of men that the nations, being converted to the will of the one Father, may be able to build a world wherein righteousness and peace shall dwell.

Let us pray for all in need.

Almighty God, Father of all mankind, we bring before Thee the need and despair of those whose lives are broken by the enmities and indifference of men. Prosper all who are working to provide homes for the homeless and food for the hungry. Give wisdom and understanding to all who are called to govern peoples other than their own, that they may be just and merciful in all their dealings; and hasten the day when hatred and enmity may be done away in a common obedience to Thy holy will; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Let us pray for peace between labor and management.

O God, who hast ordained that men should live and work together as brethren: remove, we humbly beseech Thee, from those who are now at variance, all spirit of strife and all occasion of bitterness; that, seeking only what is just and equal, they may ever continue in brotherly union and concord, to their own well-being, and the prosperity of the realm; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Four things a man must learn to do
If he would make his record true:
To think without confusion clearly,
To love his fellow men sincerely,
To act from honest motives purely,
To trust in God and heaven securely.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered on Thursday, May 4, 1967, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. SCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana, with the understanding that the time will not be taken from my time.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business after the conclusion of the votes on the conventions, be limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with postmasters.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Eugene M. Becker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmaster.

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

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

U.S. ARMY

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

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

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

U.S. NAVY

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

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

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

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Navy and Marine Corps.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS—PRIVILEGE OF FLOOR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my assistant, Joan Kurilla, may be present with me on the floor during my address.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], with the understanding that the time shall not be taken from my time.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his courtesy.

POPULATION CENTERS AS AGAINST MEANINGFUL MILITARY TARGETS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the lead story in the May 8 "Periscope" column of Newsweek magazine asserts:

> This will enrage a great many people, but some top Air Force officials now argue that the final stage of the escalating air war over North Vietnam should be a World War II type of punitive bombing of population centers as well as industrial sites.

Starting with the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. J. P. McConnell, and the Air Force Vice Chief, Gen. Bruce Holloway, we have made thorough inquiry; and I am glad to report to the Senate that no "top Air Force officials" recommend any population center bombing, or believe in it. Neither does any member of the Air Force Secretariat.

"Enrage" is a strong word, but this distortion of the aims and capacity of Air Force and naval airpower does distress those who believe that, if the United States is to continue this war on any basis, the Government should use its qualitative advantages, in the air and on the sea, instead of continuing to slug it out on the ground, month by month, one for one, foot by foot, hill by hill. In the last few days, hundreds of the finest of our youth were killed, and hundreds more wounded, in the capture and hold-

ing of three hills in the northwest area of South Vietnam.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff should not make policy. But their opinions as to how we should conduct the tactical day-to-day operating details on the battle-front should not be so consistently disregarded.

It is mathematical that the more the Air Force and the Navy attack the more meaningful military targets in North Vietnam, the less will be the number of guns available against American youth in South Vietnam.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that a thoughtful and interesting article by Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times of May 5, "Raids On Mig Bases," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RAIDS ON MIG BASES—ATTACKS ON TWO OF THE SIX IN NORTH VIETNAM FOUND TO HAVE LITTLE EFFECT SO FAR

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

United States attacks on two of the six principal fields used by the North Vietnamese Air Force have had relatively little effect on the air war so far.

Officers agree that the bombings, though perhaps of political and psychological importance, were bound to have limited military effectiveness because of restrictions that governed them. Air officers say that the attacks, which began April 25, violated some basic principles of air warfare.

Normally, the enemy's airfields are the first target in any war in which air power is involved. Neutralization of the enemy's air power is regarded as essential to gain and maintain air superiority with a minimum of losses.

But the United States has been bombing North Vietnam for more than two years, and the principal jet bases for North Vietnam's MIG fighters were not bombed at all until 10 days ago.

DELAY ALLOWED BUILD-UP

The delay permitted gradual development of a North Vietnamese air force that virtually did not exist three years ago. North Vietnamese pilots trained in the Soviet Union have received advanced "on-the-job training" in North Vietnam.

New planes have been provided by the Russians, and the North Vietnamese air order of battle includes 100 to 120 fighters. A score of these are believed to be MIG–21's, some of them of the late MIG–21D model, equipped with the Soviet A–2 heat-seeking missile.

Reports in aviation circles indicate that even later aircraft are being provided. All of the most modern MIG's are based at Phucyen, a field that has not been bombed. The rest of the growing North Vietnamese Air Force—chiefly MIG–15's and MIG–17's, with a few MIG–19's—is based at Hoalac and Kep, the only two bases so far bombed, and at Glalam, Catba and Kienan.

A second principle of air war was violated the officers say, when the attacks were restricted to only two of the six known bases. The two were regarded as the least important of the six; indeed, when Kep was originally bombed, its runway was being lengthened, and no MIG's were stationed there.

To insure optimum destruction of an enemy's air force, heavy simultaneous attacks upon all his known air bases are regarded by military men as essential.

The targets would be the planes themselves, refueling and rearming facilities, control towers, hangar and maintenance shops and the runways, which should be cratered with heavy bombs.

Heavy earthwork and concrete and steel protecting walls around aircraft parking areas have been built at the North Vietnamese fields; to insure destruction, each parked plane would have to be hit with separate bombs or rockets, or with heavy-caliber ammunition. If the facilities at one or both of the bombed airfields were destroyed, the surviving aircraft could be based on the four fields that have so far been exempted from attack. In time, other fields, now perhaps under construction, could serve similarly.

Presumably the two fields that were attacked were selected by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and the White House because of their distance from Hanoi and from relatively heavily populated areas.

Hoalac is 20 miles west of Hanoi; Kep is 38 miles northeast of the city, Gialam, on the other hand, is in the city's outskirts, in the midst of a built-up area. Phucyen, 16 miles away—perhaps the most important of the six fields is also near some built-up areas. Catba is miles east of Hanoi.

The North Vietnamese planes are few in number but they play a key role in an intricate and tightly integrated air-defense system that is probably—for the area covered—the most modern and the densest in the world.

North Vietnam is defended by early-warning and ground-control-intercept radar in profusion, plus about 200 sites for surface-to-air missiles—some 25 battalions with six launchers each. There are 5,000 to 7,000 anti-aircraft guns of 37-mm., 57-mm., 85-mm., and 100-mm., the heavier ones radar-controlled, plus many lighter weapons.

The MIG–21's, which Senator Stuart Symington says can "outmaneuver, outclimb, outaccelerate and even outrun our own fighters at higher altitudes," have nevertheless had little success in their air-to-air combat with United States planes. But their importance is disproportionate to their numbers.

They have forced many United States aircraft to low levels within range of North Vietnamese antiaircraft, pilots say. Frequently many United States fighter-bombers must jettison their bombs to prepare for air combat.

IF MIG'S WERE IN CHINA

If the bombing of the North Vietnamese airfields were intensive and inclusive enough, the MIG's could be forced to take stanctuary on Chinese bases.

The MIG is a short-range aircraft, designed primarily as a bomber interceptor. Retirement to more distant Chinese fields—perhaps 100 to 300 miles from Hanoi—would considerably handicap it, greatly reducing the ability of the North Vietnamese Air Force to intervene effectively in air battles around Hanoi or Haiphong.

As Gen. William C. Westmoreland said on April 24 in his New York speech, "Their reaction time would be increased," and in air battles time is of the essence.

Greater freedom of action and more effectiveness for United States aircraft should be, as these officers see the situation, the strategic objective of the airfield bombings but because the bombings have been piecemeal and delayed, and because Hanoi, forewarned, has used the time well, they say this result cannot now be achieved without much greater United States effort and more casualties than would have been required a year or two ago.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], with the understanding that the time he consumes shall not be taken from my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE BY WHICH H.R. 3399 WAS PASSED

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H.R. 3399) to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission was passed on Thursday, May 4, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered and placed on the calendar.

MOTION FOR HOUSE TO RETURN TO THE SENATE THE PAPERS ON H.R. 3399

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the papers on H.R. 3399, to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240, to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] moves that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the papers on H.R. 3399, to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240, to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. In keeping with his always-complete cooperation and courtesy to Senators he agreed to yield to me long enough to insert two items in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

PROGRAM TO REFORM WASHINGTON COURTS PROPOSED BY BAR GROUP

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia which deals with problems of law enforcement in the District of Columbia and problems that arise in connection with our courts, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article in the Washington Post of this morning entitled "Bar Group Proposes Progam To Reform Washington Courts," and a digest of the major points on the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BAR GROUP PROPOSES PROGRAM TO REFORM WASHINGTON COURTS—COMMITTEE CITES DELAYS, LACK OF PERSONNEL

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

A committee of leading Washington lawyers, backed by the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals, has drawn up a blueprint for "immediate progress" in reforming the city's crowded, slow-moving courts.

After a year's study, the committee focused on these major problems:

Confusion, waste of manpower and lack of legal safeguards in the Juvenile Court.

Shortages of judges, probation officers, defense attorneys, clerical help, space and money in the Court of General Sessions and its parent D.C. Court of Appeals.

The lack of strong administrative leadership and resulting "far-too-long" delays in the U.S. District Court.

The need throughout the city's system for much more information on how the courts do business and what they need to do it more efficiently.

The committee's 45 recommendations called on the judges themselves to take immediate steps to manage their work better, to ride herd on stalling lawyers and to report regularly on their progress.

MORE LEGAL AID URGED

Many more judges and other court personnel, expanded legal aid for the poor and for juveniles, and a professional efficiency study of the courts also were recommended.

The committee's nine members—Chairman Gerhard A. Gesell, George E. C. Hayes, Mrs. June L. Green, John Pickering, John H. Pratt, James Francis Reilly, Daniel A. Rezneck, Samuel Spencer and Edward Bennett Williams—were named last April by the District's Judicial Council.

The Council, made up of the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals, already has endorsed all of the committee's proposals.

This means that recommendations which the courts can carry out on their own—nearly half of the 45—come virtually as directives from the Judicial Council, which can enforce many of them by rule, if necessary.

SOME EARLY ACTION SEEN

The Judicial Council committee already has discussed them with officials of the courts, and action on some is expected "within a week to 10 days," one spokesman said.

Starting with the Juvenile Court, the committee said it could not recommend adding more judges to it (although it urged that the current vacancy on the three-judge court be filled), because the court is not now "making effective use of all available judicial time."

The committee called for an internal overhaul of the Juvenile Court's case handling procedures and "for greater coordination and communication between judges." This was a clear reference to the public feud between Chief Judge Morris Miller and Judge Orm Ketcham, which has limited the amount of cases assigned to Ketcham daily.

Every child brought before the court should be represented by a lawyer, the committee said it recommended that the court cooperate with the city's bar and legal aid groups to provide attorneys for children whose families cannot afford them.

The lawyers also should have access to the Court's so-called "social file" on each child, the committee urged. The Juvenile Court is now considering a rule making the files available and setting up a limited legal-aid plan.

The committee wants Court officials and police to reexamine their policy of placing children in the overcrowded D. C. Receiving Home to await court hearings. Both groups have consistently resisted this proposal, which was first suggested by the D.C. Crime Commission in its report four months ago.

EARLY REVIEW SOUGHT

A Juvenile Court judge should review the reason for holding a child in the Receiving Home within a day of the child's arrival there, the committee said. The delay before that review is now five to seven days.

The committee said it would also urge the District Commissioners to stop both the Court and the Welfare Department from mixing delinquents with neglected and homeless children in the Receiving Home and other juvenile institutions.

For the Court of General Sessions, the committee recommended adding five more judges, to a total of 26.

Although the Crime Commission had said that more judges were not needed, a committee spokesman said its members felt that the new General Sessions chief judge, Harold H. Greene, had made several reforms in the Court but was still facing long backlogs and delays.

Until a new courthouse can be built to improve the court's "inadequate facilities," the committee suggested that more room be made in General Sessions by taking the D.C. Court of Appeals out of its "civil building."

COURT MOVES OUTLINED

The Appellate Court could be put in the building across E Street nw. that now houses the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, the committee said. The Military Court, which meets only three times each month, could in turn be put into "some place like the new Court of Claims," a committee spokesman suggested.

The primary problem in the U.S. District Court, the committee concluded, was that the chief judge did not have the power of administrative help to regulate the work of the other judges and to improve case handling procedures.

At the committee's urging, the Judicial Council is now considering adoption of a rule that would greatly expand the chief judge's powers and responsibilities. Right now, he is only an "equal," a committee spokesman said, explaining that the other judges seldom are bound by his direction.

The committee urged District Court judges to "be less lenient" in granting lawyers' requests to continue cases. It wants all civil suits called up for hearing three times a year in attempts to settle them before trial whenever possible. Civil suits now may lie fallow for years without any judicial action.

MANAGEMENT STUDY

A management study of the entire city court system, as recommended by the committee, is now in the final stages of planning by the Judicial Council and the staff of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee chaired by Sen. Joseph D. Tydings (D-Md.).

Announcement of private foundation and Government grants covering the estimated $400,000 cost of the study is expected within a few weeks. The study is expected to begin next fall.

The Judicial Council committee underlined the need for more probation officers and other court personnel for each of the trial courts. The Juvenile Court probation officers should be based in the neighborhoods where the children they supervise live, the committee added.

It also wants enough personnel in each court to operate the Criminal Justice Act program, which pays lawyers to defend indigents, and 10 more Legal Aid Agency public defenders for the Court of General Sessions, where 4,000 criminal defendants show up without lawyers each year.

The total cost of implementing all 45 recommendations would be about $4 million, a committee spokesman estimated. More than half of that would be spent in General Sessions, he said, and the bulk of the rest for the Juvenile Court.

The committee will continue its study of the courts and will issue more recommendations later, the spokesman said this first group of suggestions will be discussed at the District's Judicial Conference of judges and lawyers later this month.

REPORT'S MAJOR POINTS

Here are the major recommendations of the Judicial Council committee for improving Washington's courts:

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

It should have five more judges, 10 more public defenders and 23 more probation officers.

Judges' salaries should be raised from $23,500 to $27,500 to conform with other big cities.

Witness fees should be raised from 75 cents to $4 a day, plus travel expenses.

Court for some criminal, traffic, small claims and landlord cases should be held at night.

A new courthouse should be built.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

The Chief Judge should have and use strong powers to regulate the other judges and to control the court's workload.

Judges should not grant so many lawyers' requests to have cases continued.

More effort should be made to settle civil suits before trial.

JUVENILE COURT

Every child brought before the court should have a lawyer.

Homeless and neglected children should not be sent to the same institutions as delinquents.

Delinquents locked up in the D.C. Receiving Home to await hearings should be brought into court sooner.

The judges should cooperate better in managing their work.

Paternity, child support and other adult cases should be transferred to the Domestic Relations Branch of the Court of General Sessions.

D.C. COURT OF APPEALS

It should have six judges instead of three.

It should be moved out of the overcrowded General Sessions Court and into the building across the street now used by the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

It should have more staff to reduce clerical delays.

Its procedures should be made clearer to lawyers.

THE SYSTEM

A planned $400,000 efficiency study of all the city's courts by a management expert should be made as soon as possible.

Each court should have a trained administrator with enough power and staff to streamline procedures.

Each court should report publicly every three months on the size of its caseload, length of delays and what it is doing to deal with them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very penetrating and, I think, unanswerable editorial in the Washington Post of this morning entitled, "Deficiencies in the Courts" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEFICIENCIES IN THE COURTS

The price of justice for this community has been outlined with admirable clarity by the Judicial Council's Committee on the Administration of Justice. Nine eminent lawyers under the chairmanship of Gerhard A. Gesell have listed the needs of the five courts serving the District. The total is rather formidable. Yet it is difficult to see how any one of more than 40 recommendations can be ignored without detracting from the quality of justice here.

The unfortunate truth is that most of the local courts are overwhelmed with their burden of adjudicating cases. The volume of work in the D.C. Court of Appeals, for example, has grown to a point where it needs six judges. It has only three. The United States

District Court is critically short of administrative staff, and the Chief Judge lacks the authority to manage the court in an efficient manner. It is said that 150 cases in that court are awaiting sentence because of the shortage of probationary officers to make presentence surveys. High on the list of requirements for its court are expansion of the administrative staff and a detailed management survey to help it clear up its self-defeating backlog of stale cases.

For the Court of General Sessions the experts prescribe five additional judges, increased salaries, a night court, an improved library, 10 more legal-aid attorneys, 23 more probation officers, more law clerks, higher witness fees, a management study and enlargement of its jurisdiction. For all the local courts the Committee recommends regular quarterly reports to the bar and the public—reports that would focus attention upon their performance and their problems. In addition, of course, there is urgent need for a new court building. Many of the recommendations can be put into effect by the courts themselves or by the Judicial Council, but other improvements must await action by Congress and the appropriation of about $4 million for new and increased salaries and the proposed management surveys.

The Juvenile Court presents a special problem that could not be fully explored by this programmaking Committee. But the report alludes to the feud within the court by calling for "greater coordination and communication between the judges" and for more efficient use of available judicial time. Among 13 pointed recommendations for the Juvenile Court are these: No child should be detained beyond "the next court day" without a hearing; neglected or dependent children should not be mingled wtih delinquents; counsel should be appointed in every case where a child appears without a lawyer; the Corporation Counsel should play a larger role in juvenile cases; probationary and psychiatric services available to the court should be greatly improved. No community that is concerned with a mounting volume of youthful crime can afford to ignore such critical deficiencies in its juvenile court as may be seen between the lines of this brief report.

Fortunately, all the recommendations of the Committee have the endorsement of the Judicial Council. Presumably this means that the Council will issue directives putting the reforms into effect wherever possible. But the hearty cooperation of Congress, individual judges and the public will also be needed if these grave shortcomings in our judicial system are to be overcome.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not rise to criticize the courts. I believe the courts in the District of Columbia do a remarkable job in view of the inadequate support that they receive from the Congress. However, for years, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia I have been pleading on the floor of the Senate for more adequate support of our courts and a larger number of courts because we are faced with a most serious problem involving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia, in all areas of jurisprudence, and not only in the area of criminal jurisprudence.

Mr. President, I close by highly commending the District Bar Commission for the recommendations they have made, and the Washington Post for carrying out a great educational responsibility in publishing the two items to which I have referred.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

ADDRESS BY FORMER GOV. ALF M. LANDON, AT THE WICHITA CONFERENCE ON CHINA, WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Alf M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas and an outstanding student of our international problems, spoke on Saturday, May 6, at the Wichita conference on China, Wichita State University, under the auspices of the League of Women Voters of Wichita and the American Friends Service Committee.

Governor Landon spoke frankly and forthrightly on "Our Confused Foreign Policy."

In his speech Governor Landon stressed the need for a thorough reappraisal of our commitments and our ability to effectuate them.

He stated:

What the country needs is for the President to create an actual council of state, which should include at least the majority and minority leaders of the Congress and the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to operate within the full meaning of the term.

And I do not mean for a mere briefing. I mean a fully informed council of state which will consider not only Vietnam, but all other perilous options calling for immediate consideration and decision in Asia, Africa and the Western Hemisphere.

That council of state means an assessment of our entire foreign policy, recognizing that Vietnam does not exist apart from that.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

OUR CONFUSED FOREIGN POLICY

(By Alf M. Landon)

Tonight I discuss the hard facts of war and peace problems and policies in the light of the world we actually live in and in the light of the dangerous developments of the past month. The war in South Vietnam has once more entered a new phase—brought on by the bombing of power plants in the city limits of Hanoi and MIG airfields in North Vietnam.

At this stage in our affairs, we find the United States of America fighting the fourth largest war in our history far from our shores.

We find ourselves cast in the role of the imperialist aggressor in the eyes of much of the world.

Saddest of all, we find self-doubt—widespread confusion except a noisy few—not over fighting the war in South Vietnam to a successful conclusion, but over the administration's double-talk concerning what the war is all about—President Johnson's lack of constitutional authority—and why the President escalated the Vietnam war from the little handful of Kennedy advisors to the major war it is today.

I do not mean that Americans are not going to have to finish the job in Vietnam that President Johnson started. I do mean that we need more realistic information on what that job entails.

Never in our history—except perhaps the bloody mass riots in New York City in 1863 and 1864, in protest against the draft and the Civil War—have we known anything like the disgraceful and shameful burning of the American flag and draft cards that took place in our great and beloved country on Saturday, April 15th.

The right of lawful dissent is a precious one, and must be guarded zealously and be protected in every phase of American public life.

The attempt by some to rationalize tramping on the flag—draft card burning and vilifying a president of the United States—cannot be classified with the sacred right of dissent.

Their irrational emotional display only serves to discredit and disrupt objective discussion and consideration of the facts and solution of the world's present perilous position.

Equally unrealistic and emotional is the committee of one million against the recognition of China and its admission to the United Nations, or those who are for limiting all trade with Communist countries—or for a total military or "peace at any price" solution of our Vietnam-Asian issues.

Laying those extremists aside, there exists a broad field of legitimate protests of the President's leadership that cannot be classed as "unpatriotic."

For the first time in our history, in an effort to silence his critics, a president has brought home a field commander of a major war and put him into the political arena.

The basic mistake President Johnson has made was to underestimate what Americans had to do to win in South Vietnam. That contributed as much to giving Hanoi a lift as any demonstrations anywhere.

This is the most centrally controlled war by a president that America has ever fought—not only on selecting the North Vietnam targets, but also on the type and load of bombs to be carried by the bombers.

General Westmoreland has more people dictating to him the conduct of the war than any general in command on the field of action in our history.

Since Mr. Johnson is selecting both the political and military targets with respect to the conduct of the Vietnam war, Americans have the right to fix the responsibility on him for the conduct of that war and for failure to achieve peace. So far, the President has failed to act on General Westmoreland's latest request for more troops.

The unpopularity of the Vietnamese war is born of frustration and confusion arising from national administration statements that conflict with what we do in South Vietnam—both militarily and politically—and the failure of our national administration to relate it clearly to our overall foreign policies. Vietnam has always been a part and parcel of the world's international relations which include many other unsolved key problems.

Vietnam is more than merely of American concern. The fact can not longer be concealed that it is an Asian war—not an isolated South Vietnamese war. It is not a war of conquest. And President Johnson says it is not a war for a military base in Asia.

Yet the war has turned South Vietnam into an enormous military base—one of the greatest installations in the world. The question of who is going to occupy it when the American military personnel leave is one of more than pressing concern to every government in the world. It is obvious that the South Vietnamese have neither the technological knowledge, training, economy, natural resources nor population to fit that tremendous job.

Yet President Johnson disposed of that momentous question off-hand when he offered—as soon as a peace agreement with Hanoi is reached—to withdraw five hundred thousand American military personnel within six months—a completely unrealistic solution—as well as another presidential unilateral decision.

President Johnson's off-again, on-again, gone-again strategy in Vietnam shattered confidence in military and political minds all over the world in his leadership, and has precluded support from those who believe in an open society based on democratic processes as

compared with Communistic rule by a closed society.

The failure of President Johnson to match what he says with what he does in Vietnam is not a partisan observation. That failure has been consistently questioned by Democrat members of the Congress. In fact, President Johnson's own party leaders in our country have been outspoken and critical—for different reasons—of the way he has dragged his feet, either in missing opportunities to settle the Vietnam war satisfactorily to America and our allies, or in his tactical military decisions.

The questions raised concerning the President's Vietnam military and political policies are clearly bipartisan. Clearly they question more than our masive military intervention in that little jungle-dominated country with a sizeable stone-age population. Clearly President Johnson at times has attempted to characterize that little country in the kind of unrealistic emotional terms that all wars must be wrapped in, in order to make them popular.

Vietnam is a concrete example of chain reactions that exist in all fields of life's affairs. Beginning in 1948, I urged that we could no more ignore China than Pike's Peak, and urged diplomatic recognition, with admission of China to the United Nations. Had we recognized in that normal way the existence of China—instead of thinking we could wish it away—the question now can be raised with validity whether either the Korean War or the Vietnamese war would have ever occurred.

Although Mao is a ruthless would-be conquerer—following in the footsteps of others like Napoleon and Stalin the Terrible—it must be noted that he ran the Russians out of Manchuria—thus preventing their domination of China.

Also, China was practically invited into Korea by Secretary of State Dean Acheson when he publicly stated that Korea was beyond the periphery of American interests.

Vietnam became a major scene of action because our last three presidents stumbled into an expanding war there through their political policies affecting other more crucial areas in world affairs and through the Soviets' and Mao's attempt to establish new colonial empires in Africa and Asia.

Vietnam was not selected by either side as the site for the critical decisions it now occupies—any more than Gettysburg was planned as a crucial battlefield by Generals Lee and Meade in our Civil War. The Vietnam War—that started as a mere jungle skirmish—with American forces presented to the American people as merely "advisors"—is growing bigger month by month.

Although Vietnam is the fourth largest war in our history, it is somewhat of a prologue to coming momentous events that require reappraisal and re-evaluation of the executive's political policies by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

American preoccupation with the Vietnam war hinders the realization that all the Communist world is solidly behind Hanoi.

In October, 1964, when Chou and Mao proposed to Washington, Moscow, London and Paris 2 days after China's first successful nuclear bomb—a conference of those five nuclear powers for the purpose of discussion preliminary to a conference of all the world governments to eliminate nuclear weapons—our national administration dismissed China's bomb as obsolete and its proposal as mere propaganda.

I immediately urged acceptance of their proposal for the purpose of discussion. If it was only propaganda, that was the way to expose it. United Nations Secretary General U Thant the next morning endorsed my response. Russia and France accepted China's proposal. Prime Minister Wilson reversed his previous public and private record in joining with President Johnson in rejecting this proposal.

That could well have proved to have been one of the decisive decisions in all the world's history.

That conference would, of course, have had to include a settlement of the Vietnam war. At that time, we had not bombed the north, as President Johnson pledged he would not do.

The administration talks about a NATO and a Europe that do not exist. President Johnson has talked about a South Vietnam that never existed and a United Nations that never existed.

A World War Two peace treaty has never been signed. We have had—and have now—six divisions stationed in Europe. The Korean War settlement was polished to look like peace. We still have a 50,000 military force there and half the country is still Communist.

We even talk about a Cuba which does not exist. Russia has a military beachhead there 90 miles from our shores. We ignore that like an ostrich with its head in the sand—as we have China. Yet we are fighting a big war in the other half of the world while looking over our shoulder, concerned whether China will do this if we do that.

Yet we wonder at the huge anti-administration demonstrations here at home and anti-Americanism all over the world.

I do not doubt for one minute that—as Secretary of State Rusk said—the "Communist apparatus" has been very active in U.S. demonstrations and elsewhere all over the world. However, quoting Ambassador Goldberg, "Well, I'm sure the secretary did not mean to equate dissent with disloyalty."

Therefore, let us think about our foreign policies in an interdependent world that does exist—a world in which local elections in England, in Germany, in India, in Japan make front page headlines here as do American local elections—a world in which the people are more interested in saving their own respective hides than being reformed en masse in our image. As I said—on this point—some 25 years ago—all the world does not like ice cream sodas.

Imperialistic Communism is defeating itself by the failure of the Lenin-Marx theories wherever they have been tried and by its ruthless brutality.

We must consider momentous events that are occurring in Asia. There is an evident swing there among heretofore unquestioned neutralist countries against Communist domination. Indonesia has resumed its place in the United Nations and is gradually re-establishing better relations with America.

Another significant turn in Premier Ky's reversal of his truculent, belligerent position following the Honolulu meeting in February, 1965—at Manila in October, 1966—and at Guam a few months later.

In February, 1967, the Premier proposed that Hanoi and Saigon discuss peace themselves on terms including the Viet Cong in the Hanoi delegation—amnesty for them and their inclusion in any South Vietnamese government if elected in a free election. Hanoi has not replied.

Of course, the stumbling block is the well known fact that Communists are very allergic to free elections.

Recently Singapore's Prime Minister publicly stated, "We may well prefer a permanent American military presence. What is happening in Vietnam cannot be repeated."

Cambodia is going through the same conflict that bothered Indonesia for a while in its revolt for independence and freedom from China. The Cambodian government is trying to reconcile its resistance to encroaching Communism with American containment policies in Asia without, at the same time, asking for direct military aid.

These reversals of Communism in Asia probably contributed to the modification last March of the Sino-Russian split to the point at least of speeding up railroad transportation across China of Russian military equipment and supplies for North Vietnam.

This new development, in turn, has stiffened Hanoi's position on negotiations for a settlement in Vietnam.

The biggest question confronting all foreign offices at this very moment is how much further will the healing of that Sino-Soviet split go. Therefore, this swing away from Chinese influence in Asian neutral countries is most timely.

We must know in order to wisely consider these developments what pledges President Johnson made at the Manila Conference—or what might well be construed as pledges by any Asiatic nations that would involve the United States of America in another war like Vietnam.

Why has not President Johnson submitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—the most unique and powerful legislative Committee of all the world governments—the text of what he said at the Manila Conference in October, 1966? Every other government in the world has that complete manuscript by this time. Why is it still a secret from the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—where, under proper constitutional procedure, it belongs?

I believe it is the responsibility of this distinguished Committee to re-examine our overall foreign relations. It is timely for the Congress to temper our evangelistic foreign policy with reality.

Mr. Johnson's failure to comply with our constitutional requirements for a declaration of war by the Congress is another case in point of the complete ignoring of our democratic processes by our impulsive President—by his plunging ahead naively—assuming that because we are the richest country in the world, we can do anything we want under the sun. Meanwhile, his fiscal policies are arousing increasing doubts in the monetary markets of the world.

While all this is occurring in Asia, hot spots continue to develop in Africa—particularly with reference to Rhodesia and South Africa. The great strategic importance of Aden as an air and naval base which England is going to leave is not to be overlooked if Nasser occupies it. Along with the majority of the United Nations, at England's request we voted sanctions on Rhodesia that are not working and are of doubtful constitutionality.

That brings us to glimmers of hope for discovery of terrestrial peace instead of a smoldering nuclear war, and for continuation of the Soviet adjustment of Marx-Lenin theories by spreading capitalistic principles in Russia and other Communist countries in varying degrees. Rising nationalism—the disintegration of the European Cold War by growing East-West tradewinds, the advent of the Sino-Russian split, a shrinking Communist position in Asia and Africa—these are momentous developments. It's been a long time since we have heard that old Soviet chant of "decadent capitalism." They are even boasting now of their economic gains resulting from individual profit incentives.

That adjustment started in Europe a year or so ago with the Soviet abandoning its theretofore truculent and belligerent policies for a better workable understanding with West Europe.

President Johnson last summer then responded by giving notice of reversing the impractical policies of his predecessors that were based on the unification of West Germany and of ignoring the existence of China. "Building bridges" with Russia and China, he called it.

Then came another curious go-and-stop in the President's policies. He made no attempt to push the American-Russian consular treaty through the Congress—until last

February, when he was informed if he really wanted it, he would have to get behind it—which he finally did.

Also, he has not lifted a finger to get approval of his recommendation to the Congress for legislation freeing trade from its present restrictions between America and the Communist countries—except for a special bill of limited extent.

Yet the trade legislation, in particular, is a very important step in better relations with the Soviet and all Communist governments.

I have long believed that trade was the greatest influence for international understanding and the greatest deterrent to war in this modern world of ours. The market place is where the theories of Lenin and Marx failed. Therefore, the market place is where Communist imperialism is the weakest. Trade—not force—is the key to the counter revolution that is slowly taking place—not suppressing by force what was created by force—but by economically reducing a complex Communist structure to discredit.

The repeal of our present restrictions on Communist trade is certainly the place for America to make a realistic start on "building bridges with Russia." Throughout all history, the market place has been where Homo Sapiens got acquainted.

Retention of these trade restrictions means only waving fists on our part at the Communists. The Communist nations can get—and are getting—whatever they want and need from our NATO allies—who are doing much business with them—while we are doing little.

The trade and cultural agreement with Poland, which was recently concluded for submission to the Congress, makes sense in equating American interests with that country.

In August, 1966, President Johnson offered a different, sound and constructive policy with China. Then again came the curious contradictions that have so often characterized the President's policies and statements. At the same time he was talking of "building bridges," he continued to oppose China's admission to the United Nations.

President Johnson must push vigorously his corollary legislation, pending in Congress for almost two years, for open trade with Communist countries.

Also, we must withdraw our opposition to the admission of China to the United Nations and we must grant diplomatic recognition of China—if and when there is a stable central government once clearly established in that country.

The need is to re-think—with our allies and associates of the non-Communist world—aspirations and goals for living a happy life. By that I mean a good life—based on tangible pragmatic arrangements. Many old concepts must be revised by the Soviets—by Chinese—by Americans and by other great and proud peoples.

Vietnam has become the stage—the location—for what can be the modern world's greatest tragedy—or Vietnam can become a great construction of a remote jungle country primitive society. Vietnam can become the start of the brightest epoch in the history of mankind—or the darkest.

Last March occurred an ominous development—the Sino-Soviet modification of their bitter split to the point at least of speeding up railroad transportation across China of Russian military equipment and supplies for North Vietnam.

Brezhnev exultingly boasted about it and what that meant in the way of "direct and active political, economic and military help" from Russia. Therefore, its meaning must be read in that light.

The biggest—the most momentous question confronting all foreign offices at this very moment is how much further will the healing of that split go. If it leads to uniting once again the Communist nations and parties in every country with that Asian giant—and uniting China itself once again—it would be the biggest news since China's first nuclear bomb.

The position of the United States in Vietnam changed almost over-night in the middle of April. The biggest jump in escalating the Vietnam war occurred with the bombing of North Vietnamese air fields and targets closer to Hanoi and Haiphong Harbor. Is that President Johnson's reply to the Sino-Russian escalation of the Vietnam war?

Three weeks ago administration officials broke that bad news indirectly to Americans and the world when our southeast Asian allies, meeting in Washington, were told that prospects for peace in Vietnam were extremely poor and forecast a long war. The principal reason given was the Sino-Soviet agreement providing quick and dependable delivery of Soviet military supplies over Chinese railroads to North Vietnam.

Two weeks later, the State Department informed a committee of the Congress that there is no danger for the United States in the Sino-Russian deal. The State Department said the same after the first Chinese nuclear bomb.

This crucial decision is not the sole responsibility of President Johnson based on information available only to him. He should make a complete report of all the information he possesses to a council of state of the executive and legislative leaders who should be given the opportunity to share that responsibility with him.

World War One was stumbled into—just as America stumbled into Vietnam. There was no reason for a small country down in the Balkans to precipitate a catastrophe like World War One except it became a test of strength between great powers.

By the same token, Vietnam has similarities to the precipitation of World War One.

When Austria sent the ultimatum to Serbia in 1914, it was thinking only of a small war. When President Kennedy sent in the first eight or ten thousand "advisors," he was thinking of a small war—a Vietnamese war.

It is no longer a Vietnamese war. It is no longer a small war. It is more than an American big war—our fourth largest. It is constantly growing bigger. This small war has become a major war. Now, in view of the Sino-Russian agreement on transportation, it can become even greater.

Just as the Balkan War of 1914 escalated into first a European war—then a World War—when one nation after another entered—so this small Vietnam war has escalated on the battle front to a big war and is threatening to escalate still bigger by more nations being drawn into it.

A concrete illustration that the Vietnamese war may be reaching that point of climax is the new Sino-Russian treaty of last March. This treaty may mean two things. One—a forerunner of the renewal of Sino-Russian cordial solidarity; that is—provided the Chinese central Government does not break up into segments of war lords, as may well occur. And two—whether President Johnson's immediate widening of the field of targets for American bombers in North Vietnam was in response to the Sino-Russian agreement or whether it is his counter to Hanoi's increased bombing, as Secretary of Defense McNamara says, and whether the Sino-Russian support stimulated Hanoi—whatever it is—the biggest jump in escalating the war in Vietnam occurred in the middle of April.

That certainly precipitates the question whether more escalation of the American war in Vietnam is threatening to reach a point of no return from actual collision with Russia or China—or both.

That is the question that must be decided without any further delay. It would be best if it were not done unilaterally—from the White House.

What the country needs is for the President to create an actual council of state, which should include at least the majority and minority leaders of the Congress and the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to operate within the full meaning of the term.

And I do not mean for a mere briefing. I mean a fully informed council of state which will consider not only Vietnam, but all other perilous options calling for immediate consideration and decision in Asia, Africa and the Western Hemisphere.

That council of state means an assessment of our entire foreign policy, recognizing that Vietnam does not exist apart from that.

This is what the statesmen of Europe on the eve of World War One did not realize—that Austria's attack on Serbia was tied up with the entire foreign policy of all the European nations.

Let us not continue to make that mistake with reference to Vietnam. Let us not stumble into another world war by ignoring the fact that Vietnam is a major part and parcel of the foreign policies of other great powers.

We have got all sorts of perilous pieces—like Rhodesia, the Red Sea, NATO, our Southeast Asian allies, Europe—to mention the most obvious—which resemble a jigsaw puzzle which this council of state needs to fit together for a foreign policy that is not improvised over-night to fit each recurring crisis.

What I am asking for is a complete reappraisal of international relations of the countries of the world—not by the executive alone, but also by the legislative, represented by the proper leaders of both parties in responsible positions.

That of necessity includes a review of missed opportunities for "building bridges" for peace by the last three presidents.

The United States and other powers have really paid only lip service to the United Nations. The United Nations was oversold to begin with and has been oversold since by politicians and idealists alike.

All the great powers have acted unilaterally outside the United Nations when it came to their own interests—just as was the case with the League of Nations. When they had a hot potato they could not handle—or did not want to handle—they dumped it into the United Nations and then proceeded to sweep it under the carpet, as was done with the Congo and Cuba and is now being done with Rhodesia.

Oh, sure, at England's request sanctions were levied against Rhodesia—over the protest of the small African countries who said such sanctions represented a mere gesture because they would not work.

We are concentrating on the best way to wage war or to survive war—not to prevent war.

The United Nations is the only agency we have to work out the guidelines for a world without war. We are not concentrating on making the U.N. work as was intended when it was organized. So far, its original purpose after 20 years is far short of the hopeful anticipation of the role it could and should fulfill in adjusting international relations and settling disputes without war.

The United Nations as it exists today is not an organization that can block war—except for a few special cases. It is a forum for discussion and to that extent of value.

We have witnessed a number of so-called summit talks since World War Two. Why not a summit conference of all the major powers for a thorough over-hauling of the United Nations in the light of experience—in the light of the necessity of preventing a future nuclear war?

Concentrating on this goal—under the

pressure of the proliferation of nuclear weapons—and realizing the impracticability of eliminating nationalism in any world organization—the United Nations can be at least a more effective organization in dealing with the long range problems of stability in the world on which peace is always built.

That, of course, calls for more cooperative policies by the major powers and in stronger support of the United Nations. That is the lesson they must learn if the United Nations is to be a more effective barrier to a nuclear war.

All these eminent and momentous questions—starting with Vietnam—are a part and parcel of the same package. Man is standing at his last crossroad. Either he works out the way to peace and survival—or he stumbles into the bottomless pit of nuclear war.

And time is running out for all mankind—for all major and minor powers.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I am always glad to see in the RECORD any statement made by the distinguished former Governor of Kansas, Alfred M. Landon, a man of great sagacity, whose consideration of public issues continues to be a matter of general interest. His sagacity, his reflective mind, his contributions to the American scene are always noteworthy.

I am very proud to claim former Governor Landon as a good personal friend.

INVESTIGATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the social security law will have served the people of the United States for 32 years this August 14. We must all be grateful for the farsightedness of Congress which, when Americans were suffering the deepest of economic depressions, enacted a social insurance that is so vital today.

In 1935 when the Social Security Act became a working reality, the visage of America was different from that of today. We were in the depths of a devastating depression. People had little and expected less. The social security law was originated under those condition as a minimum protection against destitution in old age.

As the Nation grew, standards changed, and prices increased with the rising economic level. Minimum protection and services of the social security law broadened as the system came to grips with other social ills.

Mandated increases in the years following the Second World War more than doubled old-age pensions. Couples who retired in 1940 and received social security payments of $36.40 a month were getting $120.60 a month by 1959. Today, they would receive $140 each month.

If we consider the pension dollar in 1939 as having a purchasing power of 100 cents, that dollar's purchasing power dropped to 46.9 cents by 1960, more than offsetting a social security benefit increase of 7½ percent in 1958. By 1965, the purchasing power of the dollar was 44 cents, and social security benefits increased by 7 percent. Today, the pension dollar will buy only 42.2 cents of the goods and services that it would have purchased in 1939.

Because of this, the Republican coordinating committee, of which I am a member, proposed an increase of another 8 percent in social security benefit payments. The committee urged also that an automatic cost-of-living increase provision be written into the social security law. This coincides also with a recent AFL–CIO recommendation for a provision in the social security law against such erosion of benefits.

To further help retired people maintain a decent standard of living, I introduced this year a bill which would permit those who receive social security benefits to earn up to $3,000 annually without loss of pension funds. At the present time, beneficiaries lose pension money when they have earned over $1,500 a year.

SOCIAL ILLS

In its 32 years of existence, the social security law grew and attempted to deal with many of the problems of our society.

The old-age pension of that original law became an old age, survivors, and disability insurance program in 1956. The law established the basis for related State and Federal programs which today serve the needs of the blind, the unemployed, dependent children and their mothers, orphaned children and crippled children.

This left still another area for our concern with the less fortunate. We recognized that the aged and the indigent, those who are in the greatest need of doctors and hospitalization, are the least able to afford proper medical care. Congress provided health insurance benefits for the aged through the Social Security Amendments of 1965. The program is known as medicare.

But with these developments which changed social security to meet more fully the needs of our people, there occurred other changes which began to erode the benefits. Almost unnoticed, social security has become a bureaucratic operation of unwieldy systems which no longer are able to cope with today's increased workload.

TODAY'S PROBLEMS

All of us recognize that social security pensions and other benefits are hardly enough to meet the needs of this complex society. Yet we have overlooked a basic malfunction in the administration of this program which cancels for many the very benefits it was devised to provide.

The problem today is that more and more people have to wait longer and longer periods of time before they receive their social security checks.

My office is inundated with pleas from Pennsylvanians who have made repeated, unsuccessful entreaties to local and regional social security offices concerning long-delayed payments. The Social Security Administration in Washington has prepared a written statement in response to inquiries about abnormal delays. This indicates that such cases are not confined to my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but have developed into a national problem.

The problem is a very real one to those who depend entirely on that social security check that may fail to arrive.

Social security is the major source of income for about one-half of the beneficiaries over 65. For nearly one-fifth of the aged couples and more than one-third nonmarried beneficiaries, social security is their sole source of income. Imagine how even 1 month's delay in a social security check affects the lives of these people.

A widow with three small children in Pittsburgh filed a claim for a social security pension on May 27, 1966, shortly after her husband's death. Having received no money, 10 months later, the woman asked my office in Pittsburgh for help on March 10, 1967. After checking with the local social security office, my staff called directly to the Philadelphia payment center where her claim had been filed. On March 13, the widow received a check, but said that the amount was less than she was entitled to receive.

On April 4, one of my assistants wrote to the regional director in Philadelphia. Nearly 3 weeks later, on April 21, my Pittsburgh office received a letter of acknowledgment. It is now almost a year since the original claim was filed.

I receive an average of 30 such pleas each week.

THREE CAUSES OF DELAY

Three factors, all of which could be remedied, seem to cause such delays: First, an antiquated system of operation; second, an inefficient system of locating critical case files; and third, an overload of work caused by the new medicare program.

One Social Security Administration employee in Pennsylvania tells my office that the following situation exists today:

The local office is handicapped by its own system of operation. Because of the system, it can take up to six weeks to receive word on cases which are identified as critical. Claim delays up to two months are not unusual.

When a local Social Security office receives a complaint from a beneficiary, the office files a form with its regional office, which is Philadelphia in the case of Pennsylvania. I understand that it is a Social Security Administration rule that the local office must wait 15 days before taking further action.

If further action by the local office is necessary and if the complaint is one of particular hardship, the complaint enters "critical case procedure." The local office may mail a list of critical cases to the regional office only once a week.

The local office must then wait another 10 days before taking further action. At that point, the critical case could be in any one of six regional offices: New York, Philadelphia, Birmingham, Chicago, Kansas City, or San Francisco. When this happens the local office loses direct control over the case.

The local office which filed the original complaint may not make further inquiry to the regional office handling the critical case, but must direct all questions through its own regional office.

What regional office handles an individual case is determined by the beneficiary's original entry into the Social Security program. If a retired Pennsylvania steelworker began paying Social Security for the first time on a job in California, everything involving his pension, including payment, would be handled from the San Francisco office.

A second major cause of delay is the Social Security Administration's "freeze list" system of locating files which are in process of review.

Account numbers from the critical case lists sent to the regional office weekly are

mimeographed and circulated to the dozen work stations where case reviewers have hundreds of cases out of file. Arrival of the freeze list on the reviewer's desk demands that all regular work must stop. The reviewer is to search through the files on his desk to locate any of the wanted files. These, of course, are the critical cases.

My office is told, however, that as a reviewer is promoted in rank and in salary scale, he must meet and maintain a certain daily caseload. If stopping to look for missing files on critical cases will keep a reviewer from meeting his daily quota of cases reviewed, he just might not stop to look for the files.

A Social Security Administration employee told my office that some account numbers are carried from one weekly freeze list to another.

A third major cause of delays is the growing backlog of delayed medicare payments and other administrative problems involved with this new program. They create a work overload in social security offices which further delays progress on social security claims.

Enacted by Congress in 1965, the hospital insurance amendments went into partial effect on July 1, 1966. While the medicare program, as it is popularly known, is administered directly under the social security law, much of the actual operation is handled by reputable health or life insurance companies, or other such agencies. Under the present system, the beneficiary is billed directly for doctor or hospital fees and is then reimbursed under the medicare program through the agency. This has proved to be unsatisfactory to many people.

A resident of Tunkhannock, Pa., wrote to me that the agency had paid no attention to a request for a refund on a receipted bill of $135.

A Philadelphian complained that a claim filed for 3 months with the agency is still unpaid.

A Norristown resident wrote to me—

Three months ago I sent in a surgeon's bill for $400 and an anesthetist's bill for $80. All necessary forms were included. They sent a check for $24 and that is all I have received on the $480 claim. I wrote to Medicare December 31st, after waiting three months for reimbursement, asking for an explanation. I received a card advising they would check it. This was three weeks ago.

Therefore, with the administrative problems of the new medicare program, the human factor in locating critical case files, and an inefficient system of operation worsened by confining rules, the isolated delay has become daily routine.

TWO STEPS TO CORRECTION

Regardless of the reasons, the fact remains that some people are not getting their money on time.

I recommend two steps toward remedying the situation:

First. There should be a Senate investigation of the social security system through the appropriate committee to establish beyond doubt the causes of payment delays and to seek methods to correct the situation.

The committee should also reexamine medicare reimbursement and consider one recommendation that physicians handle medicare claims as they do other medical insurance. All medical costs covered by medicare would then be paid directly to the physician or the hospital, not to the patient. This would be of further service to many people who find it difficult to pay medical bills in the first place. Direct reimbursement also would reduce much of the paperwork which is contributing to the overburden of work in social security offices.

Second. The Social Security Administration should establish in each State, "complaint centers" which would examine the claims, to handle them expeditiously. Each center should have a separate fund from which all reasonable claims would be paid immediately.

The beneficiary would then get prompt compensation. The beneficiary would report to the center in person each month for his payment until his claim is properly processed and automatic payment can begin. With the exception of obviously doubtful claims, there would be no reason to withhold money from a beneficiary.

The beneficiary would understand that all necessary adjustments will be made in subsequent payments so that the individual who receives too little or too much during the waiting period could enter the new program with a corrected balance of payment.

SUMMARY

The Social Security Act of 1935 became law so that people, by saving money during their most productive years, could provide for themselves a basis of financial security in their later years. The system is a good one. But until now, most changes have been to increase payments and to broaden coverage. I have supported all such beneficial changes. I am now recommending changes so that people who are entitled to social security benefits get them promptly.

It is the function of government to serve its people. The people involved in this problem of delayed social security payments are for the most part those who are in the greatest need of our help. They are justly entitled to full support from the Congress in this effort to give them the prompt help they need and deserve.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to concur with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania in his assumption that the citizens of his State are not the only ones who suffer from the painfully slow and exasperatingly inaccurate service of the Social Security Administration. My office has also received vast numbers of requests for assistance in untangling the snarled web of paperwork surrounding payment of social security benefits as well as medicare and disability claims.

My staff and I have found that when we assist in these cases, nearly all are satisfactorily settled in favor of the individual. These cases were not settled earlier due only to bureaucratic redtape and lack of communication between the claimant and a department of the Government established to serve them.

When I see the number of Illinois citizens who communicate their problems with social security to me, I know that this must represent a fraction of the iceberg. For every individual that requests my assistance, there must be a hundred struggling with local and regional social security officials, helplessly delayed in receiving benefits upon which they may depend for subsistence itself.

One Chicagoan wrote to me:

My husband died August 1st, 1966, and I applied on August 9th, for Social Security benefits for myself and my five sons. To this day I have not received any benefits.

My office contacted Social Security officials and this case was finally resolved. The family received social security benefits that had been delayed for over 8 months.

Certainly, some system can be devised whereby this mother could have promptly received the benefits needed to support five young children.

Another Illinois citizen wrote to me:

My problem is that after a year of countless forms, of being examined at the expense of the United States Government, and of correspondence which in volume is almost equal to the Churchill memoirs, Social Security is now sending letters to my wife to see how she is responding to treatment for arthritis when in fact I am the person who has filed the claims. . . . I am trying to follow Social Security procedures, in fact I have no choice. However, they seem unable to follow the relatively unsophisticated procedures as outlined by the Congress in investigating my claim. What would you suggest I do?

A couple sent me this plea:

Since we are both in the late 70 years of age, it makes it doubly difficult. We have registered our complaint with our Social Security board by going in twice, writing letters, and phone calls, all to no avail. Instead of benefits, they send bills. All our bills have always been paid long before they are due.

Most of these requests for assistance come from the elderly, who have little or no recourse for support but social security benefits and are dependent on the regular receipt of these checks to maintain an adequate standard of living. Other requests come from families who are struggling against insurmountable odds with the loss of their breadwinner. Social security was instituted to assist just such individuals, but in an overwhelming number of cases, it cannot and does not help when it is most needed.

When it becomes necessary for an individual to contact his Senator or Congressman for assistance in obtaining funds that he himself paid into the social security program during his earning years, close scrutiny should be given to the administration of the program.

I would like to second the recommendation of the Senator from Pennsylvania that a Senatorial investigation of the social security system take place to discover the causes of delayed and inaccurate payments so that a viable solution to this problem can be found.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to my distinguished colleague the able Senator from Illinois, whose statements indicate that the prob-

lem is as much a problem in Illinois as it is in my State, and as I am sure it is throughout the whole Nation. The efforts of citizens to find out why the Government does not do what it has agreed to do for the citizens imposes a heavy and unjust burden on Government agencies and on the legislators when they are expected to, and should, act as mediators in the attempt to solve the numerous problems raised.

The amount of havoc which can be wrought by inefficient Government employees unwilling or unable to grasp the significance of a social security beneficiary's problems, his frustration, and even his agony upon failing to receive that to which he has contributed and which is rightfully his to receive at times approaches the appalling.

For the busy caseworker we should certainly have sympathy, but for the beneficiary, for whom the whole system was established, we should have efficiency and prompt, just, and expeditious operation and administration of the laws.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that by taking this time today, with the assistance of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], we may have helped to bring to a head some better realization of the nature of the problem involved. The citizen's contact with Government, when unsuccessful, when frustrated, when unduly annoyed, when absolutely unfair in some cases, is what leaves the average American citizen with such an experience to condemn his Government, to attack all agencies and officials of Government, as politicians, as incompetents, or as generally engaged in some sort of conspiracy to befoul the clear streams which should connect the creeks and rivers of his discontent with the broad ocean of the Government's solution—and which is anticipated—of these problems, which aid in the citizen's respect for his Government and in his desire to cooperate fully with it, which is certainly a desirable end in itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this portion of the RECORD an item from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of May 2, 1967 which discusses certain views of my colleague in the other body, Representative SCHWEIKER.

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

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, May 2, 1967]

MORE LIBERAL SOCIAL SECURITY CERTAIN, SCHWEIKER PREDICTS

(By David M. Cleary)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—A more liberal Social Security law, authorizing higher monthly payments to retired and disabled workers and simplifying the cumbersome paperwork of Medicare, is certain to be passed by the 90th Congress, now in session.

But old folks may not get the increases of 15 percent across the board—with a minimum pension at age 65 of $70 per month—recommended by President Johnson in January. Lawmakers may be unwilling to saddle people now working with the price tag $4 billion per year.

These are the views of Rep. Richard S. Schweiker (R-Pa) who has carefully watched the last several weeks of hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee, studying a 164-page list of proposed changes to the Social Security law.

"The Administration's program," said Schweiker in an interview, "calls for raising the Social Security tax to ten percent on incomes up to $10,800 in 1974.

COOL TO BIG INCREASE

"A man earning $900 per month would be taxed $540 per year, with his employer paying an additional $540," he said. "The self-employed man with the same income would pay a Social Security tax of $756 per year, and I doubt that Congress will be willing to impose such a heavy tax."

The Montgomery County Republican, serving his fourth term in Congress, said he sees little opposition among his colleagues to certain changes in the law proposed by the Administration. He expects an amended law to be enacted by the end of this year to provide for:

Inclusion in Medicare of people under 65, now receiving monthly Social Security payments because of disability.

Monthly pensions to disabled widows, who under present law get nothing until age 60, unless they are caring for at least one child under age 18.

INCREASE IN EARNING SUMS

Inclusion of the services of podiatrists under Medicare for medically-necessary services, although not for such routine matters as the trimming of corns, calluses, and toenails.

An increase in the amounts Social Security recipients are allowed to earn each month without forfeiting Social Security benefits.

An across-the-board increase in monthly payments to the elderly and disabled, though not as large as President Johnson has recommended.

"Of equal importance to many constituents who have written to me," said Schweiker, "the bill under study would make several changes in Medicare bookkeeping, designed to reduce the paperwork load on hospitals, doctors and patients alike. I support those changes, and I'm sure they have the support of the majority of Congressmen."

PROPOSED MEDICARE CHANGES

Among the proposed Medicare changes:

All services rendered by hospitals to inpatients (those admitted for bed care) would be under Medicare Part A, while all those for outpatients (people visiting clinics) would be under Part B, thus eliminating a "splitting billing" for many patients which maddeningly ties up hospital accounts.

Creation of a new "Part C" which would pay 80 percent of the reasonable charges of radiologists and pathologists in hospitals, eliminating another "splitting billing" situation that has both riled patients and caused much unnecessary clerical work.

Elimination of the requirement that a physician certify the need for every general hospital admission, since doctors argue they don't send patients into hospitals except when necessary. However, doctors would still be required to certify need for admission to mental and tuberculosis hospitals, and certify the need for longer-than-usual hospital stays.

Federal hospitals, operated by the military services and Veterans Administration, would be able to treat Medicare-eligible patients, getting paid from the Medicare fund.

THE PRICE TAGS

"These amendments would make a significant contribution to smoother administration of Medicare," said Schweiker. "I testified in support of them before the Ways and Means Committee on March 7, and I believe the majority of the House feels as I do."

The biggest objection to the Administration's entire package of Social Security amendments, as Schweiker sees it is the cost of raising monthly benefits to the elderly and the disabled. The price tags, as submitted to the Congress, look like this:

15 percent general increase with $70 monthly minimum	$4,001,000,000
Special minimum of $100 after 25 years	8,000,000
Raising earning limit from $1,500 to $1,680 per year	140,000,000
Benefits to disabled widows	140,000,000
Increase to $50 of monthly payment to persons over 72	225,000,000
Benefits for children	11,000,000
Benefits for parents of retired or disabled workers	15,000,000
Total	4,471,000,000

EIGHT PERCENT, MAYBE, 15 PERCENT, NO

"Obviously," Schweiker said, "the single measure of raising benefits to everyone now getting them, and eligible for them in the future, is the most expensive item, representing more than $4 billion of the $4.471 billion total. This is the part most likely to run into opposition."

Schweiker said House Republicans favor a general increase of about eight percent, rather than the 15 percent proposed by the Administration, and some conservative Democrats have similar feelings.

"I personally support substantial increases because of the tremendous increases in the cost of living," he said, "and on that point, I differ with some Republicans. But I doubt that the 15 percent increases will be authorized."

Schweiker also said he'd like to see Social Security recipients allowed to earn considerably more than the $1,680 per year proposed by the Administration before being required to forfeit part of their Social Security income.

PENALIZED FOR ACTIVITY

"Many people are hale and hearty, and ready to start new careers at age 65," he said. "I think it is detrimental to the general welfare to penalize people who do that, and we lose the mature judgment of many good men by discouraging their continued activity in industry merely because af advancing age."

But he said the bill, once it leaves the Ways and Means Committee, will go to Rules Committee, from which it may reach the House floor under a "no amendment" rule. In such a case, the House can vote to accept or reject the entire package, but cannot vote on the provisions separately.

That situation can be changed, he said, by a bit of parliamentary footwork called "a motion to recommit, with instructions."

If such a motion is adopted, so that individual parts of the bill would be subject to House vote, Schweiker predicted that the earnings limits for Social Security recipients will be raised well above the suggested $1,680 per year.

PREDICTS COMPROMISE

"There's a lot of feeling in that direction among the members," he said.

But as things stand now, Schweiker and other Congressmen who are not members of the Ways and Means Committee can only wait. Some three more weeks of Committee deliberations are scheduled, so the bill can't reach the House floor until some time in June.

If passed by both House and Senate in its present form, the bill calls for some Social Security amendments to become effective next January.

"But the bill can't hope to pass without change," said Schweiker. "The final law will be a compromise between the Administration and the Congress."

SPEECH BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY BEFORE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a speech delivered by Gov. George Romney to the National Federation of Republican Women on May 5, 1967.

In passing, I express the hope that there were those who listened, and I express the judgment that this speech was a very good one, that it was constructive and helpful, that it was not confined to narrow ideological ideas, and conveyed and sought to convey the responsible views of a responsive citizen in meeting current issues, both foreign and domestic.

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

SPEECH BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY OF MICHIGAN TO THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN, MAY 5, 1967

In the past few months, I've traveled from Alaska to Atlanta . . . from New Mexico to New England . . . and everywhere, the message is clear:

The most significant political fact in America today is the new vitality and attitude of the Republican Party.

These days it's exciting and it's fun to be a Republican.

And in Michigan . . . as in many other states . . . it's not as lonely to be a Republican these days.

When I first took office as Governor in 1963, even my Lieutenant Governor was a Democrat.

In those days, only 23 percent of Michigan voters identified themselves as Republicans, while 27 percent thought of themselves as independents and fully 50 percent identified themselves as Democrats.

Through positive problem solving programs, through a new Constitution, through genuine public interest government, through fiscal integrity, through hard political work by thousands of people, particularly women, things have changed in Michigan.

In the 1966 election, 52 percent of the voters cast straight Republican votes. And that's Republican progress!

Today in Michigan, we have Republican leadership in both houses of the Legislature.

We have a 12–7 Republican margin in our Congressional Delegation, including five outstanding young Congressmen who replaced Democrats last year.

We have erased Democratic majorities in the State Supreme court for the first time in a dozen years.

We finally retired "Soapy" Williams.

We elected a Republican United States Senator from Michigan for the first time in 14 years—the dynamic Bob Griffin.

We're making gains everywhere.

More than half the people of this country now live under problem solving Republican Governors.

We Republicans elected 47 more Members to the House of Representatives last year, and five more Senators.

In state legislatures across the country, we elected 540 more Republican Members.

And the victories of 1966 are only the beginning.

The exciting truth is that a new Republican Party, with a new look, is preparing to lead our Nation into a new generation of progress.

The Republican Party today is in an unequalled position to help the people of this Nation find a better way. And we're ready to win!

The National Republican Coordinating Council has provided invaluable groundwork for the 1968 national campaigns.

The effective work of the Republican minorities in Congress is providing sound, positive Republican programs in the House under the capable leadership of Rep. Jerry Ford and in the Senate under the incomparable Sen. Everett Dirksen.

The National Committee is playing a key role in these vital make ready months under the practical effective leadership of our Chairman, Ray Bliss.

The women of our party are unequalled in their enthusiasm, their spirit, their devotion and their effectiveness. You are showing the party has a heart.

And the young people of this country, with America's future in their hands, are looking to the Republican Party for leadership as never before in recent memory. And they're ready to help us, too.

Yes, we can win in 1968 not only the White House but the House of Representatives as well.

When the people spoke in 1966, this is what they said:

"We the people . . . we are individuals. Treat us as individuals.

"Don't try to lump us into faceless special interest categories. We refuse to be neatly packed and labeled into economic, religious, racial or ethnic blocs to be used by political brokers.

"We will not be deceived by promises of group favoritism and special privilege. We're not for sale.

"Give us a government that serves us, not one that makes us dependent and stifles us—a government we can control, not one that manages our lives."

That's what the people said.

The political epoch of the New Deal and its offspring is over.

Our position party is still living in the glories of the thirties. Its leaders are still trying to apply the theories of the thirties as the solutions of the sixties.

And they just don't work. The "Great Society" methods have been too shallow and superficial. The truth is the "Great Society" is really the "Great Facade."

The people are concerned and dissatisfied. They want a change. Most of them know there is a better way than LBJ.

When I spoke to you last, I voiced some of my deepest convictions.

I believed then, and I believe now, that the gravest threats to the future of America are not from without, but from within.

The gravest threats to the future of America are the decline in religious conviction, decline in moral character, decline in responsible citizenship based on an understanding of the principles on which this nation was built, and the deterioration of family life.

I believed then, and I believe now, that we don't have to worry in the future about having enough government in America. We're going to have plenty of government. But grave deficiencies are already developing in personal responsibility, family responsibility and private institutional responsibility.

I believe then, and I believe now, that human and social problems can't be solved just with government and money. It takes responsible citizens who care . . . and care enough to get involved.

I believed then, and I believe now, that politically only the Republican Party can do the job which must be done if America is to realize its purpose and destiny.

In my opinion, the Republican Party is the last political hope in this country for the type of government which you and I want for ourselves and for our children.

Our opportunity to realize this hope exists because the people don't want what LBJ is giving them and because there is a better way.

The people don't want a government that runs their lives. We know there's a better way—a government that serves and puts the people first.

The people don't want a government that ignores the basic cause of vast economic power struggles based on class warfare. There's a better way—government that encourages labor management teamwork to put an end to strikes and lockouts that paralyze entire communities and create national emergencies.

The people don't want a government that coddles and makes them dependent on welfare.

There's a better way—leadership that believes in and knows how to lick poverty with jobs, not just handouts.

The people don't want a government that bends to cronies and special interest bosses. There's a better way than LBJ—government that shapes its policies and enforces the law without fear or favor.

The people don't want a government that conceals big spending with phony budgeting. There's a better way—an administration that believes in and practices truth in budgeting.

The people don't want continuous deficits or a government that spends us into inflation and then blames others. There's a better way than LBJ—an administration that believes in and practices fiscal integrity.

The people don't want a government that ignores the danger of excessive concentrations of public or private power. There's a better way—government that keeps public and private power divided so the people can rule.

The people don't want a government that weakens private competitive enterprise and red tape and regulations. There's a better way—government that fosters and strengthens competition, and puts the people as customers back in the driver's seat.

The people don't want a government that undermines their independent action and voluntary cooperative institutions. There's a better way—to recognize that "The most powerful force on earth is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

The people don't want a government that takes more and more responsibility away from elected state and local representatives and gives it to a few appointed federal officials. There's a better way than LBJ—an administration that believes in and will work to really strengthen state and local self government.

Because the present administration is out of touch with the people and the principles that are the roots of America's greatness, it lacks the capacity to solve America's problems at home. It is treating the symptoms with aspirin, but it can't effect a cure.

The shallowness of the administration's approach is shown by the way it talks about the issues.

It talks about a war on this and a war on that—a war on crime, a war on poverty, a war on pollution. It's even conducting a war on fiscal integrity—unfortunately that's the only one it's winning.

Sure, we're against crime and poverty and pollution, but isn't it time we started talking about what we're for?

Isn't it time we got down to fundamentals—back to basic principles—and started applying them positively and constructively?

Plenty of things are wrong in this great land of ours, but plenty of things are right, too.

And the better way to correct the things that are wrong is to hold fast to the things that are right and strengthen the forces that have lifted America to unparalleled heights of freedom and well being.

There's a better way than LBJ abroad, too.

The people don't want a government that stumbles into international commitments that grow like topsy. There's a better way—a

foreign policy based on a consistent, realistic long range concept of America's world role.

The people don't want a government that squanders American prestige, raising false fears and hopes by acting as a global policeman and global financier. There's a better way—a government that establishes sound priorities and then commits its resources and prestige with respect for the interests and responsibilities of its allies.

The people don't want a government that doles out foreign aid money simply for the asking, while world poverty and instability continue to increase. There's a better way—government whose foreign economic development programs encourage greater private investment, partnership and self help.

The people don't want a government that misleads America with manipulated, inflated and distorted reports on the conflict in Southeast Asia. There's a better way—government that forthrightly tells us what's really going on.

We don't want a government looked to by other nations just because of our economic and military might. There's a better way—government that wins the world's respect for our ideals, realism, knowledge and institutions rather than for our arsenals and pocketbooks.

Do you agree there's a better way than LBJ?

Yes, and our job as Republicans is to show the people of this nation how to achieve that better way.

Yes, and if we do, we can win in 1968.

We can win as Republicans united in these basic beliefs about the people and their government.

The Republican Party has greater faith in the individual, and what he can accomplish.

The Republican Party has greater faith in what the people will do voluntarily for themselves and for others, if encouraged to do it.

The Republican Party has greater faith in the vitality and potential of state and local governments to help the people solve their problems close to home.

The Republican Party has greater faith in the matchless power of private initiative, free competitive enterprise, and free collective bargaining.

The Republican Party has greater faith in limited government and in government by law.

The Republican Party has greater faith in the necessity of meeting the needs of the people through fiscal integrity.

The Republican Party places its faith in candidates who when elected will serve as public officials and not as partisan officials or special interest tools.

The Republican Party has greater faith in telling the people the facts about our international involvements.

The Republican Party has greater faith in a foreign policy which is consistent with long range definition of our national purpose.

The Republican Party has greater faith in applying our proven principles to achieve progress and peace at home and abroad. A better way. The Republican Way.

I'm convinced that a majority of the American people share these basic beliefs.

If we will unite in taking them to the country, we will win in 1968.

And we must win in 1968. For the Republican Party is political hope for our future as a nation.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

I regret that I was not able to be present to hear the Senator's address on a very important and vital subject. I know he understands the problems concerned with the schedules of the day.

It seemed to me as I read his statement last night—he was courteous enough to provide me with a copy over the weekend—that once again we have an example of a situation and condition where the present administration seems to think that problems may be solved when slogans are coined, or merely by the passage of a bill.

I recall, as will the Senator from Pennsylvania, that in the 89th Congress much was said and there was much to-do about the great volume of legislation. Great emphasis was placed upon quantity, without very much being said about the quality of the legislation that was passed.

But the essence of solving the Government's problems is not merely the action which takes place in this Chamber and that on the other side of the Capitol, but in the implementation.

I am impressed by two things about the Senator's speech: first, it is not merely a blanket criticism of a condition, but is well-documented by the work of his office and letters that he has received; and, second, I think it most important that on the first page of his draft he compares the amounts received by social security beneficiaries with the increased cost of living; for these are the real, hard facts of the whole matter.

I endorse the steps for correction that he has set forth on page 4 of his statement; and I ask the Senator to permit me, in connection with his statement, to urge once again the passage of a bill introduced by me, which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was so gracious as to endorse, to provide a new Hoover Commission to look into all of the executive agencies, bureaus, and organizational pyramids that exist in Government today. For as I note on page 4, the administration of social security is not confined within that agency itself, but, especially since the advent of medicare, is spread out all through the Government. I am sure that the Senator joins with me in that plea.

I congratulate the Senator on a most worthwhile statement. I concur with his proposed increases in the amounts that those on social security may earn. Such a change is long overdue. Many of us have sought it heretofore. If I am not a cosponsor on this measure, I have been on such measures before, and I ask the Senator that my name be so included at this time.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be very happy to do so, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his very thoughtful, kind, and generous consideration of the suggestions I have made. I do underscore the purport of his bill in regard to the establishment of a commission to examine into all these matters, and hope for its success. I am most grateful that the Senator has taken the time to study the statements I made, and, as I have said, I thank him for his support here.

I conclude, Mr. President, by recounting an incident which occurred in my life a great many years ago, when I was a beginning debater in high school. I add, incidentally, that I lost my first 13 debates, before I discovered the value of rebuttal. I was somewhat more successful thereafter.

But being unaware of the devastating nature of rebuttals, I was engaged in a rather juvenile effort, in one of those debates, on the subject of which of two historical characters was the greater. I made my statement in behalf of my historical character, and stated, in opposition to the other character, that I thought he had bitten off more than he could chew.

I was completely destroyed as a debater that day, in that little country high school, by a farm boy who commented, in defending the other historical personage, who had died at an early age, "I reckon if he had lived long enough, he would have chawed his bites."

I think that has been the trouble with the legislation passed by the 89th Congress: We bit off more than we could chew, and we are now in the process of imploring our own Government to "chaw" its bites, to overcome the indigestion of administrative difficulties which has led to the frustration of the lonely citizen, and particularly the elder citizen, who wonders how it is possible, if he cannot even fight city hall, for him to fight the U.S. Capitol.

I hope I have made some suggestions and stirred up some interest in the problem, so that an old man or an old woman—or let us be more tactful, being in politics, and say an elderly senior citizen, be he lady or gentleman—may hope hereafter to receive better and more expeditious treatment from the Government—which, after all, belongs to him. One day not long ago, an elderly couple walking through the corridors of the Capitol very timidly approached one of the guards and asked, "Is it all right for us to walk through here?"

The guard looked at them for a moment, smiled, and said, "Why not? It's yours, isn't it?"

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business extending no later than 10 minutes after 12 today.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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. 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.

GOVERNMENT EXPANDS USE OF CONSULTANTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, during the past several years the various agencies of the Government have greatly expanded their use of consultants, and questions have arisen as to whether or not this is resulting in a backhanded method of padding the payrolls.

It is recognized that in certain instances the use of consultants or experts can be justified, but it was intended that this category of employment be confined to specialized use.

In an effort to determine to what extent this practice has expanded and to what extent it is being abused, I filed an inquiry on March 9 with Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Under date of March 23, 1967, I received a preliminary report, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD along with my March 9 inquiry. In this report Mr. Macy has promised to furnish a more detailed breakdown including the amount of compensation received, days worked, and so forth. When this additional information is received, it, too, will be placed in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 9, 1967.

Mr. JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACY: Will you please furnish me with an itemized breakdown of the number of consultants that have been hired by each of the respective agencies during the first half of fiscal 1967 (July 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966). With this report please include the following:

1. The name of the agency, the number of employees, and the per diem payments.

a. In addition to the per diem payments do these consultants receive expense allowances to cover travel, hotels, etc.?

2. Does service as a consultant count as additional time in computing civil service retirement benefits?

a. If so, is the time counted on the basis of the work period or over the period of time in which the man is carried on the rolls as a consultant?

This report may be broken down by agencies or Departments, whichever is more convenient.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: You asked in your letter of March 9, 1967 that I furnish you with certain information concerning the use of consultants in the government service.

We will have to get information directly from the agencies to answer in detail your first question, relative to the number and pay of consultants, by agency. I can give you some general information, however, which may be helpful while are are collecting the data to answer more specifically.

Although there is some technical distinction between experts and consultants (the primary one being that experts actually do the work while consultants serve as advisers), they are generally hired under the same authorities and once employed, the same rules apply to both groups. Relatively few appointments are made to the expert category. Most agencies lump both groups together statistically. Therefore, we are not attempting to distinguish between the two in the information we furnish you.

We found through a telephone survey during February of this year that agencies in the Washington area, where nearly all the experts and consultants are employed, have 8,924 on the rolls. Attached is a listing of these by agency. There are, on the average, about 75 additional consultants on the rolls employed under individual authorities granted to agencies which do not have blanket agreements. Thus the total number of experts and consultants on the rolls in February was approximately 9,000.

Only a portion of this number would actually have worked during the month. Common agency practice is to make appointments for one year and then use the consultants as needed. Often a consultant will work only three or four days during the course of the year.

Rates of pay and allowances for expenses vary widely. These are determined by the individual agencies, within statutory limitations. Many consultants work without compensation and are only placed on the rolls so that they may be reimbursed for travel expenses. About one-third of the consultants with the Bureau of Standards, for example, serve without compensation.

Your second question is whether service as a consultant counts as additional time in computing civil service retirement benefits. In general the service of a consultant who is paid on a time basis is creditable Federal service for retirement purposes. Credit is thus allowed for consultant service paid for on a per diem basis or on a "while-actually-employed" basis; in the latter instance credit is allowed only for the days actually worked.

Service on a fee basis is not creditable. Likewise, service without compensation or with nominal compensation ($1 a year) is not creditable unless the consultant performs full-time or substantially full-time Federal service.

In addition to the listing of the numbers of experts and consultants employed by the individual agencies, I am enclosing a pamphlet which may be useful to you, "Employment and Compensation of Experts and Consultants."

We will conduct a survey among the agencies and furnish you more precise information on the number of consultants employed, the compensation received, the expense allowances, and the man days worked, as soon as we receive and compile it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

Number of experts and consultants employed by agency

Department of Commerce:	Number
Bureau of Standards	62
Bureau of Domestic and International Business	21
Environmental Science Services Administration	26
Maritime Administration	1
Patent Office	0
Bureau of the Census	18
Office of the Secretary	77
Department of the Interior	90
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Office of Education	1,804
Social Security Administration	106
Food and Drug Administration	128
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	161
Administration on Aging	65
Welfare Administration	68
St. Elizabeths Hospital	0
Office of the Secretary	143
Defense Communication Agency	9
Defense Intelligence Agency	20
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	5
Export-Import Bank	1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	3
Federal Trade Commission	5
National Capital Planning Commission	4
Post Office Department	10
Smithsonian	5
U.S. Information Agency	20
Federal Aviation Agency	62
Office of Emergency Planning	60
Department of the Treasury	90
Department of Transportation	58
Department of Labor	179
National Foundation on Arts and Humanities	136
National Science Foundation	41
Peace Corps	223
Department of Housing and Urban Development	109
General Services Administration	15
National Advisory Commission on Selective Service	4
Commission on Civil Rights	19
Commission on Marine, Science, Engineering, and Resources	6
Federal Radiation Council	3
National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber	13
President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice	22
Special Representative on Trade Negotiations	5
Water Resources Council	1
National Capital Transportation Agency	0
National Security Agency	48
Department of Agriculture	55
Defense Atomic Support Agency	47
Department of Justice	5
General Accounting Office	19
Administrative Office, U.S. Courts	6
Civil Service Commission	16
Bureau of the Budget	98
Department of State	332
Office of Economic Opportunity	152
HEW, Public Health Service	2,197
Department of the Navy	100
Department of the Air Force	187
Department of the Army	435
Office of the Secretary of Defense	302
National Aeronautics and Space Agency	400
Veterans' Administration	225
Agency for International Development	400
Total	8,924

THE NEW LEFT: SEDITION AND RIOTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I read with a great deal of alarm a statement by the national secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society, which appeared Sunday in the New York Times.

Gregory Calvert, a former history teacher, was quoted by Reporter Paul Hofmann as declaring:

We are actively organizing sedition.

Calvert also was quoted as saying that:

We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment.

Mr. President, I do not know whether this group has been investigated by the proper authorities. I would hope that it is.

I do not believe that we should permit any organization to preach its doctrines of sedition. I do not believe we should condone a group which admits, as was done in this article, that "some of our members undoubtedly will help" in ghetto riots this summer. Riots violate the law and trespass on the rights of law-abiding citizens.

If nothing has been done to curtail this group, something should be done forthwith. The press could help in this respect by relegating the so-called "news" of such irresponsible statements by people like Mr. Calvert to the back page.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The New Left Turns to Mood of Violence in Place of Protest" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NEW LEFT TURNS TO MOOD OF VIOLENCE IN PLACE OF PROTEST

(By Paul Hofmann)

"We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment," said the national secretary of the left-wing Students for a Democratic Society, Gregory Calvert, one day recently.

"We are actively organizing sedition," he said.

Mr. Calvert, a 29-year-old former history teacher, spoke pleasantly about revolution in his dingy office on Chicago's Skid Row. The threat of violence in his words characterizes the current radicalization of the New Left.

A maze of factions with a penchant for verbosity and a hankering for action, the New Left wants emphatically to be distinct from the old left—the socialist and Communist movements whose history goes back over generations.

EBULLIENCE AND FRUSTRATION

Just how distinct it has become was made clear during a three-week series of interviews with some 75 New Left activists and sympathizers from coast to coast. Most of them were younger than 30, and some sounded much more truculent than members of the Moscow-oriented Communist party, U.S.A.

The trend toward radicalism and direct action constitutes perhaps the major attitude in the New Left today. Other findings in this assessment of the New Left's mood are as follows:

An ebullience over the impact of opposition to the war in Vietnam, which emotionally involves some members of the middle class and leads them to New Left positions also on domestic issues.

A frustration resulting from the lack of New Left political power and the failures of "peace" candidates in national and local elections.

A virulent factionalism similar to the doctrinaire old left feuds, a factionalism that is being exploited by extremists.

A spreading tendency to link up with leftist and "anti-imperialist" movements in Latin America, Europe and emerging nations.

The growth of a broadening "hippie" segment, mainly on the East and West Coasts, occasionally joining the New Left in demonstrations but also worrying it because drug users and beatniks tend to withdraw from society instead of attempting to reform or revolutionize it.

The drifting apart of young whites and Negroes, close allies in the civil rights battles in the South a few years ago, as black power extremism spreads in Northern ghettos.

CHE LIVES IN OUR HEARTS

If there is one dominant hero of the New Left mood, perhaps he is Ernesto Che Guevara.

Mr. Calvert, the beardless, ruddy-faced national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society, said:

"Che's message is applicable to urban America as far as the psychology of guerrilla action goes. . . . Che sure lives in our hearts."

Che Guevara, the Argentine-born revolutionary who was an associate of Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, disappeared more than two years ago and is rumored to be leading insurgents somewhere in the Andean vastnesses.

A long way from the South American sierras, a surprising number of young left-wing intellectuals were found to revere the Argentinian adventurer. Rebellious students who spoke with equal disdain about "Establishment liberals" and "Communist squares" professed the cult of the "pure" man of revolutionary action.

Posters of Che Guevara and of Malcolm X, the black nationalist slain here two years ago, are advertised for sale "at special bulk rates" in a San Francisco monthly, The Movement. The radical publication disaffiliated recently from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the militant, Southern-oriented movement that used to be one of the pillars of the New Left but has lately veered toward black power goals and away from Students for a Democratic Society.

I'M NO PACIFIST

Che Guevara's bearded likeness was encountered on the walls of the littered offices of radical newspapers and left-wing groups. His name cropped up in talks in college cafeterias whenever the New Left's current infatuation with direct action was mentioned.

"I recognize that violence may be necessary, I'm no pacifist," said a vibrant young woman who has done much work for the New Left, Leni Zeiger. "I'm a white, middle-class girl, but I understand why Negroes, Puerto Ricans or Okies riot. I feel the same frustrations in myself, the same urge to violence."

Nevertheless, Miss Zeiger said during an interview at that citadel of the New Left, the University of California campus at Berkeley, "there are a lot of dilemmas about violence. . . ."

At the age of 21, Miss Zeiger considers herself "old New Left," because she believes more in community work and, possibly, political action than in urban guerrillas. She has been active in left-oriented projects in black and poor-white ghettos in Chicago and Cleveland and, while working for her B.A., is now on the staff of The Movement, doing research among poor Southerners and "hillbillies" in California.

Of the continual left-wing rifts, Miss Zeiger said:

"The trouble is that the politically minded people aren't very radical, and the radicals aren't very political."

Violence was a topic, too, in a talk with a University of Michigan economics teacher at Ann Arbor, Michael F. Zweig. He is a former president of the S.D.S. chapter there.

CALLS VIOLENCE NECESSARY

"I think violence is necessary, and it frightens me," Mr. Zweig said. The 24-year-old graduate school teaching fellow, whose face is framed by a luxuriant blond beard remarked:

"There isn't a great feeling of personal liberation in burning down a Cleveland store."

After another wave of urban riots like those of recent summers, Mr. Zweig suggested, local governments might decide to collaborate with left-inspired neighborhood groups, and poor people might even obtain guaranteed annual minimum earnings, a kind of negative income tax.

"If that's all we get," the teacher said "violence doesn't become so desirable."

He added: "I am very pessimistic about the prospects of change, even of meaningful reforms in this country. The quality of life [in America], that's what I am so pessimistic about."

Profound dissatisfaction with living in the contemporary United States was voiced by many other New Left backers. They saw the nation as oppressively dominated by an Establishment of political-corporate power structures that were hampering social and civic rights progress at home and tampering with the destinies of people abroad.

"Nicaragua and a lot of other countries should get together to resist the United States," said Gary Rothberger, a sociology student who succeeded Mr. Zweig as president of the Ann Arbor chapter of S.D.S.

Insurgency in Nicaragua and in other Latin-American countries is stirring news to the left wing on United States campuses. A California student, not yet 20, who looked like a younger Che Guevara, said he had spent last summer with Guatemalan guerrillas.

NEW LEFT MANIFESTO

Ann Arbor is important on the New Left map because Students for a Democratic Society was born there some six years ago. The movement's first national convention in Port Huron, Mich., in June, 1962, produced a basic New Left manifesto.

This rejected "paranoiac anti-Communism" while blaming the Soviet Union for suppressing opposition. It strongly attacked American capitalism, denounced the "hypocrisy of American ideals" and advocated a vaguely defined "participatory democracy."

Several S.D.S. members asked for practical examples of "participatory democracy" in action, pointed to the Yugoslav system of workers' councils' running nationalized business enterprises.

Amendments to the "Port Huron Statement" have made the S.D.S. program completely agnostic on Communism, opening the door to membership of Communists.

Since then, Students for a Democratic Society has gone through various phases. It aided the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in the South, it went into the Northern ghettos to organize their inhabitants, and lately it has swung back onto the campuses.

Some of the ghetto efforts are still alive. Among them are the Newark Community Union Project—directed by Tom Hayden, a cofounder of S.D.S. and main author of the Port Huron manifesto—and Chicago's Jobs or Income Now (J.O.I.N.).

In the short but lively history of S.D.S., 1967 is the year of the "prairie guys," the national leaders who were elected at a convention in a Methodist camp at Clear Lake, Iowa, last September. Nick Egleson, president, Carl Davidson, vice president, Mr. Calvert and their friends are leading S.D.S., in Mr. Davidson's words, "from protest to resistance."

ACTION ABOVE IDEOLOGY

Mr. Calvert described himself as a "post-Communist revolutionary," putting action above ideology. Dee Jacobsen, assistant national secretary and headquarters manager, said the North Vietnamese whom S.D.S. representatives had got in touch with "cannot understand why we don't take any direct action."

The three-room, $125-a-month national headquarters of Students for a Democratic Society is at 1608 West Madison Street, Chicago's Skid Row. It is close to the area of last summer's Negro rioting.

Despite the squalid setting, the headquar-

ters looks more efficient than it did at its former location near the University of Chicago campus on the city's South Side.

Last year there was picturesque clutter; now there is drab orderliness. There are boxes for outgoing and incoming mail, staffers who answer telephones and an ancient safe with a combination lock.

"We are getting ready for the revolution," Mr. Jacobsen joked with a thin smile when a visitor remarked on the new look.

Mr. Jacobsen said he had abandoned psychiatric hospital work to become a full-time S.D.S. organizer because he felt "my life was getting unbearable."

Mr. Calvert and Mr. Jacobsen said S.D.S. had some 200 chapters, with 6,000 dues-paying members and at least 25,000 other supporters who participated in chapter activities.

These activities, the S.D.S. leaders said, are centered on assisting young men to evade military duty by "insubordination, legal and illegal emigration to Canada, going underground in America—everything."

Students for a Democratic Society is organizing "draft resistance unions" and has a "national draft resistance coordinator," Jeff Segal.

CHANGE OF PLAN

The resistance-fomenting new leadership has only contempt for electoral campaigns by "peace" candidates and is cool toward mere protest demonstrations. The leadership first decided not to participate in the Spring Mobilization antiwar demonstrations of last April 15, deeming them a futile exercise, but was overruled at a meeting of the movement's national council in Cambridge, Mass., early in April.

The national leaders still did not seem to think much of the mobilization, and they have hinted at possibly even sterner action than resistance to the draft.

"Some of our members undoubtedly will help" in ghetto riots this summer, Mr. Jacobsen said.

A former S.D.S. organizer, who asked that he not be named, ridiculed the present leadership's talk of urban guerrillas.

"Greg Calvert has read something about leftist terrorist commandos in Caracas," he said, "and he and his friends think they are Venezuelans. They are becoming a sect. Romantic and out of touch with reality."

He said infiltrators from the pro-Peking Progressive Labor party had gained control of at least one S.D.S. chapter in Chicago. He did not name it.

Other New Left moderates suggested that the verbal militancy in S.D.S. headquarters might mask an inferiority complex vis-a-vis Negro racists who had already made up their minds that violence was necessary to attain black power.

"Some of the black nationalists are stacking Molotov cocktails and studying how they can hold a few city blocks in an uprising, how to keep off the fire brigade and the police so that the National Guard must be called out," a white Ohio student said. "And they're right. We ought to help them where we can, but we oughtn't be hung up with leading or liberating the Negroes."

IN PRAISE OF BLACK POWER

Mr. Calvert conceded that S.D.S. had few Negro members. He said:

"Black power is absolutely necessary. When we have organized the white radicals we can link up with the Negro radicals."

This seemed to imply a lack of such a link at present.

In the view of Jack Newfield, assistant editor of The Village Voice, the Greenwich Village newspaper, and a former S.D.S. member, the radicalization of New Left movements results from a feeling of hopelessness.

"The situation is getting more oppressive," he said. "Look at Alabama, look at Georgia, look at the war in Vietnam."

At the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice, an official said "it is obvious that these [New Left] groups are becoming more and more vociferous and threatening" in protesting against the war in Vietnam and calling for sedition. However, he said he was unable to comment on how serious a threat to law and order these groups were.

He said that "we are following closely the activities of some of these groups," keeping in mind that the First Amendment to the Constitution protects freedom of speech. He said violations of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Sedition Act were being investigated but declined to indicate whether prosecutions were on the increase.

Talks with police officers and community leaders in various cities found most in agreement that only a small hard core of leftist activists is determined to defy the law—maybe not more than a few hundred across the nation. The number of young New Left militants who advocate violence is growing, it was found, but whether their increasingly radical talk will be translated into unlawful action is controversial.

A potential threat to public order from New Left radicals was seen in areas where racial disorders this summer are feared including Cleveland, Chicago and, possibly New York.

Numerically, the New Left remains weak. The figure of 200,000 adherents nationwide that is often mentioned by sympathizers seems exaggerated.

STAUGHTON LYND'S VIEW

In the New Left itself, the campus talk about direct action is only rarely frightening. It does not frighten Staughton Lynd, who at the age of 38 is often called an "elder statesman" of the New Left.

The guerrilla concept is "not descriptive" of the new radical trend, he said in an interview. He appeared to distinguish between active violence and civil disobedience, which he himself practiced at the end of 1965 when he defied the United States Government and visited Hanoi with Mr. Hayden, the S.D.S. cofounder, and Dr. Herbert Aptheker, the leading theoretician of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Mr. Lynd, an associate professor of history at Yale University, who has been influenced by Quaker pacifism and Marxist doctrine, said he expected to receive a leave of absence from Yale and move to Chicago to teach at an S.D.S.-backed school for community organizers. Graduates of the school may lead draft resisters or defend the interests of the poor in housing and welfare, he said.

Mr. Lynd stressed that a "solid base of local organization" was more important to the New Left than going "too quickly" into national politics.

"I believe in local political candidates" of the New Left, he said.

A more sanguine assessment of the New Left's political possibilities was given by Paul Booth, who was S.D.S. national secretary before Mr. Calvert. Mr. Booth said in Chicago that the defeats of New Left and "peace" candidates in last year's primaries and Congressional elections "have given our people a better sense of how much work is to be done" to win political power.

THIRD-PARTY IDEA

Mr. Booth said the idea of setting up a third party on an antiwar and New Left platform deserved consideration.

He expressed hope that "maybe in three months" a vast alliance would rally behind the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the civil rights leader and Nobel Peace Prize winner, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the pediatrician and antiwar leader, as candidates for President and Vice President. Dr. King has said he does not intend to run.

Mr. Booth, a 23-year-old Swarthmore College graduate, is a board member of the National Conference for New Politics. ("Those left liberals!" Mr. Calvert sneered when the group was mentioned to him.)

The conference was established last year to help New Left and antiwar forces win political influence. Cochairmen are Julian Bond of the Georgia Legislature and Simon Casidy, a California Democrat. Dr. Spock was among the founders.

Another backer of Dr. King is Robert Scheer, the 31-year-old managing editor of Ramparts magazine. During a visit to New York he predicted broad popular support for the clergyman.

"I cannot think of any Negro minister attacking him," Mr. Scheer said. "Stokely Carmichael [chairman of the S.N.C.C.] embraced him publicly. The extremists will have to go along."

Mr. Scheer knows how to sound pretty extremist himself. In the Spring Mobilization rally in San Francisco he called President Johnson a "murderer" who was aiming at a "final solution" in Vietnam. The term "final solution" was used in official Nazi documents to describe the destruction of Jews ordered by Hitler.

The executive director of the Conference for New Politics, William F. Pepper, said in an interview at the group's New York headquarters, at 250 West 57th Street, that "we aren't a bunch of liberal do-gooders, we are revolutionary." ("Liberal" is a dirty word in New Left.)

He said the conference aimed at affiliating with the hundreds of antiwar committees and left-oriented "single-issue and multi-issue" groups that had sprung up throughout the country.

Mr. Pepper said he once was a campaign coordinator for Senator Robert F. Kennedy in Westchester County but that in his present activity he was not "fronting for Senator Kennedy."

A MEETING WITH KENNEDY

Senator Kennedy has shown interest in the New Left and some time ago had a long talk with Mr. Lynd and Mr. Hayden at his home here. The meeting was arranged by Mr. Newfield, who is working on a biography of the Senator.

It was an aide of Dr. King, the Rev. James Bevel, who served as national director of the Spring Mobilization. The protest idea was originally conceived by pacifists around the Rev. A. J. Muste, who died last Feb. 11.

While Dr. King jolted the civil rights movement by saying that it was vitally connected with the campaign against the war in Vietnam, leftists became prominent in the mobilization campaign. Some moderates withdrew.

The antiwar rally on April 15 in San Francisco's 62,000-seat Kezar Stadium, which was almost filled, was directed by a 21-year-old Trotskyite, Kipp Dawson. Outside the stadium, members of a Los Angeles-based pro-Peking group, wearing homemade uniforms with red-star insignia, sold copies of the "little red book" anthology of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's thoughts. The Maoists had denounced the April 15 demonstrations as a "revisionist Trotskyite betrayal," but did not pass up its possibilities for propaganda.

The W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, widely regarded as an unofficial youth arm of the Communist Party, U. S. A., played a subdued role in the antiwar drive or were missing altogether. Leftists of various shades wondered why.

An attempt to obtain an explanation at the Chicago national headquarters of the clubs was unsuccessful. The two-room office in the Great Lakes Building, 180 North Wacker Drive, was closed, and the telephone was disconnected.

A THEORY ABOUT THE CLUBS

Some DuBois Clubs have ceased their advertising of activities in local student pub-

lications. A Negro undergraduate had his own theory of why the clubs, which are named after a dead Negro Marxist scholar, seem dormant:

"The Communist Party desperately wants to look liberal and respectable. These DuBois cats, square as they are, are too swingin' for the party bureaucrats."

A former DuBois leader, Michael Myerson, is director of a newly formed Tri-Continental Information Center here that, according to an announcement last week, "has established contacts with anti-imperialist organizations and movements throughout the world." Among the sponsors are Communist party members such as Dr. Aptheker, S.D.S. backers and Dr. Spock.

Mr. Myerson, a 26-year-old University of California graduate, said the members of the center were offering their services and support as individuals and not as representatives of any organizations. The group has an office at 1133 Broadway and a two-man staff. It said it would issue a monthly bulletin and a series of pamphlets and would send fact-finding missions "to areas suffering from United States domination."

Students for a Democratic Society, too, is branching out internationally. A new Radical Education Project calls for creation of a network of "scholars, journalists, leftist youth leaders, government officials, guerrilla leaders, etc.," to gather international intelligence on insurgent movements and foreign policy developments.

The Young Socialist Alliance, an appendage of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers party, thoroughly committed its small but disciplined membership to the Spring Mobilization demonstration.

The Trotskyites' advocacy of all-embracing, "nonexclusive" antiwar alliances is met with deep distrust by many New Left adherents.

"LIARS," A STUDENT SAYS

"The Trotskyites are liars and just want to take over the entire left," a Harvard University student said.

A visitor to the Spring Mobilization headquarters in San Francisco, a few days after the April 15 demonstrations, found the organizing committee's director there, the petite Miss Dawson, counting money contributions and arranging for the payment of bills.

It quickly developed during an interview that Miss Dawson's revolutionary idol is Che Guevara.

"The Cuban revolution is the most exciting thing that has happened in our time," said the Young Socialist Alliance activist, who was not yet born when Leon Trotsky was murdered in Mexico in 1940.

Trotsky, one of the chief organizers of the Russian October Revolution of 1917, advocated world revolution and establishment of uncompromising "pure" Communism. He was forced into exile by Stalin. Followers of Trotsky's doctrine of "permanent revolution" are influential in some Latin-American countries.

While the heirs of the old left thus identify with Che Guevara, his book "Guerrilla Warfare"—and not Mao's little red book—is becoming part of the young radicals' field kit.

Still on their required reading list is Albert Camus, the Algerian-born French author and moralist who groped for secular saintliness without God and would not cross the "tragic dividing line" from nonviolence to violence. But Camus seems to be losing ground on campuses to Major Guevara and to Frantz Fanon, the late psychiatrist from Martinique who glorified the Algerian war and wrote, in "The Wretched of the Earth," a passionate manifesto for global revolution.

"I'm just reading Fanon," remarked Miss Zeiger on the Berkeley campus. "I think I prefer Camus."

But then, she is old New Left.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington, D.C., Post last Saturday published a statement by Howard University President James M. Nabrit, Jr.

In one portion of the statement, President Nabrit superbly set out the role of the university, and the student in today's troubled academic community. He said:

Each right of an individual places a reciprocal responsibility upon others: the responsibility to permit the individual to exercise that right. The student, as a member of the academic community, has both rights and responsibilities. Within that community, the student's most essential right is the right to learn. The University has a responsibility to provide for the student that environment and those protections and opportunities which best promote the learning process in all its aspects. Hence, the University will not tolerate any action which interferes with the right of students to learn, including freedom of discussion of both sides of a controversial issue.

The student, in turn, has responsibilities to his fellow members of the University community, the most important of which is to refrain from interference with those rights that promote essential purposes and processes of this community.

Mr. President, I particularly applaud the emphasis this statement gives to the responsibility side of the ledger. Rights mean little if responsibilities are not fulfilled. Freedom of discussion on our campuses means little if it is one sided or if the search for truth is perverted by attempts to mislead.

S. 35—INCOME TAX OF SINGLE PERSONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on the opening day of this Congress I introduced S. 35, the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the head of household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers and individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more, who maintain their own households.

The measure is designed to reduce a tax inequity which discriminates against single persons and is similar to bills which I introduced in the 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses. I am pleased to have jcining me as sponsors of S. 35, Senators CARLSON, COOPER, GRUENING, HART, MCGEE, MONDALE, MOSS, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, SMITH, SCOTT, and YOUNG of North Dakota; and I am hopeful that a majority of the Senate will support this change when we bring it before the Senate for action.

The discrimination against single persons which this bill seeks to reduce has been in the Internal Revenue Code since 1948. In that year, Congress extended income-splitting to married couples for the Federal income tax. The purpose was to adjust the Federal code to provisions in several State tax laws, but the result has been a tax inequity against single persons. The action taken by Congress in 1948, of course, did not change the rate of tax as between single and married persons, but it did change the rate of progression to the higher rates as income increases.

Under the tax-splitting provision, the income of a married couple is treated as though it were equal portions of income from two individuals. This advantage is granted regardless of the amount the spouse earns or even whether the spouse earns any income at all. It also applies whether the married couple have dependent children—although one of the arguments made for income splitting was that married couples had the costs and responsibilities of rearing children.

The tax advantage is small at the lowest levels, but it increases rapidly. The point of the highest percentage of tax advantage to a married couple is about the $24,000 level. Under 1966 rates, the tax paid by a single person on a $24,000 taxable income is $8,030. On the same taxable income a married couple filing a joint return would pay a tax of only $5,660. The difference is $2,370, or nearly 30 percent in favor of a married couple filing a joint return.

The inequity of the provision was modified in 1951, when we approved the category of head of household for some single persons who maintain a household for certain dependents or who maintain a separate household for parents. The head of household tax status gives them about half of the tax advantage that married couples receive if they file a joint return.

There is not much prospect for a comprehensive revision of the code at this time, but we should make limited adjustments to reduce the most serious inequities. It is my view that one important step which should be taken is to reduce the discrimination against widows and widowers and against single persons—at least those single persons who have attained age 35 and who are maintaining a household of their own.

The discrimination is particularly severe against single women age 35 or over. At this age they generally are required to maintain their own household because of their occupation, their place in society, or simply for the sake of decency and convenience in living. Often at this age they are expected to—and do—make special contributions for the support of relatives and for social and civic welfare. They have the responsibilities and expenses of maintaining a household, and the tax law should take account of their status.

A recent column by Sylvia Porter deals with the discrimination against single persons in the tax law, and I ask unanimous consent that her article, which appeared in the Washington Star, April 30, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. TAX UNFAIR TO UNWED

(By Sylvia Porter)

Sally is a single woman living alone in a New York City apartment and supporting herself by her earnings as a secretary. A fortnight ago Sally mailed her 1966 income tax return and paid an income tax which unfairly discriminates against her because of her marital status.

Joe is a bachelor also living alone in a midtown apartment, who supports himself and an aged aunt in a different household by his earnings as a junior executive. Joe has just mailed his 1966 tax return and paid a tax

which unjustly penalizes him not only because he is single but also because his dependent is not his mother but the aunt who reared him after his mother's death—and therefore, he does not qualify for "head of household" status.

Our current federal income laws are biased against the single individual, both in application of tax rates and in personal exemptions.

CALLED INDEFENSIBLE

The discrimination is indefensible. It adds a harsh financial blow to the emotional one the single status imposes, particularly on the never-married middle-aged woman.

If you are a married couple and have just filed a joint return for 1966, you have paid an income tax which is equivalent to what you would have paid if each of you had reported separately and paid tax on half your total income at single person rates. You have, in effect, "split your income" to achieve a substantial tax advantage.

If you are single and you have reported the same total income as this married couple, you have paid your income tax at the much higher rate applied to the full total. You have no advantage comparable to income splitting.

If you are married with no children and living in a three-room apartment, you are entitled to two personal exemptions of $600 each to help you reduce the taxes you owe on your income.

MANY COSTS ARE SAME

If you are single and living in an identical apartment on another floor of the same building, you are entitled to only one personal exemption of $600. Many of your overhead costs are the same and your living expenses are much more than half those of the childless married couple, but the personal exemption rules in our tax laws do not recognize this reality.

If you are unmarried but support close relatives, you may be able to get head of household status and preferred tax treatment.

If you too are unmarried but support people not closely related, you cannot get this status or preferred tax treatment.

In a major study of our income tax structure last fall, Joseph A. Pechman, director of economic studies for the Brookings Institution, zeroed in on the discrimination against single taxpayers, but his findings received meager attention.

As I know Sally and Joe, so you know (or are) their counterparts, for there are millions like them the nation over.

The inequities have crept into our tax structure by miscalculation and historical accident. The personal exemptions were set to protect very low income people and to help families with large numbers of children. Little thought was given to the single middle-income man or woman. Income splitting was adopted in 1948 to give to the rest of the country the tax advantages of the states which at the end of World War II had community property laws and which treated income as if divided equally between husband and wife.

But in Pechman's words: "The needs of a household do not increase in proportion to the number of people in the household. . . . Present exemptions do not cover the rock-bottom economy standard for single persons and married couples with no children but are more than adequate for families of six or more."

As for income splitting, Pechman says, "The practical effect is to produce large differences in the tax burdens of single persons and married couples, differences which depend on the rate of gradation and not on the level of rates. Such differences are difficult to rationalize on any grounds. Moreover, it is difficult to justify treating single persons with families more harshly than married persons in similar circumstances."

Vietnam or no, tax reform again will become a major target in 1968. This, therefore, is the time for you, America's millions of single taxpayers, to start putting pressure on Congress for elimination of the discrimination against you—via increases in your personal exemptions, liberalization of head of household provisions or other devices.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I believe that this matter is one of the real injustices of our tax structure at the present time, and I am happy that he has introduced the bill. This problem should have and must have consideration by this session of Congress, in order to treat fairly many of the people involved.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

TRIBUTE TO 1ST SGT. SAM K. SOLOMON

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in a war which has tested the fighting qualities of the American serviceman and found him both capable and courageous, no higher accolade can be accorded the combat soldier than the deep and lasting respect of his own comrade in arms. Such a mark of special recognition has come to a Hawaii soldier whose heroism in Vietnam has become legendary among men of the 25th Infantry Division.

Last November 3, 1st Sgt. Sam K. Solomon, of Kohala, Island of Hawaii, gave his life while rescuing wounded men in his company. His self-sacrifice under enemy fire was so conspicuous, his helmet has become a symbol of the man and his deed. The story of Sergeant Solomon and his helmet is related poignantly in an article written by Associated Press correspondent Al Chang.

In tribute to the memory of a gallant Hawaii solider, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "No GI Can Fill This Helmet," published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of May 3, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 3, 1967]

MEMORIAL TO ISLE SOLDIER—NO GI CAN FILL THIS HELMET

(By Al Chang)

CU CHI, VIETNAM.—In the corner of the orderly room of "Charley" company, 1st battalion, 27th Wolfhounds, there is a shiny helmet liner emblazoned with the stripes of a first sergeant, the Wolfhound crest and the taro leaf patch of the 25th Infantry Division.

Newcomers are warned forcefully not to touch it.

Then when they are filled in on the history and traditions of the Wolfhounds, they are told what the helmet liner means.

It belonged to Sam K. Solomon, a tall tough soldier from Kohala, Hawaii. He left it in the orderly room last November when he went into the field with "Charley" company at the start of Operation Attleboro.

On November 3 the outfit was in heavy action, and Solomon moved out alone eight times into the dense bush to bring back wounded men. Then, halting for a breather, the big first sergeant was shot and killed by a sniper.

"He was one of my finest soldiers," said Major General Fred C. Weyland, who was commanding general of the 25th at that time. "He didn't have to come to Vietnam because he was the lone survivor in his family, but he volunteered to be with his men. His death was a most tragic loss to our country."

After Solomon died, the men of his unit made sure the helmet liner stayed where he left it as a memorial to the man they consider "the first soldier of the Wolfhounds." It is shined carefully every day.

"I had been in the company only four months when he was killed," said Sergeant George R. Tabor of Chicago, Illinois, the company clerk. "During that time I got to know him well. When he was killed, I was really hit hard. It was like losing a father. He was the type that if you were in danger and hit, he would come out after you and he did.

"That helmet in the corner of this orderly room is for him, and, like everyone else, I'll see to it that it will remain there and we'll all keep it shining."

When Solomon was killed, Charles J. Buckley of Bryan, Texas, took over as "C" company's top kick. He shares the feeling for the almost legendary Solomon.

"When I came into this company and heard about his feats and saw his helmet lined in one corner of my orderly room. I got a great feeling of respect for this man," Buckley said.

"Nobody is going to be allowed to touch that helmet," he went on. "It's a living memorial to a fine and great soldier. It's a reminder of the courageous acts of our first sergeant. When I leave, I'll pass the word along to my replacement.

"Since I took his place, a couple of people tried to manhandle the helmet, not knowing what it meant. They nearly got shot."

Solomon had a reputation for being a tough sergeant when new men joined his unit, but he made soldiers out of them and they came to respect and love him. His service now has become legendary and the shiny helmet liner serves as a constant reminder of the man and his deeds.

"We had 12 people left in the company who knew Solomon when he was first sergeant," said First Lieutenant Thomas L. Coldren of Hughes, Arkansas, company executive officer. "When new men arrive they are told of the traditions of the Wolfhounds and the helmet is shown to them.

"It has become a symbol. No one can fill that helmet."

PACIFIC CONFERENCE ON URBAN GROWTH

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, representatives of the United States and a number of Pacific Basin nations convened this week in Honolulu for the first Pacific Conference on Urban Growth.

In his welcoming remarks, Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, noted that many of the most imaginative programs relating to urban growth are in Asia rather than in the West.

Governor Burns painted a grim picture of what we can expect if we do not "nurture and promote that essential human dignity which each man must have."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Governor's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY GOV. JOHN A. BURNS, PACIFIC CONFERENCE ON URBAN GROWTH, KENNEDY THEATRE, EAST-WEST CENTER, MAY 1, 1967

It is my pleasure, on behalf of the people of the State of Hawaii, to extend to all of

our distinguished guests our very warmest Aloha. This conference, which has brought delegates from throughout the Pacific-Asian world to Hawaii, once again demonstrates that Hawaii is playing its destined role as the meeting place of East and West. As the 50th State of our Union, situated almost halfway between the great land masses of North and South America and that of Asia, we are delighted to serve as the bridge over which those of different cultures can walk the path to mutual understanding, to peace, and to co-operative efforts to solve the many problems which confront us.

We are pleased, as host for this conference, to represent all of the states of the United States and their deep and common concern with the problems of urban growth. The topics we will be discussing at this conference have relevance not only for Hawaii and the nations you represent but for most of our sister states; and our conclusions will be of interest to all urbanized societies. Increasingly in this country we are developing the concept of "creative federalism" in which the federal government, the states, and the cities co-operate in meeting the vast and complicated problems of urban growth and in which they in turn call on private industry and the voluntary associations for assistance and aid. "Creative federalism" then is a kind of partnership approach which invites and fosters innovative ideas, diverse involvement, and multiple sources of criticism of present approaches and proposals. It is based on the belief that only through the combined and best efforts of all of us will we even achieve partial solution of our major urban problems. This "creative federalism" makes many of us important participants in urban development including state governors, members of our state legislatures, and heads of state departments, as well as federal and city officials, labor, business, church and professional leaders, and private citizens. We at the federal, state, and city levels in the United States are still struggling to work out the substance and form of "creative federalism." We do know, however, that it involves all of us intimately in the problems of urban growth.

There can be no conscientious citizen today who is not deeply troubled by the plight of our cities both in your nations and in mine. The world is rapidly becoming urbanized. While there may be those who would lament it, the forces of science, technology, and related phenomena are such that increasing urbanization seems inevitable. And while there are exceptions, generally speaking the world has not adjusted well to this growing urbanization. We have permitted slums and hovels to develop. We have hardly begun to cope with our mounting transportation problems. And sometimes when we have moved to replace inadequate and unattractive housing, we have ended up creating modern slums conducive neither to family living nor community spirit. The time has come for all of the nations of the world to be particularly honest, one with the other; to face up squarely to the inadequacies of both our conceptual thinking about the problems of the city and to our inability to implement much of our new thinking; to make a massive but intelligent attack on the problems which are with us now; to project ourselves far enough into the future so that we do not develop instruments of urban growth that merely offer temporary solutions to present problems and actually increase our difficulties ten, twenty, or fifty years hence.

One of the most propitious elements of this conference is that our Asian friends and neighbors are joining with us in this consideration. For if one looks with care, he finds that many of the most imaginative programs relating to urban growth are in Asia rather than in the West. Who could have been in Singapore without admiring what has been done there in the building of new housing? And in a number of your nations you have dealt intelligently with the always difficult political problem of squatters. Tokyo with its electric railway has given all the world pause and caused us to take a second look at our sometimes unimaginative attempts to solve the mass transit problem. And representing a state which did not have sufficient foresight to provide adequate land for its state university, I cannot but envy the planning that has apparently been done at the University of Malaysia in Kuala Lumpur. For all of these and many other accomplishments, your nations are to be commended. And we are fortunate that you have come to this conference to give us the benefit of your experience and planning.

It is extremely easy to become discouraged and disturbed about mankind's plight. One can think of, and in many cases see, so many evidences of where we have placed profit ahead of human beings, where we have worshipped function and disregarded style, where we have been opportunistic rather than brotherly. Examples of these processes exist all over the world. No nation and no part of any nation is free from them—the depressing industrial complexes in parts of England; the grimness and poverty of squatter villages in some Asian cities; or the unhappy slum ghettos of America.

When one views all of this it appears that man is, indeed, a sorry creature and there seems little hope for him to plan his salvation.

But somehow I sense a quickened concern for the problems of the human spirit throughout the world, a deeper recognition that man lives not by bread alone. But all that we produce, all the affluence which we can attain, will taste as ashes if they do not nurture and promote that essential human dignity which each man must have. It is possible that a new age is upon us. All of us, from time to time, are irritated with the sometimes seemingly irrational activities of the young. And indeed some of these activities are exactly that: contributing nothing to the human enterprise and even, in fact, tending to destroy such good as has been achieved. But if one looks with care and casts aside his predispositions toward judging everything in terms of himself, one sees at least a core of young people who are crying out to us—in all honesty and with all sincerity in the best way they know how—that affluence is not enough. They are asking the questions beyond affluence, the questions which we in our anxiety to achieve our economic ends did not permit to be of concern to us. Affluence for what? Economic security for what? What is the end of man? How does our new technology meet the fundamental needs of human nature? These are good questions, too long left unattended; and difficult as they are to resolve we must face them,

And in relation to the subject of this conference, one can draw fresh hope from the fact that in some places major problems of urbanization have been met with resolve and intelligence. The Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, of 1936 almost always had over it a low-lying bank of smog created by the great industrial complex that had located there and been permitted to exist without any regard for the human beings who were operating it. So bad did the condition in the area become that in nearby Donora one bitter weekend many people were killed. But the community leaders, both public and private, of the city of Pittsburgh finally saw what they were doing to themselves and all their fellow citizens, and we had what has come to be called The Pittsburgh Renaissance.

Smoke and pollution of the air have not been eliminated, but they have been effectively controlled. The dilapidated run-down unhappy area known as The Point, which is where the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers meet, is now a beautiful park-like development with magnificent buildings on it. These civil leaders in Pittsburgh have changed that city from one where corporations used to have great difficulty in getting talented executives to serve to a city where the living conditions are—if not perfect—quite good, indeed. And one could repeat this example a number of times and throughout the world on all the continents. This seems to me to be the evidence that all is not lost. Man, under the proper circumstances, does have the ability to cure urban blight. He can articulate alternatives and provide options which offer some hope of enlarging human freedom and contributing to the development of responsible men. He can expand the range of viable and real choices in terms of the style of life people choose to lead. He can attend to the functional aspects of our economy but do it in such a way that the human spirit can soar and we can live the kinds of lives that free men are entitled to live.

Man can establish institutions that are concerned with the problems of urban growth, both theoretically and practically. Thus our universities through research and education may provide us with real assistance in helping us to understand the problems we face today and those that will be upon us tomorrow, and then assist us to solve these problems. In Hawaii, for example, we have a unique institution—the East-West Center—devoted to promoting mutual understanding. Among the concerns of its constituent institutes have been the processes and effects of the urbanization which we are considering at this conference. Furthermore, at this time, the University of Hawaii is considering the establishment of an educational program in public policy planning which should enhance the opportunities for those of us of Asia, the Pacific, and America to examine together the planning processes and the policy problems that are common to our nations, regions, and cities and to prepare ourselves to deal with them. In addition to educational institutions, we in America rely heavily on a wide variety of voluntary associations including citizen groups, churches, unions, business and industry groups, and professional associations to participate in solving the pressing urban problems that confront our people. The vitality of 'creative federalism,' which I spoke of earlier, is dependent upon the willingness of the individual to participate in the urban process as a member of these institutions and as a private citizen. Thus, the initiative of the individual is the cornerstone on which our society rests its hopes of progress; this is the same individual whose human spirit ought to soar and who ought to live the kind of life free men are entitled to live.

The problems of urban growth, which bring us together here today for mutual consideration over the next 12 days, are the problems of all humanity.

They are, by and large, problems common to all societies.

From country to country, from state to state, from city to city, from village to village, there are the full range of differences in the modes and standards of living of people.

Fundamentally, however, urban growth creates problems common to all peoples—whether in Honolulu or Hong Kong, Chicago or Cairo, Taipei or Tokyo, Singapore or Stockholm.

Wherever and whenever man congregates to live together in an organized society, problems arise in housing, in providing public services in water and power, in transportation and in other requirements of communal living.

If urban problems give us any comfort at all, it is in the proof they give us that no society is more equal than any other in this area—we are all afflicted with common growing pains.

Urban growth offers a challenge, therefore, to all of us.

The road to the development of the present Constitution of the United States of America was difficult, troubled, and rocky. It started with a revolution and then proceeded through a number of ineffective attempts to devise a new government for our states including the Articles of Confederation which functioned so badly that it began to appear that the revolution had been fought in vain. Finally there came the Constitutional Convention of 1787, but even then there was no end of disagreement. Many compromises were necessary before the venture could be brought to a successful conclusion. Finally, the Constitution was signed by all the members present, but three. While the last members were signing it Benjamin Franklin, looking toward the President's chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, observed to a few members near him, that painters had found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising from a setting sun. "I have," said he, "often in the course of the Session, and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting: But now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

Today, I, too, believe I see a rising—not a setting—sun.

Mahalo!

RETIREMENT OF CARROLL KENWORTHY FROM UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I understand that Carroll Kenworthy will retire Tuesday after 37 years of reporting the Washington scene for the foreign clients of United Press International. For the past 26 years, he has been head of the foreign department at UPI's Washington bureau.

Kenworthy's reputation with his colleagues has been earned by his equanimity in a crisis and his reliability on all occasions. Perhaps the greatest newsbeat of his career came a week before Pearl Harbor, when he wrote a story—later cited by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson at the joint congressional committee investigating the lack of preparedness at Pearl Harbor—saying it was felt that "talks between Secretary Hull and the special Japanese Envoy, Saburo Kurusu, are near collapse" and "it is believed Japan may strike."

Kenworthy is the son of a Quaker minister, and he has remained active in the Quaker Society of Friends. He received a bachelor's degree from Earlham College, Indiana, in 1925, and later served as trustee for that college from 1954 to 1963. After receiving his master's degree from Columbia in 1927, he acquired newspaper experience on the Hartford Courant, the Tokyo, Japan, Advertiser, and the Wall Street Journal before joining what was then the United Press as diplomatic reporter in Washington in 1930.

His accuracy and dependability will be missed on the Washington news scene, and I join his colleagues in wishing him many happy years of retirement.

THE GREAT ATTRIBUTES OF KANSAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, we in Kansas are proud of our position as "Midway-U.S.A." and one of the businessmen in the State who is continually calling attention to the great attributes of Kansas is Fred Kimball, senior vice president and director of Kansas Gas & Electric Co. in Wichita.

The enthusiasm with which Fred Kimball sells his company and his State is captured in full measure by an article written by Dick Dilsaver, Wichita Beacon editor. Mr. President, I ask consent that the article, published in the Wichita Beacon of May 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

K.G. & E.'s FRED KIMBALL CLAIMS JOB "IS ANYTHING DEALING WITH PEOPLE"

(By Dick Dilsaver)

If you're a salesman, you need a prospect before you can make a sale.

Fred Kimball found a sure way to locate prospects in 1929 when, at the brash age of 20, he started selling appliances for Kansas Electric Power Co. at Leavenworth, Kan.

He offered a new-fangled product, the electric refrigerator. To find who needed one, he simply followed this iceman.

When he'd come to a house where a sign in the window said ICE—that's how the housewife who needed her icebox filled signalled the ice man to stop—Kimball knew he had a genuine prospect. He set a sales record his first month on the job.

Fred Kimball has been selling successfully ever since. Today as a senior vice president and director of Kansas Gas and Electric Co., he's selling electricity and promoting the sale of the many products that use it. But he works just as hard at selling Wichita and Kansas.

Kimball learned about hard work at an age when most fellows are finding out more about girls, mumblety-peg and how to throw a curve ball.

He did his share of the chores while being raised as the fifth of six children on a corn-country farm near the Missouri River in northeast Nebraska.

By the time he was 13 he was jerking sodas and clerking in drug stores 50 hours a week—up to 90 hours in summer—to aid his widowed mother. Even a move to sunny Albuquerque hadn't saved his father from tuberculosis.

A year at the University of New Mexico preceded the job at Leavenworth which started his career in utilities that now has spanned 38 years. He had hopes of flying lessons at Kansas City and part-time study at the University of Kansas in Lawrence, but "there always seemed to be work to do."

He moved up the pole in Kansas Electric Power (it's Kansas Power and Light now) with transfers to Parsons and Lawrence, then switched in 1939 to Missouri Public Service Co. at Warrensburg, Mo. World War II was served in Washington as an administrator and analyst for the Office of War Utilities Division, War Production Board.

Some men who liked to fish as avidly as Kimball does wouldn't have budged from his post-war spot, promotion manager for Portland, Oreg., Gas and Coke Co. He'd found a glacier-fed stream on Mount Hood he could reach in 90 minutes after lunch, catch a basketfull of rainbow trout and be home by dark.

The man who induced Kimball to leave that was Gordon Evans, now KG&E board chairman and president, who many a Wichita businessman will agree has a persuasive way about him.

The two men had worked together in Missouri before the war. Evans, then executive vice-president of KG&E, hired Kimball to come here as general sales manager.

"It's the happiest move I ever made," says Kimball. That includes fishing. "We have great fishing. I soon learned that landing a Kansas big-mouth black bass on a spinning rod is more fun than catching trout in Oregon." Mostly he fishes Wichita area farm ponds, using "anything and everything" for lures, but favoring Mepps spinners. His top bass catch scaled 5½ pounds.

Kimball's first assignment here was to expand the KG&E sales program with emphasis on development of industry. In 1956 he was named vice president, with personnel administration and public information added to his realm. He was elected to the board of directors a year ago and this February was named senior vice president. He describes his job as "anything in the company that deals with people."

The electric business isn't the same as when he came here. Christmas Eve once was the day of the year when use of electricity reached its peak. Then came air conditioning. Huge power plans were built to meet the increased need, which now peaks in summer, usually the third weekday of a hot spell.

That expansion also brought problems. The entire generating capacity was needed only a few days a year. The rest of the time it stood idle, yet it represented great investment and fixed costs—such as taxes, interest, depreciation—which continued year around.

The industry pondered the problem and came up with this answer: make it feasible and economical to heat complete homes and businesses through electricity, thus using more electricity in winter.

"There's been an astounding change in just four or five years," says Kimball. "Of 1,450 living units—homes and apartments—on which construction started in the KG&E service area last year, 615 or 42.4 percent used electricity as the only source of energy."

He practices what he preaches. The home he built at 550 N. Armour in Woodlawn Village a few years back is so all-electric that the driveway is wired to melt ice and snow. Even the dog house is all-electric.

A person trying to get a head start on Kimball would stumble in the dark.

He's up sometimes at 4:45 a.m. and always by 5:30. Mrs. Kimball is, too. She sets out orange juice and coffee while he gets the paper.

"Nothing would upset me more than if the paper boy were late," he says. "I'm an inveterate newspaper fan and read every Beacon and every Eagle from front to back. Even when I'm away on business, the family saves every copy and I read them when I return."

Kimball reaches his seventh-floor office at First and Market before 8 and starts by distributing a healthy stack of work and assignments he completed at home the night before.

A high proportion of his time is devoted to community development.

"Kansas, particularly southeast Kansas and Wichita, have been very good to me," he says. "I feel I should do anything I can to return any of these benefits to the area."

What he considers "anything" is just about everything. Here's just a partial list of the positions he's held:

President, Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce; president, United Fund; founder and president, Kansas Sales Executive Club; board chairman, Wichita Area Development Inc.; vice-president and director, Metropolitan YMCA; national council and Quivira council, Boy Scouts of America; vice-president and director, Sedgwick County Mental Health Assn.; founder, South Central Kansas Economic Development Council; a trustee, member of executive committee and chairman of development committee, Wesley Medical Center; vice president and trustee, Midwest Medical Research Foundation.

Where does he find time for such service? "When things need doing in the community, you simply take whatever time it needs," he said.

Now, he's president-elect of Rotary Club, where he's completed a cycle of sorts. In other communities he was a member of Lions and Kiwanis. Other affiliations are Wichita Club and Wichita Country Club. The Kimballs are members of East Heights Methodist Church.

Among his fondest honors he counts the 1961 Man of the Year award presented by Public Relations Society of Wichita for his work on "Focal Point U.S.A.," a KG&E promotion depicting the attributes of this area. In 1964, he was named Salesman of the Year by the Sales and Marketing Executives Club, again for boosting Kansas and Wichita.

"Kansans need to be proud of our area's advantages," he says.

Like climate—"We are blessed here by four true seasons without monotonous long-time extremes like some of the so-called glamour spots."

And location—"Kansas is becoming the population center and the best place in America to produce goods for all of America."

And recreation—"We have splendid facilities for all the most popular participation sports like bowling, golf, fishing, hunting, swimming, picnicking and boating, and sports spectators in Kansas see some of the finest college teams in the nation."

The next project Kimball wants to see moving faster and further is the Mid-Arkansas Valley Development Assn. (MAVDA). He's a member of the MAVDA executive committee pushing for a comprehensive study of the Arkansas River and tributaries from Tulsa to the Colorado headwaters.

"This study is long overdue," Kimball says, "A complete one never has been made even though the Arkansas is the fifth longest river in the United States. We must learn and consider the best ways to conserve this river's resources and develop navigation, municipal and industrial water supply, flood control, irrigation and recreation. We need also to evaluate the aesthetic contributions which can be made to our city and state."

Recently Kimball has been making a not-always-successful effort to cut down on night meetings so he can spend more time with his family. It includes his wife, the former Anita Bazer Lantz; daughter Sandra, 17; and twin sons Larry and Leigh, 13.

But one activity defies cutting—Wichita State University sporting events. He's vice president of Century Club which boosts the Shockers, and a director of WSU Physical Education Corp., which governs the school's sports operations. He's always at WSU games, shouting "Go, Shockers!"

Just as in other settings he's always cheering "Go, Wichitans!" and "Go, Kansans!"—not from the sidelines but from the thick of the action.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this week will mark a time of great pride for the 900,000 safety patrol volunteers who promote school safety in all 50 States.

Safety patrol members from throughout the United States will assemble in Washington, D.C., to commemorate more than 40 years of continued high civic service, to march in a spectacular parade—and to honor those young persons who have distinguished themselves in the cause of school traffic safety.

To provide national recognition to this annual event, I have introduced legislation to establish on a permanent basis that the second week in May every year be designated "National School Safety Patrol Week."

This designation from the Federal Government would be a token of the gratitude Americans—particularly those of us who are parents—feel for the safety patrol teams. They can be justly proud of their work.

I am equally proud to announce that among the 22,000 youngsters who will gather this week in Washington for the safety patrol tribute will be 215 boys and girls from my State of Connecticut—and that five Connecticut youths will be singled out for honors in the 1967 National School Traffic Safety Poster Contest.

A $500 savings bond is the prize one Connecticut boy—12-year-old Alexander Baker, of Branford—will be awarded in an honors program in the Federal Aviation Agency building here.

Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, will make the presentation.

Young Mr. Baker, who lives at 149 Linden Avenue, in Branford, entered his poster in the "Cross Only at Corners" category. He competed against some 17,000 youngsters from 2,200 schools across the Nation.

The other Connecticut finalists—all of whom entered the "Wear White After Dark" category—are:

Thomas Ardise, of 96 Colonial Road, Stamford. First place, elementary school division.

Michael Roth, of 1 Marshall Place, Branford. Second place, elementary school division.

Joseph Verrilli, of 62 Fourth Street, Bridgeport. Second place, primary school division.

Christopher McAuliffe, of 31 Parkwood Drive, Windsor. Honorable mention, primary school division.

I congratulate these fine youngsters for their posters and the awards they will receive. They have represented their State well.

At these same award ceremonies Thursday, Secretary Boyd will also present the American Automobile Association's Gold Lifesaver Medals to nine safety patrol members who actually saved a life in a traffic incident.

Then, the nine Lifesaver Medal winners will ride at the head of the 31st annual National School Safety Patrol Parade Saturday.

The parade—highlighted by 80 marching bands, 50 floats and hundreds of majorettes—is expected to last six hours and is one of the most colorful yearly processions in the Nation's Capital.

Secretary Boyd will be the grand marshal and the U.S. Army Band will lead the way. The parade will march down historic Constitution Avenue starting at 9 a.m. In the reviewing stand will be Members of Congress, Cabinet officers and diplomats.

The parade will be an impressive sight—a fitting tribute to the dedication and sense of high purpose the school traffic safety patrol program represents.

WITH THE GREATEST RESPECT—PLEASE, UNCLE SAM

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, a Cheyenne, Wyo., citizen, Mr. Jack Mabee, who is president of the Chief Oil Corp., and Chief Enterprises, has placed a paid advertisement in a recent edition of one of the newspapers in his city—the Wyoming Eagle.

Mr. Mabee's advertisement commanded the largest portion of a full page and took the form of a plea to Uncle Sam from a "citizen, taxpayer, and businessman, insofar as Government and taxes permit," to rationalize the dilemma many taxpayers find themselves in today.

Mr. President, I cannot help thinking that the majority of American citizens perhaps find themselves in the same "pickle" as Mr. Mabee—that of attempting to "make both ends meet" at a time when the cost of living is at an alltime high and still rising, and the frustration and difficulty of rationalizing the actions of the Great Society is almost overwhelming.

I can certainly understand this gentleman's consternation, and I believe he makes some worthwhile points in his advertisement.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mabee's statement of April 26, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WITH THE GREATEST RESPECT—PLEASE, UNCLE SAM

"Hey, Uncle, how much does it cost to rear a child? You allow us taxpaying parents only $600 a year to clothe, feed, house and train a youngster. In your Federal Job Corps you spend $7,000 a year! Now which is the correct figure? Either we're allowing you too much or you're not allowing us enough.

"You allow tax-paying parents $600 deduction for the care and feeding at each child. Yet, under the Cuban refugee program you assume minimum upkeep requires $1,200 a year—and if the Cuban boy or girl is attending school an extra $1,000 a year.

"How come you short change the home folks, Uncle? In the austere environs of a federal prison, you have discovered that it costs—to maintain one person, with no frills, no luxuries and no borrowing Dad's car—$2,300 per year. By what rule of thumb do you estimate that Mom and Dad can do it for one-fourth of that amount?

"Under Social Security, you will pay $158 a month to maintain the elderly. What makes you think we can maintain our young'uns on $50 a month? And, Uncle, your Vista program (Volunteers in Service to America) spent $3.1 million last year to train only 202 trainees. That indicates that the cost of maintaining and training one youth for one year is more than $15,000. Then how come we taxpayers get an exemption of $600 to maintain and train one youth for a year?

"Or let's see how much you spent upkeeping one youngster in military uniform. House $55.00 a month. Food, $30.27 a month. Clothing upkeep, $4.20 a month. That comes to $1,074.04 a year. How in the world do you expect parents to provide all these things, plus clothes, recreation, books, medicine—for $600 a year? With your figures, Uncle, you admit it can't be done.

"Is it possible, Uncle Sam, that you expect us parents to manage more efficiently than you do, because we usually do? With all our expenses, we American individuals have more than enough in savings to offset our debts. You don't.

"With all our prosperity, you, Uncle, are still spending per year $2.9 billion more for relief than during the depths of depression. So it just may be that you are uncommonly extravagant.

"Regardless of how we try to rationalize and explain you and excuse you, it is still

a hurtful affront when you allow us working, dues-paying home folks only $600 a year to rear a legitimate child—while you, under ADC, will pay more than $800 a year to upkeep an illegitimate one."

This advertisement is paid for, personally, by the undersigned, who is a Citizen, Taxpayer and a Businessman, insofar as Government and taxes permit.

(Signed) JACK MABEE,
President, Chief Oil Corp., and Chief Enterprises.

HARRY S. TRUMAN—A VERY GREAT PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, today marks the 83d birthday of President Harry S. Truman, one of the greatest Americans of all time. It has been given to few men in history to serve his Nation and mankind as has Harry Truman throughout a lifetime of public service. He was a great U.S. Senator, a great citizen, and a great President of the United States.

Not only is he loved by his countrymen, but he is greatly honored and respected by freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Mr. President, he has helped many of us who are Members of this body. He is not only a great citizen, but also a great partisan when he needs to be a partisan.

I may say very definitely that I would not have been elected Senator from my State of Ohio in 1958 except for the fact that former President Harry S. Truman came to Cleveland for the sole purpose of urging my election over the incumbent, Senator John W. Bricker. Former President Truman made speeches and televised statements urging my election in Cleveland and at huge rallies in Akron and Columbus. Up to that time, no one, but no one, predicted anything other than my defeat.

The sad truth, from my personal standpoint, is that the national leaders of my party had "not given me a prayer." Sad to relate, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the treasurer of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee had manifested a very dim view of even the possibility of my election.

Former President Truman's courageous whistlestop campaign for election in 1948 will always be remembered in the annals of the politics of our country. Well, he made the same sort of "give 'em hell" speeches for me in Ohio, and immediately following them and his denunciation of the political record of my opponent, my campaign was off the ground. The rest is Ohio history. In 1963 President Truman came to Ohio and addressed a banquet held in my behalf and urged my reelection to the Senate. It will always be a matter of great pride on my part that this great man manifested his confidence in me and gave me encouragement in two difficult campaigns where I was regarded as the underdog, to really understate the situation.

Mr. President, I do not need to take time here to recite the many accomplishments of this great man's administration and of his life's work. I fervently hope that all of us and the Nation will have the benefit of his wisdom and counsel for many, many more years.

The facts are that nobody grows old by living a specific number of years. People grow old by deserting their ideas and losing their enthusiasm. Men and women are as old as their doubts. They are as young as their hopes, their zest for life, and their self-confidence. Given that criterion, Harry S. Truman is one of the youngest men I know.

I am happy to salute one of the first citizens of our land on his birthday anniversary. I wish him and Mrs. Truman a long life of happiness.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session, to consider treaties on the Executive Calendar.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair state the unanimous-consent agreement in connection with the vote on the treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the agreement previously entered into by the Senate, the Senate will proceed at 12:10 p.m. today, by three separate votes, to vote on treaties numbered 16 through 18 on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

In accordance with the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to vote, by three separate votes, on treaties Nos. 16 through 18 on the Executive Calendar.

The roll will first be called on Calendar No. 16, Executive G, 88th Congress, first session, the subject of which is a convention concerning the international exchange of publications and documents.

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE EXCHANGE OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS AND GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS BETWEEN STATES, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AT ITS 10TH SESSION, PARIS, DECEMBER 3, 1958

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 104 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Aiken	Harris	Morton
Allott	Hart	Moss
Anderson	Hartke	Murphy
Baker	Hatfield	Muskie
Bartlett	Hayden	Nelson
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bennett	Hill	Pearson
Bible	Holland	Percy
Boggs	Hruska	Prouty
Brewster	Inouye	Proxmire
Brooke	Jackson	Randolph
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Kuchel	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Lausche	Scott
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Smith
Carlson	Long, La.	Sparkman
Church	Magnuson	Spong
Cooper	Mansfield	Stennis
Dirksen	McCarthy	Symington
Dodd	McClellan	Talmadge
Eastland	McGee	Thurmond
Ervin	McGovern	Tower
Fannin	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Yarborough
Gore	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hansen	Morse	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Case	Gruening	Montoya
Clark	Hollings	Mundt
Cotton	Javits	Pell
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Dominick	Kennedy, Mass.	Tydings
Ellender	Kennedy, N.Y.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 109 OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Senate will now proceed to vote on Executive Calendar No. 17, the subject of which is the amendment to article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations.

On this question, the years and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 105 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Aiken	Dirksen	Holland
Allott	Dodd	Hruska
Anderson	Eastland	Inouye
Baker	Ellender	Jackson
Bartlett	Ervin	Jordan, Idaho
Bayh	Fannin	Kuchel
Bennett	Fong	Lausche
Bible	Fulbright	Long, Mo.
Boggs	Gore	Long, La.
Brewster	Griffin	Magnuson
Brooke	Hansen	Mansfield
Burdick	Harris	McCarthy
Byrd, Va.	Hart	McClellan
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	McGee
Cannon	Hatfield	McGovern
Carlson	Hayden	McIntyre
Church	Hickenlooper	Metcalf
Cooper	Hill	Miller
Mondale	Percy	Stennis
Monroney	Prouty	Symington
Morse	Proxmire	Talmadge
Morton	Randolph	Thurmond
Moss	Ribicoff	Tower
Murphy	Russell	Williams, N.J.
Muskie	Scott	Williams, Del.
Nelson	Smith	Yarborough
Pastore	Sparkman	Young, N. Dak.
Pearson	Spong	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Case	Hollings	Mundt
Clark	Javits	Pell
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Curtis	Kennedy, Mass.	Tydings
Dominick	Kennedy, N.Y.	
Gruening	Montoya	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The Senate will now proceed to vote on Executive Calendar No. 18, the Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska, [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 106 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Aiken	Hansen	Morse
Allott	Harris	Morton
Anderson	Hart	Moss
Baker	Hartke	Murphy
Bartlett	Hatfield	Muskie
Bayh	Hayden	Nelson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bible	Hill	Pearson
Boggs	Holland	Percy
Brewster	Hruska	Prouty
Brooke	Inouye	Proxmire
Burdick	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Russell
Cannon	Lausche	Scott
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Smith
Church	Long, La.	Sparkman
Cooper	Magnuson	Spong
Dirksen	Mansfield	Stennis
Dodd	McCarthy	Symington
Eastland	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	McGee	Thurmond
Ervin	McGovern	Tower
Fannin	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Yarborough
Gore	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Case	Hollings	Mundt
Clark	Javits	Pell
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Curtis	Kennedy, Mass.	Tydings
Dominick	Kennedy, N.Y.	
Gruening	Montoya	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A LARGE PROTOTYPE DESALTING PLANT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 270, a bill to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 270) to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to participate in the development of technology for a large-scale desalting plant by providing financial, technical, or other assistance to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for the design, development, construction, and operation of a water treatment and desalting plant to be constructed as a part of a dual-purpose electrical power generation and desalting project in the Southern California area.

SEC. 2. Before providing any assistance as authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall first determine that the value of the anticipated technical knowledge and experience

in desalting to be derived from his participation in the construction and operation of this facility will be not less than the amount of such assistance.

SEC. 3. In order to provide the assistance authorized by this Act, the Secretary may, without regard to the provisions of Revised Statutes 3648, enter into a contract with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California containing such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate and covering such periods of time as he may consider necessary but under which the liability of the United States shall be contingent upon appropriations being available therefor. No such contract, however, shall be executed by the Secretary until 45 calendar days after it has been transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which 45 days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment for more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die. The contract shall provide that any financial assistance by the United States under this Act toward the construction of the Bolsa Island or the facilities thereon shall be contingent upon the parties concerned obtaining, prior to the start of construction of the Bolsa Island, a construction permit from the United States Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of the nuclear reactors on the said island. The contract shall also provide that the United States, its officers and employees shall have a permanent right to access to said island and the desalting project located thereon for all official purposes.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on or before March 1 of each year on his operations under this Act and on the results obtained by the United States from participation in the desalting and electrical power generation project pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 5. To carry out the purposes of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $57,200,000, which shall remain available until expended.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I intend to move that the Senate concur in the amendments added by the House, but before doing so, I want to explain their effect on the bill as previously passed by the Senate.

Senate bill 270 authorizes the Department of the Interior, in association with the Atomic Energy Commission, to join in a cooperative arrangement with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, a public corporation engaged in the wholesale supply of water to many municipalities and other public corporations, the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, and two investor-owned electric utilities serving the southern California market area.

The bill would authorize the Department of the Interior to contribute to both the capital investment costs and the operation and maintenance costs of the desalting facility. The Department's total contribution of $57.2 million plus the $15 million which the Atomic Energy Commission is already authorized to provide will represent only about one-sixth of the total capital costs involved in the dual-purpose project. The capital costs that will be borne by the metropolitan water district and the public and private electric utilities in relation to this project will be approximately $380 million. The Department of the Interior's participation in this project will enable it to purchase needed technology, produced under practical, demonstrational conditions, which will greatly advance the Nation's saline water conversion program.

I believe the amendments added by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should cause no significant difficulties as I interpret their intent and could inure to the benefit of all the project participants.

The most significant new language adopted by the House reads as follows:

No such contract, however, shall be executed by the Secretary until 45 calendar days after it has been transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which 45 days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment for more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die. The contract shall provide that any financial assistance by the United States under this Act toward the construction of the Bolsa Island or the facilities thereon shall be contingent upon the parties concerned obtaining, prior to the start of construction of the Bolsa Island, a construction permit from the United States Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of the nuclear reactors on the said island. The contract shall also provide that the United States, its officers and employees shall have a permanent right to access to said island and the desalting project located thereon for all official purposes.

This will allow our committee to carefully examine the proposed contract between the Government and the metropolitan water district which, under the bill, must be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I also agree with the judgment of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the Secretary of the Interior should report to the Congress annually on his operations under this act and on the results of the Government's participation in this project.

Another feature added by the House committee is the requirement that the contract with the metropolitan water district provide that any financial assistance by the United States under this act toward the construction of the island site or the project facilities on the site shall be contingent upon the parties concerned obtaining an AEC construction permit for the construction of the nuclear reactors before the beginning of construction of the island site. It is clear to me that it is not intended to apply to those project activities which necessarily must precede the actual physical construction of the island—including those related to detailed design, site investigations, and other advance activities, including the placing of orders for long lead items in order to get on manufacturers schedules. Obviously, these pre-construction efforts must proceed without delay, in advance of the start of actual construction of the island, if the project is to be undertaken and accomplished in a manner satisfying the needs of all the participants.

The reference to the AEC construction permit is also clear. As is generally known the regulatory side of the Atomic Energy Commission maintains careful licensing and regulatory control of the construction and operation of nuclear facilities from the standpoint of nuclear health and safety, and AEC's initial construction permit, if issued, is but the first of its licensing measures. When AEC issues its initial construction permit the condition represented by this provision will have been fully met.

As the preparatory efforts progress, the parties to this project may start on certain necessary advance features of the island, short of actual physical construction, before AEC formally issues its initial construction permit for the nuclear facilities. This type of activity is not intended to be precluded prior to the actual issuance of the permit. On the other hand, if the AEC permit is not issued for the Bolsa Island site, or any other suitable site, and consequently the project is terminated, this provision would preclude Interior's financial participation in the cost of the actual construction of the island itself as distinguished from the preconstruction activities. Thus, all the participants in this cooperative arrangement are made fully aware of this legislative and contractual aspect of the financial assistance to be provided by the Department of the Interior under this act, as distinguished from the AEC which is presently authorized to provide its assistance to this project. AEC's assistance as authorized by the Congress does pertain to certain safety features of this island siting as well as to the coupling of the water facilities with the power generation plants. Interior's assistance will, without duplication of AEC's assistance, apply to the capital costs of all the facilities related to water production, including the systems required for the supply of energy for the desalting operation and the site for the water facilities, but not including the capital costs for conveying the product to the metropolitan distribution system.

I congratulate Chairman ASPINALL and the other members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who have, in my judgment, strengthened this bill. I also extend my congratulations to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the sponsor of S. 270, for his zeal, guidance, and dedication to this worthwhile project.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I express my gratitude for the generous comments of my friend from Washington, the chairman of the committee which sat in judgment on this legislation. All I can say is that I thank him very much.

In addition, Mr. President, I quite agree that the purpose of the House amendment has been correctly spelled out by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I thank the Senator for most carefully spelling out the purpose of the language we will approve today, as I think it is important in going forward with the construction of this facility to have a clear understanding of the meaning of the enabling legislation. This giant facility will be built on a manmade island of some 43 acres, lying seaward of the coastline of my home county of Orange in the State of California. It will carry on, with the aid of nuclear energy, an actual test, Mr. Presi-

dent, of whether the salt water of the sea can be used to produce, economically, 150 million gallons of fresh water each day, for distribution by the public agencies of southern California.

I thank my able friend for his interest, his enthusiasm, and his leadership in what has now been accomplished. I also thank the other Senators who have joined me in sponsoring this bill: the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], my colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD].

The combination nuclear electric power and sea water conversion plant is to be owned and operated by these local, private, and public agencies. The Federal Government, in turn, will gain valuable technological experience in the field of sea water conversion. This unique partnership of private and governmental agencies will make it unnecessary for the Department of the Interior to seek funds for all-Federal construction of such a massive prototype plant.

In a study report submitted in December 1965, the Bechtel Corp., of San Francisco, stated that the project was technically feasible and could produce fresh water at a cost of 21.9 cents per 1,000 gallons at plantsite, and 27 cents per 1,000 gallons delivered to the metropolitan water district system. The present minimum cost of fresh water from existing desalination plants is about $1 per 1,000 gallons.

There is no substitute for having a large prototype plant operating if we hope to measure the cost savings to be achieved by large-scale operations. Although the plant is not expected to produce any dramatic technological breakthroughs, a demonstration that water can be taken from the sea and converted to fresh water at a low cost will have a great impact on future water resource development.

Upon completion, the plant will provide southern California with 150 million gallons of fresh water each day. This is over 100 times the 1.4 million gallons per day capacity of the former San Diego-Point Loma experimental plant which was moved to the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba late in 1964. The proposed plant would have more than twice the combined capacity of all the salt water conversion plants in existence today.

In addition, the nuclear reactors and turbine generators will generate approximately 1,800 megawatts of electricity—enough to supply the domestic needs of 2 million people. Even mighty Hoover Dam produces less power than will the proposed plant. The plant will be built on a 43-acre manmade island about one-half mile off the Bolsa Chica State Beach in Orange County. A two-lane causeway will carry water and power transmission lines to the mainland. The water will then be pumped 25 miles to the Diemer filtration plant where it will be blended with other water in the existing distribution system.

Those of us who have studied California's water resources for many years do not expect desalination to solve all of our State's water problems. It will however, help to ease our critical water shortages.

Reliable estimates foresee a doubling of California's population within a mere 25 years. This, coupled with the fact that per capita water consumption is ever increasing, makes it imperative that we test every promising approach to assure a reliable water supply for future generations.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the able senior Senator from California. The Senator is the ranking minority members on the committee, and the interpretation that has been stated here by the Senator is a unanimous one. I think it should make very clear to the departments concerned; namely, the Department of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission, the clear intent of the Senate in accepting the amendment offered in the House of Representatives, and now being concurred in here. With that understanding, I urge that the Senate concur in that amendment.

I do wish to say, as the able Senator from California has pointed out, this is indeed a historic event. I think it is just the beginning of a program that can not only do much to relieve the growing water problem in our own country, but I sincerely feel that, this being a very large plant, it will be one through which not only our Government but other governments around the world can obtain, I am sure, much valuable information which will help make possible the promotion of tremendous programs in the area of desalinization.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 270.

The motion was agreed to.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is now in order under a 3-minute limitation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION BY THE CANADIAN SENATE AND EXPRESSING THEIR APPRECIATION OF THE SAME

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Senate of Canada expressing its appreciation and gratitude to the Senate of the United States adopted on March 14, 1967, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECTS FOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects to be undertaken for the Air National Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1968

A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology. Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report "National Atmospheric Science Program—Fiscal Year 1968," with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Commerce.

SPECIAL REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN A PROPOSED INCREASE OF THE FUND FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, signed by the Secretary of State, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Acting Secretary of Commerce, and the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Advisory Council, to the President and the Congress (with an accompanying report); to the Committeeman on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the savings available through the use of formal advertising in contracting for automotive tires and tubes, General Service Administration, report dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings in costs of transporting food donated for distribution abroad, Agency for International Development, dated April 7, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, YOSEMITE PARK AND CURRY CO.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract which will authorize the Yosemite Park and Curry Co. to operate the Government-owned El Portal Motor Inn and provide related facilities and services for the public in the El Portal Administrative Site of Yosemite National Park, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RECLASSIFICATION UNDER RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the reclassification of certain land in the Hanover Bluff Unit of the Missouri River Basin Project, in Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORDERS ENTERED IN CASES OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO HAVE BEEN FOUND ADMISSIBLE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, enclosing copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found to be admissible to the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF AN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the adjustment of status of Koesmartono Prawotoadikoessoemo (with an accompanying paper) ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING, REPORT ON FOREST AND GRASS FIRES

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, dated May 5, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"A joint memorial to the President of the United States, the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, hereby request that:

"Whereas, the milk prices paid to the farmers for raw milk have declined substantially while milk production costs have elevated sharply with the price to the consumer being increased; and

"Whereas, the farmers' selling price for cattle has declined 10% in the last few months, the selling price for lambs has declined 33% in the last year, the selling price for hogs declined 31% in the last few months, and the selling price of poultry has decreased 6.4% while the price of meat to the consumer has increased 29% in a matter of months; and

"Whereas, the farmers' selling price for wheat has declined 14.4%, for wool 42% in one year, and for eggs 21.5%, as the cost of living and the cost of production of the farmer have increased sharply; and

"Whereas, two-thirds of the world's population are not receiving adequate foodstuffs and the farmers of the United States are being encouraged to increase production, while farm prices now at 75% of parity have dropped two points during the past month and are five points lower than the last year.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Thirty-ninth Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, that we most respectfully urge the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake to determine the problems and explain to the citizens of the United States the reasons for the great disparity between the prices paid to the farmer and the prices paid by the consumer for agricultural products.

"Be it further resolved, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, to the Senators and Representatives representing this state in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Governor of the State of Idaho."

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

"RESOLUTION 4

"Resolution memorializing the President, Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide for hearings for air routes between Minnesota and Europe

"Whereas, it has long been recognized that adequate air transport is essential to the economic progress and full development of the potential of this State; and

"Whereas, there is a strong and growing community of interest between Minnesota and the friendly nations of Europe which will continue to expand because of the long existing business and cultural ties between the citizens of Minnesota and our friends in Europe; and

"Whereas, there is no direct air service between any point in Minnesota and any point in Europe which results in substantial inconvenience to the traveling public and the expenditure of additional time and money in making intermediate connections at other cities in the United States; and

"Whereas, air transport has developed to the point where it is economically and operationally feasible to provide direct air service between airports in Minnesota and airports in Europe; and

"Whereas, in 1965 there were 24,768 travelers between the State of Minnesota and points across the Atlantic and an estimated 800 round the world travelers, who would all be benefited and convenienced by direct air service between Minnesota and Europe; and

"Whereas, air cargo is increasing at a greater rate than air passengers, manufacturing firms headquartered in Minnesota have plants throughout Europe and require direct air cargo service as a necessity for economic growth, and direct air cargo service is essential for public convenience of Minnesota and Europe; and

"Whereas, there is now a proceeding before the Civil Aeronautics Board to improve the air service between the Twin Cities of Minneapolis-St. Paul and points in the Orient but no such proceeding has been scheduled or is being heard with respect to any point in Minnesota and Europe; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved that it is the sense of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that the Civil Aeronautics Board should schedule and conduct hearings looking toward the establishment of direct air service between points in Minnesota and points in Europe, and, if necessary, that the United States Department of State should negotiate for the establishment of such service.

"Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in Congress, and the several members of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"JAMES B. GOETZ,
"President of the Senate.
"L. L. DUXBURY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the Senate this 21st day of April in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the House of Representatives this 24th day of April in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

"EDWARD A. BURDICK,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved May 1, 1967.

"HAROLD LEVANDER,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed May 1, 1967.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."

Four resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION CHANGING THE DESIGNATION OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE TO SENIOR CITIZENS ASSISTANCE

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation changing the designation of Old Age Assistance to Senior Citizens Assistance; and be it further

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

"Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
"Clerk.

"House of Representatives adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:

"[SEAL]

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

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING A TAX CREDIT FOR COLLEGE TUITION PAYMENTS

"Whereas, The cost of a college education has increased markedly in recent years; and

"Whereas, The burden of paying for such education is becoming increasingly difficult to bear; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing a tax credit for college tuition payments; and be it further

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

"House of Representatives, adopted, April 11, 1967.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 13, 1967.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:

"[SEAL]

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

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE AMOUNTS OF MINIMUM MONTHLY PAYMENTS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

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

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

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

"Whereas, An increase of such minimum payments to one hundred and fifty dollars per month per person and two hundred and fifty dollars per month per married couple would tend to relieve such conditions; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the minimum monthly payments under the Social Security Act to one hundred and fifty dollars per month per person and two

hundred and fifty dollars per month per married couple; and be it further

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

"Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:

"[SEAL]

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

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING ALLOWABLE EARNINGS OF PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FROM $1,500 TO $2,500

"*Whereas*, Under present regulations, those persons receiving social security benefits are not permitted to earn more than fifteen hundred dollars in any one year without a decrease in payments received by them; and

"*Whereas*, Many of the persons receiving such payments are almost totally dependent upon them for their living expenses; and

"*Whereas*, The cost of living has increased substantially so that the benefits referred to are now totally inadequate; and

"*Whereas*, An increase of allowable annual earnings from fifteen hundred dollars to two thousand five hundred dollars will enable such persons to retain their self respect; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States enact legislation increasing allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits from fifteen hundred dollars to two thousand five hundred dollars; and be it further

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

"Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:

"[SEAL]

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

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT AND ADOPT AN AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION PERMITTING BIBLE READING AND PRAYERS IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"*Whereas*, These United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts were founded and established in and under a belief in Almighty God; and

"*Whereas*, This principle and belief is explicity set forth in the Declaration of Independence adopted by the thirteen original states in Congress at Philadelphia, and in the preamble to the Constitution of Massachusetts; and

"*Whereas*, This same principle and belief is recognized by the United States Government in the 'Flag Code', in the 'Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag', and in the official coinage of the United States Government by having inscribed thereon the words 'In God We Trust'; and

"*Whereas*, This same principle and belief is inherently a part of our American way of life and is the basic belief of the great majority of adult American citizens and their children and grandchildren; and

"*Whereas*, A great majority of our adult American citizens are products of our public school systems and their children and grandchildren are enrolled in the public school systems of these United States; and

"*Whereas*, The majority of the private and parochial school systems likewise hold a firm belief in the principle of 'A Nation under Almighty God'; and

"*Whereas*, It is a basic belief of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of these United States that reading of the Bible which is 'God's Holy Book' and prayer are a basic part of the belief that this State and Nation is a State and Nation under God and that such Bible reading and prayer should be a part of the curriculum of our public school systems; and

"*Whereas*, Under the recent United States Supreme Court decision reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord's Prayer is now unlawful in our public schools; and

"*Whereas*, Such Supreme Court decision denies the very great majority of Americans of their fundamental constitutional right to express in our public schools their belief in Almighty God, the reading of the Bible and prayer. and forbids the public school systems of these United States from expressing and teaching that ours is a State and Nation under God; and

"*Whereas*, The said Supreme Court decision has made it possible for a very small minority to suppress the will, desires and wishes of the great majority of the peoples of these United States; therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and adopt an amendment to the United States Constitution permitting Bible reading and prayers in our public schools; and be it further

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

"House of Representatives, adopted, April 18, 1967.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"[SEAL]

"A true copy. Attest:

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

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by the president, International Association of Fire Chiefs, enclosed by a pamphlet, entitled "The Wingspread Conference Report," prepared by that association, in New York, N.Y., relating to the isolation of some of the major problems facing the fire service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Anniston, Ala., praying that a commemorative stamp to note and commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Alabama Territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SENATE TO RESPOND TO OFFICIAL INVITATIONS RECEIVED FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS OR PARLIAMENTARY BODIES AND ASSOCIATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 115); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 115

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint as members of official Senate delegations such Members of the Senate as may be necessary to respond to invitations received officially from foreign governments or parliamentary bodies and associations (including the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association) during the Ninetieth Congress, and designate the chairmen of said delegations.

SEC. 2. (a) The expenses of the delegations, including staff members designated by the chairmen to assist said delegations, shall not exceed $25,000 for each such delegation, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairmen of said delegations.

(b) The expenses of each delegation shall include such special expenses as the chairman may deem appropriate to carry out this resolution, including reimbursements to agencies for compensation of employees detailed to each delegation and expenses incurred in connection with providing appropriate hospitality to foreign delegates.

(c) Each member or employee of each delegation shall receive subsistence expenses in an amount not to exceed the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 1699. A bill to permit negotiation of a modification to a contract for sale of certain real property by the United States to the city of Lawton, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1700. A bill to amend the Adult Education Act of 1966 in order to revise the allotment formula under the provisions of such Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1701. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1702. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Mrs. Agnes J. Wong against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

AUTHORITY FOR THE SENATE TO RESPOND TO OFFICIAL INVITATIONS RECEIVED FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS OR PARLIAMENTARY BODIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 115) to authorize the Senate to respond to official invitations received from foreign governments or parliamentary bodies and associations,

which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

DESIGNATION OF THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDING AS THE TRUMAN OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 116) to name the Senate Office Building as the Truman Office Building, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, for himself and other Senators, which appears under a separate heading.)

MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT FOR SALE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO CITY OF LAWTON, OKLA.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and my senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], a bill to permit negotiation of a modification of a contract for sale of certain real property by the United States to the city of Lawton, Okla. The bill I introduce today is intended to correct a situation which has existed for some 40 years and has become a burden on the city of Lawton.

Under the provisions of an indenture signed by the Secretary of the Interior on June 11, 1926, 270 acres of Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache reserve lands were conveyed to the city of Lawton in consideration of the payment of $2,800 and a promise to furnish, without cost to the Government, a sufficient supply of water for domestic use at the Fort Sill Indian School and the Kiowa Indian Hospital.

Since the signing of this indenture, the facilities of the Fort Sill Indian School and the Kiowa Indian Hospital have expanded considerably, which has required the city of Lawton to construct an 8-inch water main to the facilities of the Fort Sill Indian School and the Kiowa Indian Hospital. Also, the daily requirements of the Fort Sill Indian School have now reached approximately 45,000 to 50,000 gallons, which constitutes a sizable expense to the city of Lawton and which would appear to be somewhat beyond the intentions of the indenture agreed to in 1926.

The bill I introduce today would allow the Secretary of the Interior and the city of Lawton to negotiate an agreement under which the U.S. Government would pay for such water that is used at the Fort Sill Indian School and the Kiowa Indian Hospital.

I feel that this bill will be fair and just to both parties concerned. It will permit a renegotiation of the contract based upon changed conditions.

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

The bill (S. 1699) to permit negotiation of a modification to a contract for sale of certain real property by the United States to the city of Lawton, Okla.

AMENDMENT OF THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Adult Education Act of 1966, which is found in title III of the Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1966.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to correct a legislative oversight that could cause irreparable harm to adult basic education programs in the smaller States in fuller participation in achieving part B, of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Adult Basic Education Act contained an important provision permitting the less populated States fuller participation in achieving the overall objectives of the program. That allotment provision was contained in section 215(a) of title II–B. This was the forerunner to our present Adult Education Act. The particular excerpt to which I refer reads as follows:

> The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $50,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustment as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $50,000.

This statement was a vital part of the legislation which formerly governed the adult basic education program. But it was inadvertently omitted from title III of the Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1966, which now is the governing legislation for the present adult basic education program.

The allotment provision in the present act sets out a formula for the distribution of funds, but does not allow for a minimum base. This greatly reduces program involvement in 10 States. A pertinent section of that formula reads as follows:

> From the remainder of such sums he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of adults who have completed not more than five grades of school (or have not achieved an equivalent level of education) in such State bears to the number of such adults in all States.

Mr. President, without a minimum availability feature in the present act, States such as Alaska, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming will participate in the adult basic education program at a greatly reduced level. Yet their educational opportunities problems are just as serious as those in larger States.

This means in essence that those participants presently attending adult basic education classes may never be able to complete their program. This means that a very serious limit will be placed on the number of new participants that can enter the program. This means that new materials and innovative methods may never be tried. And this means that severe reduction in program funds will seriously reduce all of the positive aspects the program has fostered thus far.

I am not asking that the language previously included in title II–B of the Economic Opportunity Act be reinstated in title III of the Elementary and Secondary Amendments. I am proposing to go beyond the minimum availability clause previously stated, and rewrite an amendment to reflect a minimum amount of $100,000 to all States. This will insure that present adult basic education programs in the less populated States will continue to show program growth and development.

The $100,000 minimum would also enable other States such as Maine, Nebraska, and North Dakota, to participate to a fuller extent since they fall between $50,000 and $100,000 in receiving adult basic education program funds.

The adult basic education program has been exceedingly popular with the people. Since Congress enacted the law only a short 3 years ago, more than one-half million undereducated adults have learned to read and write. Many thousands are now leading productive lives as a result of this adult educational opportunity and our country is richer in human resources. The passage of the proposed amendment will strengthen this important program.

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

The bill (S. 1700) to amend the Adult Education Act of 1966 in order to revise the allotment formula under the provisions of such act, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO HOLD IN TRUST FOR INDIANS OF THE BATTLE MOUNTAIN COLONY OF CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes. I ask unanimous consent a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting the proposal, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD, together with the bill.

The bill (S. 1701) to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1701

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described public

domain land located in the State of Nevada are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony:

T. 32 N., R. 44 E., Mount Diablo base and meridian, sec. 13, W½SE¼NW¼NE¼, containing 5 acres, plus a right-of-way for access purposes across the west 33 feet of the NE¼NW¼NE¼ of said sec. 13.

T. 32 N., R. 45 E., Mount Diablo base and meridian, sec. 18 N½NW¼SW¼NE¼SW¼, containing 1¼ acres, plus a right-of-way for access purposes across the west 33 feet of the S½NW¼SW¼NE¼SW¼, SW¼SW¼NE¼SW¼, and SE¼SW¼ of said sec. 18.

The letter presented by Br. BIBLE is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1697.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill "To declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill provides that two tracts of public domain, plus an access right-of-way, will be held in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony. One tract contains approximately 5 acres and the other 1¼ acres. The right-of-way is 33 feet wide across approximately 2,805 feet of adjacent public domain, to provide access to each tract.

This group of Indians has been using the two tracts for cemetery purposes. There are about 130 graves in one tract and some 16 graves in the other. The estimated fair market value of the two cemetery sites and right-of-way areas is $400.

The Colony, which had a population of 77 in 1962, has beneficial interest in 680 acres of land. The cemetery sites are about one-half mile from the Colony lands. Our understanding is that the public domain land surrounding the cemetery sites is vacant.

A similar bill was passed by the Senate in the 88th Congress (S. 1885).

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DESIGNATION OF THE OLD SENATE OFFICE BUILDING AS THE TRUMAN OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 116

Resolved, That the Senate Office Building constructed under authority of the Act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 452, 481), is hereby designated, and shall be known, as the "Truman Office Building".

SEC. 2. Any law, rule, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which reference is made to the building to which the first section of this Act applies shall be held to refer to such building under and by the name of the "Truman Office Building".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit this resolution today because it is the birthday of a great American, a former President of the United States, and a former Member of this body, Harry S. Truman. The Senators from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. LONG] and my colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] join with me in this resolution, the effect of which would be that if any of the Senate Office Buildings are to be named, in the fashion that the House Office Buildings are named—the Cannon Building, the Longworth Building, and the Rayburn Building—it would be eminently proper to designate what is now known as the Old Senate Office Building in honor of that very distinguished American, Harry S. Truman. I know of no one in American history whose name would be more appropriate to go on a building in which he served and worked, and in which the offices of so many of his friends still remain.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be received and appropriately referred.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 116) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, coming as I do from the neighboring State of Kansas, near Independence, Mo., the home of our distinguished ex-President and former Senator, Harry S. Truman, I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington and others for introducing this resolution, which, of course, will be referred to the Committee on Rules for further action. I concur that if the Senate Office Buildings are to be named in honor of former Senators, no more appropriate choice could be made.

Harry S. Truman came to the Senate with the 74th Congress, in the same year I first came to the House of Representatives. For many years, we both belonged to what was called the 74th Congress Club. We served many pleasant years together, and I extend to him today my congratulations and best wishes on his birthday.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to file a report on H.R. 6133, a bill to expand the saline water program, following the conclusion of business today until 5 o'clock p.m.

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

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE HIGHER EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it was not possible for me to be on the Senate floor several days ago when the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] offered his statement introducing legislation (S. 1502) to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the field of law enforcement. Because of my support of this legislative approach, I have requested that I be permitted to join as a cosponsor on this bill.

As a former county district attorney in my State, attorney general of Nevada for many years and as president of the National Association of Attorneys General before coming to the Senate, I have always had a deep interest in the matter of crime prevention and crime detection. This legislation, patterned after the National Defense Education Act of 1958, is an approach that I believe deserves great attention.

With the advent of the atomic and sputnik eras, the need for improved education was given the greatest single impetus in many long years in this country. Today we are teaching our young men and women in our colleges and universities technical methods to push America's scientific frontiers farther into space. Certainly, I believe that those demonstrated capabilities can also be utilized to protect American men, women, and children from criminal acts and to develop more modern methods of crime detection and crime prevention. Probably we have been at fault in recent years in not fully recognizing the fact that our law-enforcement officers must keep pace with a changing world.

Career development for police officers is important, and better and more permanent training programs could be developed under this legislation.

If we properly spend our dollars pushing the frontiers of space farther out into the universe, then I believe we can also spend dollars properly in educating our law-enforcement officers to provide safe streets, safe homes and safe businesses, both in the day and in the night.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of my bill, S. 1626, which would prohibit the desecration or improper use of our country's flag, the name of my colleague, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 778, to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as a cosponsor of S. 382, to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to the amount to be deducted from payments pursuant to such law on account of certain Federal contributions.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 158) to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 158) to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HEARINGS ON THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER—S. 915, AND S. 475—HOLDING COURT IN DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce hearings for the consideration of S. 915, a bill that would provide for the establishment of a Federal judicial center; and S. 475, a bill to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota.

The hearings will be held on May 10, 1967, at 9:30 a.m., and May 11, 1967, at 10 a.m. in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

HEARINGS ON FEDERAL JURY SELECTION BILLS—S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, AND S. 1319

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce another set of hearings for the consideration of S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, and S. 1319. These bills would provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries.

The hearings will be held at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 16, and 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 23, and Wednesday, May 24, 1967, in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, 6226 New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 428, THE BILINGUAL AMERICAN EDUCATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the great uncharted areas in American education is the problem of bilingual education, the problem of educating children who learn as their first language—that is to say the language spoken to them by their parents, the language spoken in the home—a language other than English. This situation is encountered especially in the Southwest and Northeast, where millions of children have to try to educate themselves solely in English, whereas the language they learn first and with which they are most familiar, and in some cases solely familiar, is Spanish. This special situation creates special problems which must be dealt with if these children are to receive equal educational opportunity.

Therefore, on January 17 I introduced S. 428, the Bilingual American Education Act cosponsored by Senators JAVITS, KENNEDY of New York, KUCHEL, MONTOYA, TOWER, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The bill would provide funds to schools to improve the education of bilingual children, funds for training teachers of bilingual children, and for research.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has created a Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education to handle this bill. The members of the special subcommittee are Senators MORSE, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, KENNEDY of New York, JAVITS, MURPHY, and FANNIN. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is most grateful to have been named chairman of this special subcommittee.

Hearings will be held on S. 428 and on the problem of the education of the Spanish-speaking and of other bilingual minorities in general, on May 18 and 19 in room 4232, New Senate Office Building. Hearings will also be held, on dates to be announced later, in Texas, California, and New York. Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record are asked to contact Allan Mandel on extension 5922 or at 460 Old Senate Office Building.

BETTY FURNESS—THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN CONSUMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday, Betty Furness was sworn in by President Johnson as his new Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs.

This is a particularly important appointment, and I am confident Miss Furness will do her job well. She has national stature and will be highly visible as a representative of the American consumer at the highest levels of government.

Miss Furness is gracious and intelligent. She is no stranger to Government. As a private citizen she contributed to the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Headstart, and VISTA. In the last few years she has come to know the problems of the American consumer well. She has traveled across the country speaking—and listening to—housewives and community groups. She is known to almost every American. And she has her heart and soul in the job before her.

President Johnson has raised the Committee on Consumer Affairs to the highest level. Thus, Miss Furness will have the authority and backing to make certain that the views of the consumer are heard and protected.

The swearing in of Miss Furness marks a continuing interest of the President in consumer protection. Some months ago he sent to the Congress an extensive message dealing with new ways and means of insuring that the consumer in America is protected by his Government. That message is now being translated into legislation. I am confident that Miss Furness will continue to strengthen the President's commitment in this area, and I ask unanimous consent to insert his swearing-in remarks into the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED AT THE SWEARING-IN CEREMONY OF MISS FURNESS TO BE SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

The PRESIDENT. Miss Furness, Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, distinguished ladies and gentlemen: Often I find it very useful at a swearing-in exercise to have a little biographical information.

Somehow I don't believe that will be necessary today.

Betty Furness has, however, never held Federal office before. But she is known to millions of people in this country.

Now she is about to embark on a public career. She is about to become the advocate of the American consumer in the highest councils of her government.

She will speak for the housewife in the marketplace, who must provide her family with good food at reasonable prices for the mother who must protect her children from unsafe products; for the father who must buy for his family on credit, and who should be told what that credit is costing him.

We have made great strides in the safeguarding of the rights of consumers during the past three years.

Consumer was a word that was hardly known in our American language three years ago. Today it is on everyone's tongue.

It is something everyone is interested in. It is something that we have concentrated on in trying to make everyone in America aware of.

We have made great strides, I think, in safeguarding the rights of the consumer during the past three year. I want to acknowledge and express appreciation not only to the American people for their support but to the American Congress for their foresight and their willingness to endure criticism, even editorial comments at time, in the passing of measures.

We have put on the statute books—the Truth in Packaging Act, to require that products carry clearly and carry honestly information about their contents; the Child Protection Act.

Normally we talk about these things on their 50th anniversary or their 100th anniversary, as we did about the Commissioner of Education the other day.

But I think this morning Miss Furness would like to have me recount just some of the duties she will have—to keep our children safe from the hazardous toys.

We have put on the statute books—the Traffic and Highway Safety Acts, to help us reduce the shameful toll of lives that have been lost on our highways.

We have put on the statute books—greater insurance protection for the savings on deposits made by our citizens.

There is still much more to be done and Betty Furness has agreed to help us do it.

We still have to secure a law that will give the installment buyer a clear statement, honest statement, of the interest charges that he will pay.

We still have to guard those who invest in tracts of underdeveloped land against sharp and dishonest practices.

We still have to safeguard the public by insuring that natural gas pipelines are just as safe as we are capable of making them.

We still have to strengthen our protection of the public's interest in private pension and welfare plans, and in mutual funds.

We still have to protect consumers from hazardous fabrics, and to reshape our laws that deal with dangerous household products.

These efforts may not seem so dramatic as many great foreign and domestic programs that we have had. But they are, I think, absolutely vital to the health and safety and to the security of the American family.

Betty Furness has been traveling throughout this country. She has been learning what is most on the minds of the homemakers and the individual consumers. She has been talking to both the consumers and the producers.

I think since her announcement she has been visiting some grocery stores and buying some clothing.

She knows that a healthy relationship of the mutual trust and respect is critical in everything that we do. In doing these things she is going to be wearing three Easter bonnets, three different hats: she will be Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs to the President; she will be Chairman of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests; she will be Executive Secretary of the Consumer Advisory Council.

To help her wear those hats as effectively as possible I have had the lawyers draft an Executive Order that we think will greatly strengthen the Committee on Consumer Interests, including on it for the first time the principal officers of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and the principal agency heads of this government.

This will give the Committee increased authority in carrying out the consumer program.

It will strengthen the voice of the consumer in the council of government.

Betty, I know we are not giving you much time to catch your breath. Before the week is out you are going to have a real baptism. You will be testifying before a Senate Subcommittee.

I never wake up in the morning but what I am not thankful to George Washington for setting a precedent and making it very clear that Presidents would not have to do the same thing.

So we are glad to welcome you aboard. We appreciate the fact that you were willing to respond to your President's call.

We drafted you for this place. We know we didn't make a mistake.

We are looking forward to working with you. I predict that some day we will meet in this room on an anniversary date and point with pride to the leadership that you have provided.

WHY AUTOMOBILE DEALERS DO NOT WANT CASH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on April 20 the New York Times carried an article describing why many car dealers discourage cash sales. The article indicated many automobile dealers make more money on the financing of the car than they do on the car itself. Much of this has been made possible because consumers generally do not know the rate of finance charge which the dealer assesses. For example, a recent study asked a sample of 800 families to estimate what the rate of interest was on their personal debts. The average estimate was 8 percent, whereas the actual rate was nearly three times higher or 23 percent.

The truth-in-lending bill I have introduced would correct this situation. It would provide consumers with immediate knowledge of the true dollar cost of credit and the annual rate being charged.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the New York Times article in the RECORD.

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

PERSONAL FINANCE—DISCOVERING WHY NEW-CAR SALESMEN ARE FRIGHTENED BY THE SIGHT OF CASH

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

Next to a person wearing a bell and shouting "Unclean!" the most frightening sight to some auto salesmen seems to be a customer who does not want a multitude of optional equipment—and worst of all—wants to pay cash.

At least that is the impression more and more people have received recently after visiting new-car salesmen. One such prospective customer recalled that the sight of his warm checkbook brought a cold stare from the salesman waiting on him the other day in a Manhattan showroom.

"And I thought sales of new cars were in a slump," the customer added. "You would think I was passing bum checks or something."

The reaction of both the puzzled customer and the stony salesman are quite understandable to experienced new-car dealers, however. One major dealer in New Jersey, who had been disturbed over this state of affairs for years, offered to explain the situation.

According to the outspoken dealer, most new-car salesmen do not receive any bonus or commission by merely selling the auto at the "tissue price." Their bonuses are based on the sales of optional equipment, the placing of insurance and the "fees" from finance companies. Without these potential commissions, a salesman receives only his weekly salary.

The tissue price is the suggested list price for a new car that is delivered, stripped, from the factory. (The dealer pays the freight.) In one example given by the New Jersey dealer, the tissue price on a currently popular auto was given as $2,845 plus freight. The dealer's discount brought his cost down to $2,559. And if his sales quota is fulfilled, another $53 could be expected from the manufacturer at the end of the model year.

"With insurance, freight and repairs—you should see how some of the cars reach us—we are lucky to get a $200 profit per unit before overhead, wages and other expenses," he declared.

The salesman, on the other hand, tries to work upward from the tissue price—in this case, $2,845. "In our shop, my salesmen get 30 per cent on anything they get over the tissue price," the friendly dealer said.

This means, the dealer went on, that if a customer orders undercoating at $21 extra, the salesman can earn 30 per cent of the difference between that figure and the actual cost of the job. The cost is $7, so the salesman earns 30 per cent of $14, or $4.20. The same applies to any other extras or optional equipment ordered in that showroom by the customer.

REAL COST OF A LOAN

Of course, the potential profit on a trade-in often makes the cash customer as welcome as the one who plans to finance his car.

If the buyer asks the salesman to place his auto insurance, the commission on that usually is the standard 20 per cent brokers' fees as well. If the buyer agrees to finance his purchase through the dealer at the common nonbank stated rate of 6 per cent, he will find that his real cost of the money is not $60 per $1,000 a year, but double that.

The real interest works out to roughly 12 per cent because the borrower does not have full use of all the money for a year, only for the first month. The fees paid by the finance company (and many banks) to salesmen may come to $30 a year for each $1,000 of credit. Thus a $3,000 financing contract for three years may mean $270 to the salesman.

It seems that auto buyers who pay cash are less likely to be enticed into buying optional equipment. No matter how much hard cash a person has, salesmen have found his sales resistance much greater than a customer buying on the "never-never."

THOSE GUILT FEELINGS

Besides, many people buying on credit appear to have feelings of guilt and order extra items in an effort to placate the salesman, who they think looks down on customers financing their purchases. Whatever the psychological reasons involved, the cash customer has his guilt feelings too, but in his case the manifestations usually take the form of buying only the bare needs.

Some auto buyers have been trapped into believing that they will get a better deal by allowing the salesman to finance the car. Their thinking is that, once the car is delivered, they will pay off the whole loan and recoup all but one month's interest cost.

Most of these people receive rude shocks when they discover that the interest on installment loans discounted in advance is not spread evenly over the life of the loan but is concentrated in the first few months, when the borrower has the use of most of the money.

HOW REBATE IS FIGURED

Therefore, a borrower taking out a loan for, say, a year does not get back eleven-twelfths of his interest if he repays the money after one month. For example, if an auto buyer borrows $2,000 for one year at the current bank rate here of 5.25 per cent, he has $105 deducted in advance of his first payment.

If he decides to repay the loan when his first payment is due, he would not get back eleven-twelfths of the interest ($96.25) but only $89.25. After the loan is two months old, the rebate would be $74.50 instead of the strict pro rata figure of $87.50. By the time the loan is half paid (six payments) the bank will have earned 73 per cent of the interest on the loan.

Interest on the loan should not be confused with the "service charges" that some finance companies add in order to cross limits set by state laws. The rebates on prepayments of loans are spelled out by law in New York and most other states and usually appear on the back of the loan contract which should be read before signing even if the borrower must use a magnifying glass.

Another popular misconception centers on the cost of a new car, particularly if it it advertised at an unusually low price. This is known as "freezing a customer." By this old ploy a new-car shopper is offered a price at which the dealer would not deliver the car to his mother. It is meant to send the buyer on a futile shopping tour and bring him back convinced that he has really hit upon an extraordinary bargain.

MILWAUKEE SENTINEL CONDEMNS SST AS BOONDOGGLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's proposal to spend $198 million this year for constructing a supersonic transport prototype is waste-

ful, as I have already said and intend to document in coming weeks.

Recently the Milwaukee Sentinel expressed its disapproval of this waste. In a hard-hitting editorial the Sentinel said that the money would be far better spent if it were poured into the ground—specifically into sewers and sewage treatment systems.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent sensemaking editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SST BOONDOGGLE

Even if conditions on earth were ideal, serious questions would remain as to whether it would be advisable to take billions of dollars away from millions of taxpayers to fling a few thousand travelers around the skies at supersonic speed.

But, of course, ground conditions fall considerably short of being ideal. Nevertheless, President Johnson is asking congress for $198 million to finance the government's share of the cost of construction of two prototypes of an American supersonic transport plane. This would be on top of $200 million appropriated for the SST program last year but not yet spent.

Total development costs of the plane, which is to cruise at more than 1,800 miles an hour and to carry more than 300 passengers, is estimated at $1.14 billion. The way these things go, that figure may be doubled.

With all the problems besetting our society—notably in the area of environmental pollution—it borders on madness to be spending precious resources to cut a few hours of travel time for a few people while leaving all people to spend lost hours in thickening traffic jams on the ground.

The money being committed to the SST would be far better spent if it were poured into the ground, specifically into sewers and sewage treatment systems. This, to be sure, is far less glamorous than putting it into a project that would enable some big executive or high public official to leave after lunch and arrive before breakfast the same day. But it would be far more practical, and it would be to the benefit of everybody.

Let the British and French or the Soviet Union be the first to develop the SST, if they want to be. The United States taxpayers can take advantage of their research and development, instead of footing the bill for R and D for other nations to copy free, as generally has been the case.

Meantime, America can regard the SST program for what it is—a superboondoggle.

PADDING THE PUBLIC PAYROLL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on September 25, 1966, President Johnson ordered the Budget Bureau to freeze Federal employment at the July 1966 level.

Today I call attention to the manner in which the administration has ignored this freeze order, and instead of holding employment at the July level it has actually continued adding new employees at the rate of 4,500 per week.

Since the freeze order of September 25, 1966, the administration has actually added an additional 108,910 civilian employees to the public payroll. Those additions are as follows:

October 1966	24,488
November	36,728
December	7,588
January 1967	5,721
February	16,377
March	18,008
Total	108,910

When the September 25 freeze order was issued Director Charles L. Schultze, Bureau of the Budget, estimated the cost of each extra employee at $7,000 per year. That means that the 108,910 extra employees added to the public payroll—in contradiction of the spirit of the freeze order—will cost the taxpayers over $700 million annually.

Furthermore, these increases cannot be attributed to the Vietnam war. A large percentage of the increase is in civilian agencies and represents an expansion of the Great Society programs.

A breakdown of the 18,008 increase for March shows that over one-half or 10,537 of these were in civilian agencies. A partial breakdown of those added in civilian agencies follows:

Post Office Department	3,618
Agriculture Department	2,328
Interior Department	1,388
Veterans' Administration	674
Department of HEW	633
Treasury Department	510

It is apparent that the September 25, 1966, order freezing civilian employment at the July 1966 level was the same type of Great Society political propaganda as was the grandstand announcement of economy in December 1965. At that time the President promised to cut back Federal employment by at least 25,000.

Following that much-publicized promise in December 1965 the administration promptly forgot it, and between December 1965 and July 1, 1966, instead of cutting back 25,000 in Federal employment it increased the payroll by over 190,000.

When both of these broken promises are added together it means that the administration has increased Federal civilian employees by 334,711 in the 17-month period since this "phony" economy drive was launched. Nor can it be claimed that this increase was all attributable to the Vietnam war.

A breakdown of these 334,711 extra employees is as follows:

Civilian employees added, Department of Defense	208,022
Civilian employees in domestic agencies	126,689

These extra 334,000 employees, which both the President and his Budget Director have said were not needed, are costing the taxpayers over $2 billion per year.

How can the administration argue that the acceleration of the Vietnam war made necessary these extra employees? The Vietnam war was in progress in both December 1965 when the first promise was made and last September when the last freeze order was issued.

Furthermore, even the Vietnam war could not explain the 126,689 extra employees that have been added to the payroll as the result of the expansion of the Great Society programs under various civilian agencies.

These 126,689 unnecessary employees added to the civilian payroll will cost over $800 million annually.

Based upon these statistics it is evident that the administration's promise of economy is worthless. There remains but one way to force this administration to carry out its promise to economize, and that is to cut appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two reports giving a breakdown of these statistics as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

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

Federal civilian employment in executive branch showing employment in agencies other than Department of Defense and total, by months, November 1965 to March 1967

Date	Civilian agencies (other than Department of Defense	Department of Defense (civilian employment)	Total
November 1965	1,488,043	1,059,880	2,547,923
December	1,493,214	1,057,528	2,550,742
January 1966	[1] 1,492,513	1,063,059	2,555,572
February	1,508,459	1,072,059	2,580,518
March	1,522,516	1,088,264	2,610,780
April	1,543,393	1,100,760	2,644,153
May	1,554,198	1,110,962	2,665,160
June	1,599,856	1,138,191	2,738,047
July	1,622,199	1,165,898	2,788,097
August	[1] 1,618,104	1,187,415	2,805,519
September	[1] 1,589,227	[1] 1,184,497	[2] 2,773,724
October	1,597,998	1,200.214	2,798,212
November	1,612,849	1,222,091	2,834,940
December	[1] 1,612,705	1,229,823	2,842,528
January 1967	[1] 1,601,815	1,246,434	2,848,249
February	1,604,195	1,260,431	2,864,626
March	1,614,732	1,267,902	2,882,634
Change, November 1965 to March 1967	+126,689	+208,022	+334,711

[1] Denotes decrease as compared with previous month. Decreases generally represent reduction in employment of seasonal and youth opportunity summer temporary employment.

Source: Monthly reports of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE H. MAHON, DEMOCRAT, OF TEXAS, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, IN RE MONTHLY REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY FOR MARCH 1967

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month fo March totaling 2,882,634. This was a net increase of 18,008 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of February.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1967, which began July 1, 1966, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1966	2,788,097	50,050	
August	2,805,519	17,422	
September	2,773,724		31,795
October	2,798,212	24,488	
November	2,834,940	36,728	
December	2,842,528	7,588	
January 1967	2,848,249	5,721	
February	2,864,626	16,377	
March	2,882,634	18,008	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of March was 1,614,732, an increase of 10,537 as compared with the February total of 1,604,195. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in March was 1,267,902, an increase of 7,471 as compared with 1,260,431 in February.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Post Office Department with 3,618, Agriculture Department with 2,328, In-

terior Department with 1,388, Veterans Administration with 674, HEW Department with 633, and Treasury Department with 510. The increases in Agriculture, Interior and Treasury were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the larger increases in civilian employment were reported by the Navy with 5,035, Army with 1,874 and Defense Supply Agency with 648. The Air Force reported a decrease of 229.

Total employment inside the United States in March was 2,647,357, an increase of 15,917 as compared with February. Total employment outside the United States in March was 235,277, an increase of 2,091 as compared with February. Industrial employment by federal agencies in March was 607,721, an increase of 2,307 as compared with February.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,882,634 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 126,799 foreign nationals working for U. S. agencies overseas during March who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in February was 128,666.

PUBLIC TELEVISION—A BENEFIT TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, all of us who have been Members of Congress in the last several years are proud of what we have been able to do in the basically important field of education. We now have before us the opportunity to take another historic step for the enlightenment and edification of the American people.

I refer to S. 1160, the Public Television Act of 1967, which would establish an independent commission, charged with the responsibility of bringing to the public television and radio programs free of commercial influence and completely responsive to the needs of local communities.

One of the witnesses who appeared before the Communications Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, is a former Member of the House of Representatives from Wisconsin, Andrew J. Biemiller. Mr. Biemiller, now director of the Department of Legislation of the AFL–CIO, testified in support of the bill and further urged that one of the members of the governing body be from the labor movement, which he pointed out is "the largest single group of listeners and viewers in the Nation." As an aid in considering S. 1160, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Biemiller's testimony be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am director of the Department of Legislation of the AFL–CIO, and I am appearing on behalf of that organization to express our unqualified support for S. 1160, the Public Television Act of 1967.

In our view, this is basically an education bill. As such it is a worthy companion—and an essential supplement—to the splendid series of educational measures enacted by the Congress during the last several years.

These earlier measures, as you know, broadened and strengthened the nation's school system from pre-kindergarten to post-graduate levels. While there is still more remaining to be done—in this field, there will always be more—the statutes now on the books have gone a long way toward the fulfillment of the ultimate goal, truly equal educational opportunity for all, regardless of race, creed, national origin or economic status.

The AFL–CIO was and is among the most vigorous supporters of these measures. Education has been a primary concern of the labor movement since the first unions were formed, some 175 years ago. It is in the same spirit that we support the bill before you.

Let me say at this point that we are pleased that S. 1160 also covers radio. The AFL–CIO itself makes extensive use of radio, and we know that while it is overshadowed in the public mind by the glamour of television, it remains an extremely important medium—and one which is in even greater need of educational influences. So while for the sake of brevity I will refer to television, the same remarks apply to radio as well.

We are aware, of course, that instructional television is an important function within the whole field of educational television. We are sure it is a useful tool, and we are fully in favor of its wider availability to educators who want to use it. But our chief interest is in the broader aspect—a non-commercial television establishment, wholly free to concentrate on public interest rather than private profit.

In saying this, we are in no way attacking the concept of private profit in commercial television. I personally agree with those who complain that too often, television programing is aimed at the lowest common denominator in terms of taste and intellectual content. On the other hand, I am not at all sure I would be happy with the kind of programing which some of these critics seem to have in mind. I don't know if we could trust them to give proper attention to the Redskins or the Green Bay Packers—even without those phony time-outs.

The fact is that tastes differ, in television and everywhere else. However, broadcasting is in a category by itself compared to other enterprises.

The air—television air or radio air—belongs to all the people of the United States. The broadcasters are not owners of the medium in which they operate. They are licensees, who are pledged to devote a reasonable amount of their broadcasting day to programs that serve the public interest.

We believe this is a proper requirement, which is all too often ignored and which should be more vigorously enforced. However, even if this were done, there would be a need for another approach, represented by S. 1160.

Viewers and listeners ought to have a choice—a wider choice than they have now, and a wider choice than commercial television can reasonably be expected to offer.

A moment ago I mentioned the Redskins and the Packers. What about those who prefer serious music or serious drama? Two Sundays ago, I believe it was, the Senators were playing the White Sox on Channel 9; Philadelphia and San Francisco were fighting it out in the basketball playoff on Channel 7, and the Baltimore soccer team was making its debut on Channel 2. The other choices were a detective story and a couple of old movies.

There are millions of citizens who prefer sports and situation comedy to loftier programs. The commercial networks—and the advertisers—can't be blamed too harshly for giving them what they want. But there should also be available, in every community, television and radio programs that are selling nothing but their own content; programs that can experiment, that can innovate, without fear that one bad guess will cause an angry sponsor to put them off the air.

This, we are convinced, will come about through the passage of S. 1160.

Other countries have tried other methods. In some, the government exercises complete control over broadcasting. In others, commercial television is permitted, but government television serves as the viewers' alternative.

There is no need to dwell on the first of these, since Americans quite rightly would not tolerate it. The second isn't much better, for it offers a choice only between Big Business and Big Brother. No matter how scrupulous a government operation tried to be—or in fact was—it couldn't escape the label.

Therefore we warmly welcome the approach embodied in the bill you are now considering—an independent corporation, established and supported in part by the federal government but free of government control. We do recommend very strongly that one member of the governing body be named from the labor movement—the largest single group of viewers and listeners in the nation. This independent corporation would be charged only—if I may paraphrase the bill—with the duty of making available to all Americans the kind of programs that will enrich as well as amuse, edify as well as entertain.

This, we believe, could well be the most effective stride ever taken toward adult education—toward a better-informed citizenry, and even toward the improvement of public taste.

Mr. Chairman, we in the AFL–CIO are keenly conscious of the great impact of television and its immense potential for good or evil. To those who see only evil in it now, we say that a far greater evil would have been its perversion to the service of the state. Yet to realize its potential for good, viewers must have a better and freer choice. This is what S. 1160 offers, and we hope you will give it your prompt approval.

THE 83D BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today is the 83d birthday anniversary of my State's favorite son, Harry S. Truman. With every passing year, we witness new evidence of his wisdom while President and our great love and admiration for him grow even greater.

Our Nation has had the good fortune of having great Presidents to lead it through times of trial. Probably at no time in our history have the challenges facing us been greater than during the years immediately following World War II. Forceful and wise leadership was necessary to save the free world not only from the devastation of the war but from the menace of Communist imperialism. President Truman provided that leadership. The peace was won and the free world was saved from the slavery of communism.

Western Europe, Greece and Turkey, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines are only a few reminders of his wisdom and courage. If the world ever achieves lasting peace, and I am quite hopeful that it will some day, it will be because Harry Truman started us up the right road, and because his example, as well as his advice and counsel, has helped keep us on that road.

A better and freer America and a better and freer world were his goals. He

strove long and hard for them as President, and he continues to strive for them.

It is a pleasure today to say "Happy birthday, Mr. President, and I wish you many more."

WISCONSIN SPEAKS ON THE APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE PROPOSAL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 9, the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Senate Interior Committee will hold the first set of hearings on my Apostle Islands National Lakeshore bill, S. 778. Field hearings on the bill will be held in Ashland, Wis., on June 1 and 2.

The proposed national lakeshore would be a 57,511-acre park made up of three units. One unit would be 21 of the 22 Apostle Islands which form an archipelago off the Bayfield Peninsula in northern Wisconsin, the second unit would be a narrow strip of land about 30 miles long along the edge of the Bayfield Peninsula, and the third would be a 10,000-acre wild rice marsh known as the Kakagon-Bad River Sloughs. The wide variety of recreational opportunities that will be available to visitors to this park is unequaled anywhere in the Midwest.

The effects of the park will be twofold. First, it will offer to the people of the Midwest, as well as to the people of the Nation, quality recreation. Secondly, the proposed park will provide a tremendous economic boost to northern Wisconsin.

This proposal is the result of a great deal of work by a large number of people, including a task force from the Department of the Interior and Wisconsin citizens. I personally have been involved in this project since I was Governor of Wisconsin.

The late President Kennedy visited the area in 1963 and said:

> Lake Superior, the Apostle Islands and the Bad River area are all unique . . . we must act to preserve these assets.

President Johnson, in his message to the Congress on "Protecting our National Heritage," in January of this year, named the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore bill as one of four priority national park projects.

The bill has won the enthusiastic backing of business, labor, local government, farm organizations, conservation groups, civic clubs, regional organizations, and most of the State's daily newspapers. The great opportunity which this bill offers Wisconsin is shown dramatically by the support it has attracted. Following is a list of organizations which have supported this bill:

Hunting and Fishing Club of Globe-Union, Inc.
The Portage County chapter of the Izaak Walton League.
The Faculty Fishing Club, Wisconsin State University, La Crosse, Wis.
Business & Professional Women's Club of Madison, Wis.
Vernon Electric Cooperative.
Eau Claire Archers.
Chippewa Falls Chamber of Commerce.
Chippewa Valley Field Archery League.
Hillcrest Garden Club of West Allis, Wis.
Polk County Sportsmen's Club.
Lions Club of Mellen, Wis.
The Fond du Lac chapter of the Izaak Walton League.
Wisconsin Indian Head Country, Inc.
Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association.
West Bend Garden Club.
So Bay Co Sportsmen's Club.
Jump River Electric Cooperative, Inc.
Wisconsin Association of Rural Electric Cooperative Office Managers.
Barron County Farmer's Union.
Bayfield County National Farmer's Organization.
Save the Dunes Council.
Ozaukee County Fish and Game Association.
Wisconsin State division of the Izaak Walton League.
Minnesota State division of the Izaak Walton League.
Bayfield County Board.
Wisconsin Electric Cooperative.
Iron River Lions Club.
Managers Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives of Wisconsin.
St. Croix County Electric Cooperative.
Lincoln County Sports Club.
Rice Lake Area Chamber of Commerce.
Watertown chapter of the Izaak Walton League.
Fairchild Rod and Gun Club of Fairchild, Wis.
Northland College.
Wisconsin chapter of the National Campers and Hikers Association, Inc.
South Shore Lions Club of Port Wing, Wis.
Wauwatosa Chamber of Commerce.
Duluth-Superior Area Milk Producers Association.
Iron County Board of Supervisors.
Burnett County Audubon Society.
Finnish-American Festival, Inc., of Hurley, Wis.
Daniel Boone Conservation League of Milwaukee.
Milwaukee Organic Gardening Club.
Milwaukee Nature Club.
McKinley TNT Family Campers.
Outlook Club of Beloit, Wis.
Duluth Superior Labor Council.
Lake Superior District Power Co.
Ashland Chamber of Commerce.

From this impressive list it is apparent that support for this project is coming from a wide variety of people with a wide variety of interests. My office has been deluged with many, many hundreds of letters from individual citizens who have expressed their support. The Senate Interior Committee and the offices of other members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation have received a great quantity of mail from interested citizens.

Editorial support from the following newspapers has been given to the proposal:

Ashland Daily Press.
Wisconsin State Journal.
The Milwaukee Sentinel.
Eau Claire Daily Telegram.
The Milwaukee Journal.
Portage Daily Register.
Appleton Post-Crescent.
Chippewa Herald Telegram.
Superior Evening Telegram.
Mellen Weekly Record.
The Green Bay Press Gazette.
Waukesha Freeman.
The Sheboygan Press.
Kenosha News.
Racine Journal-Times.
Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter.
Wausau Record Herald.
Medford Star News.
Bayfield County Press.

All of these newspapers have given the project tremendous support. I would like to include all the articles that have been written in these fine newspapers, but I realize that this is not practical. Therefore, I have selected four editorials which I will insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

I am not aware of any widespread opposition to the proposed lakeshore, although I do understand that some local sportsmen mistakenly fear that passage of the bill would close the area to hunting and fishing and that some property owners in the area are concerned about how land would be acquired. The Apostle Islands bill will make no changes in hunting and fishing rights except to increase the area open for these purposes once private property is acquired.

The bill also provides that owners of homes and cottages within the boundaries of the project, which is now largely undeveloped, would have the option of selling for full current market value, retaining life tenancy, or retaining a 25-year right of use to their property.

This impressive record of support for the Apostle Islands project will be presented to the Senate Interior Committee on Tuesday, May 9. Then Wisconsin citizens will have a chance to express their feelings on the project at a public hearing in Ashland on June 1 and 2. This is a period of great satisfaction for the many dedicated citizens who have worked for many years to achieve an Apostle Islands park.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain editorials and expressions of support for this legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) News, Apr. 11, 1967]

APOSTLE ISLANDS PROJECT VITAL

People of this country are becoming increasingly aware of the need for more recreation areas.

With more and more human beings around, the expansion of recreation facilities is viewed as part of our growing pains.

However, it's not a simple matter.

Many areas, including Wisconsin, are vying for national parks or recreation projects and the competition is extremely intense.

Today we narrow the focus down to the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore project, a longtime effort to preserve spectacular islands, marshes and forests which is now approaching the critical stage.

The Apostle Islands region of Lake Superior is a magic wilderness familiar to many Kenoshans. It includes 21 offshore islands, undeveloped mainland bird and wildlife areas near Bayfield. More than a third of the 57,500 acres, which lie 400 miles north of Kenosha, already is in public ownership.

President Johnson and the Federal Bureau of the Budget have given support to the

Apostle Islands project which is sponsored by Senator Gaylord Nelson. The bill, along with other competing projects, will come before the Senate Interior Committee in May.

The Apostle Islands park proposal is important to you, to Wisconsin, and also to the nation. Its chances for approval hinge to a considerable degree upon the cumulative efforts of Wisconsin residents.

You can help by writing personal letters of support for Bill S. 778, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore bill, to your congressman, and also to the Senate Interior Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times, Apr. 11, 1967]

OPPORTUNITY THAT MUSTN'T BE LOST

In 1931, Sen. Robert M. LaFollette Jr. introduced a bill in the United States Senate to make the Apostle Islands and the adjoining shoreline of Lake Superior a national park. LaFollette's project was passed over that year in favor of Isle Royale, but the plan to preserve the wild, unspoiled islands at the northernmost tip of Wisconsin stayed alive.

After 36 years—indeed, 300 years after Father Claude Allouez, a Jesuit missionary, was the first white man to see these beautiful islands—the plan for their preservation is still alive. But this year it has come to a crisis; if Congress does not act favorably, the chance to preserve the islands in their natural state may be lost to private developers, who have already taken over the largest of the islands, Madeline.

The Apostle Islands project also has its greatest opportunity this year. Sen. Gaylord Nelson has introduced the bill to create the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore; President Johnson and the Interior Department have endorsed it, and Johnson has put it among four top priorities. Nelson persuaded Interior Secretary Udall to view it in 1962, and the late President Kennedy saw the islands and endorsed the park project a few weeks before his death in 1962.

The Nelson bill would establish a 57,500 acre National Lakeshore, which would include 21 wild off-shore islands with their unique rock formations, 30 miles of mainland shoreline and a 10,000 acre wild rice marsh that forms a natural habitat for bird and wildlife.

Just for scenery, the Apostle Islands are unique. The centuries of wind and water working on the rocks of Lake Superior have left unusual formations and these high evergreen-forested islands look like they have been pushed out of the surrounding waters. The area is virtually undeveloped and unspoiled.

It will remain that way only if Congress agrees to take it over for public use.

Senator Nelson is urging an outpouring of public support addressed to the Senate Interior Committee and individual members of the House of Representatives, where the bill faces its stiffest test.

The opportunity here is to create in the Middle West one of America's most beautiful national recreational areas. The opportunity cannot be lost.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Apr. 4, 1967]

BACKING NEEDED

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

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

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

The advice is good, and it certainly is timely. It is far too seldom today that we still have left the opportunity to preserve such a large and wonderful part of our natural heritage. The opportunity must be seized; if it is lost now, it may be gone forever.

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

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

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Apr. 23, 1967]

PRESERVE THE APOSTLE ISLANDS LAKESHORE

Almost 40 years ago, President Calvin Coolidge spent a summer in the Apostle Islands area in northwestern Wisconsin. Impressed by its beauty, he asked the United States Park Service to prepare a study on the merits of designating the area as a national park. Several years later the late Sen. Robert M. LaFollette Sr. of Wisconsin introduced a bill to put the area in the national park system. Congress took no action. In 1963, President Kennedy toured the area and said, "This must be preserved." Now, both President Johnson and the Department of the Interior have expressed support for the project.

Chances of preserving the 57,500-acre site in Ashland and Bayfield Counties have never been better than now. The Senate Interior Committee has scheduled two hearings on Bill S. 778 by Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin to designate the area as the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. The first hearing will be held in Washington May 9. The second, and perhaps more important, will be conducted by Sen. Nelson in Ashland June 1 and 2. Sen. Nelson points out that the Ashland hearing "will give citizens from all walks of life an opportunity to . . . express their opinions on the bill. From these hearings, the Senate Interior Committee hopes to learn how badly Wisconsin wants this project and whether improvements can be made in the bill . . ."

The bill deserves broad public support, especially from Wisconsin residents, and also from the neighboring states of Minnesota and Michigan. Such support will help to convince the Interior Committee to recommend passage of the bill in the face of stiff competition from other areas for similar projects.

More than a third of the 57,500 acres in the proposed park are owned by federal, state and county governments. The land is valued at $2.9 million. This cost could be reduced if public owners approve grants or transfers of ownership. The $2.9 million even without such grants, however, is still a bargain. It compares with over $5 million paid for the Sylvania tract in Upper Michigan for about one-third the number of acres.

More than cost is involved. With increasing pressures on park and recreation facilities through population mobility, the Apostle Islands area provides shore and off-shore tracts which can be developed to provide excellent facilities for tourists and wildlife lovers. Forests, sandy beaches, wild rice marshes ideal for wildlife, fishing, and a variety of other attractions in combination make the area ideal for park purposes. But immediate action by Congress is necessary if it is to be preserved against speculative development and its consequent loss for future use by citizens.

A blunt fact is that there are few areas left in their natural state in the nation to preserve. The Lake Superior shore is one place where this opportunity exists, which the Congress recognized last year with the act for preserving the Pictured Rocks shore in Upper Michigan.

Apostles Lakeshore critics claim that it would cause tax losses through removal of some privately-held land from the tax rolls. The loss in taxes is estimated at $6,000 to $9,000 annually. Such losses, however, would be more than offset by revenues estimated at $7 million annually in tourist trade. Even if the revenue estimate is on the high side, it almost certainly would be many times higher than the estimated tax losses, once the area is developed for easy access and interior improvements are made to attract tourists.

Another criticism has been that nationalization of the area would cause hardship to those living on parts of the two Indian reservations within the proposed site. Indian councils, however, would determine, under the proposed bill, whether they wish to move off by selling, leasing or trading their land. Owners of homes or cottages within the area likewise could sell at fair market value, receive 25-year leases, or retain life tenancy. Both approaches are reasonable. Development of the park could, in fact, aid the Indians by providing more opportunity for jobs in various aspects of tourist business than are now available in any industrial or commerical enterprise.

Further delays in approval of the area as a national park could be fatal. Wisconsin should support the project through every means available at hearings in both Washington and Ashland.

PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO GOVERN OIL SHALE LEASING

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on May 7, Secretary of the Interior Udall made public a draft of regulations proposed by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, to govern leasing procedures for Federal oil shale lands. At that time interested persons were invited to submit their comments in writing to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., within 30 days of the date of publication in the Federal Register of that notice.

I am writing today to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to request that public hearings be scheduled to examine in depth the implications of these proposed leasing regulations. I believe that these hearings would be most beneficial if they could be scheduled as soon after the 30-day comment period as possible. I am hopeful that all interested persons will give these proposed regulations their close scrutiny and will be prepared to present their views to the Senate Interior Committee when hearings are held.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the proposed regulations recently released by the Department of the Interior be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposed

regulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, WASHINGTON

[43 CFR, Part 3170]

OIL SHALE

Basis and Purpose. Notice is hereby given that the Department of the Interior proposes to amend the regulations regarding the leasing of oil shale lands, found at Part 3170 of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, by revoking those regulations and substituting the proposed regulations set forth below.

Interested persons are invited to submit their comments in writing to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, within thirty days of the date of publication in the *Federal Register* of this notice. Persons wishing to present their views orally are requested to communicate with the Director, Bureau of Land Management.

Part 3170 is amended to read as follows:

Part 3170—oil shale

Subpart 3170—Oil Shale: General
3170.0–1 *Purpose.*
3170.0–3 *Authority.*
3170.0–5 *Definition of term "Oil Shale".*
3170.1 *Designation of Available Lands.*
Subpart 3171—Applications for Leases
3171.1 *Qualifications of Applicants.*
3171.2 *Form and Contents of Applications.*
3171.3 *Considerations to be used in Evaluating Applications.*
3171.4 *Time for Filing.*
Subpart 3172—Miscellaneous Provisions
3172.1 *Form of Lease.*
3172.2 *Term of Lease.*
3172.3 *Acreage Designations and Limitations.*
3172.4 *Rentals.*
3172.5 *Royalties.*
3172.6 *Termination of Lease.*
3172.7 *Lease Bond.*
3172.9 *Other Provisions.*
3172.10 *Antitrust Consultation.*

Subpart 3170—Oil Shale: General

§ 3170.0–1 *Purpose.*

These regulations govern the availability for leasing of a limited acreage of oil shale lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The objectives are to:

Foster improved technology for the mining and recovery of shale oil and other mineral components of oil shale;

Encourage competition in development and use of oil shale and related mineral resources and develop a basis for subsequent competitive leasing of Federal oil shale lands;

Encourage participation by companies not favorably situated with respect to access to reserves of the minerals present in oil shale;

Prevent speculation and windfall profits;

Provide reasonable revenues to the Federal and State Governments;

under mining operation and production practices that are consistent with good conservation management of overall resources in the region.

§ 3170.0–3 *Authority.*

There regulations are issued pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 445), as amended (30 U.S.C. 181–287).

§ 3170.0–5 *Definition of Term "Oil Shale."*

As used herein, the term "oil shale" means sedimentary rock containing organic matter which yields substantial amounts of oil or gaseous products by destructive distillation. The term includes all the minerals which are components of the rock, but does not include:

(a) deposits of minerals which may be interbedded in the sedimentary rock series and which the Secretary determines can be mined (i) without removal of significant amounts of organic matter and (ii) without significant damage to oil shale beds; and

(b) deposits subject to lease as oil and gas, asphaltic minerals, or coal.

§ 3170.1 *Designation of Available Lands.*

The Secretary will from time to time publish notices in the *Federal Register* designating areas of oil shale bearing lands and deposits for the conduct of particular types of mining, extraction, or processing activities which will be made available for leases for research and development and for subsequent commercial operations in accordance with these regulations. Areas will be selected with a view to encouraging research on a variety of mining and processing methods under a variety of conditions of mineral depths, composition, thicknesses and qualities, and taking into consideration sound principles of conservation and environmental protection. A total of no more than 30,000 acres of oil shale bearing lands will be designated hereunder. Oil shale bearing lands, the surface of which is under the administrative jurisdiction of a Federal agency other than the Department of the Interior, will not be designated hereunder.

Subpart 3171—Applications for Leases

§ 3171.1 *Quaifications of Applicants.*

(a) Leases may be issued to:

(1) Citizens of the United States;

(2) Associations of such citizens;

(3) Corporations organized under the laws of the United States, or any State or Territory thereof;

(4) Municipalities.

(b) The term "associations" includes partnerships, syndicates, groups, pools, joint ventures and other unincorporated organizations.

§ 3171.2 *Form and Contents of Applications.*

(a) No form of application is prescribed.

(b) Applications should be in writing and filed in triplicate in the Office of the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Interior Building, Washington, D.C. 20240, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3001.0–6 of this chapter.

(c) The application should provide:

(1) The complete name(s) and address(es) of the applicant(s).

(2) The qualifications of applicant(s) to hold a lease under the Act.

(3) A description of the land for which a lease is desired.

(4) A detailed statement of any direct or indirect interest which the applicant then has in any lease issued or applications pending hereunder, including ownership interests in any holder of a lease issued hereunder.

(5) If the applicant is a corporation, the name and address of each stockholder of record holding more than 10 percent of the corporation's stock.

(6) If the applicant is an association, the name and address of each member who has an interest of more than 10 percent in the association.

(7) A statement of the applicant's interests in non-federally owned oil shale lands and the reasons why the applicant needs federally leased land for the proposed research and development. The statement should include a description of the location and acreage of such lands, and the best available information on the depth, quantity, composition, quality and thickness of mineral deposits present in such land.

(8) A detailed statement of the applicant's financial capability to conduct the proposed research and development.

(9) A detailed statement of the applicant's technical capability to conduct the proposed research and development.

(10) A description of the applicant's plan of research and development during the research term, specifying:

[1] The goals of the research plan;

[2] The nature, location and cost of plants and equipment to be utilized;

[3] The number of key persons to be employed and their qualifications;

[4] The schedule of expenditures;

[5] The mining and processing techniques to be studied;

[6] The possible adverse effects on the environment and the measures to be taken to avoid or minimize such effects;

[7] The acreage required for the research;

[8] The depth, quantity, composition, quality and thickness of shale deposits required for the research;

[9] The quantity of water required and the expected source;

[10] The measures to be taken to prevent waste of the mineral resources of the leased land.

(11) A description of the reserves the applicant then owns or controls of oil and other minerals of the kind believed to be present in the lands applied for.

(12) With respect to the commercial operation sought to be developed if the research plan is successful:

[1] The general nature of the commercial operation, the commodity(ies) or product(s) expected to be produced, and the approximate service life and capacity of the plant to be constructed.

[2] The expected annual unit and dollar value of production of each mineral product to be produced. If the proposed commercial operation does not include extraction of component mineral products from the oil shale, a description of the prospective market.

[3] The expected capital and annual operating costs.

[4] The quantity of water required and the expected source.

[5] The expected hazards to the environment and the measures proposed to avoid or minimize them.

[6] The quantity of land and the depth, quantity, composition, quality and thickness of mineral deposits required.

§ 3171.3 *Considerations to be used in Evaluating Applications.*

After consultation with appropriate Federal, state and local agencies, evaluation of the research and development proposals will be made on the basis of the following considerations:

(a) Selection of proposals showing greatest promise of:

(1) Ascertaining the commercial feasibility of a variety of mining and processing methods, under a variety of conditions;

(2) Enhancing opportunities for maximizing multiple mineral recovery;

(3) Enhancing the competitive opportunities of smaller companies;

(4) Limiting any potential hazards to the environment;

(5) Limiting any potential hazards to human safety.

(b) The financial and technical capabilities of the applicant to conduct the proposed research and development, and the projected commercial operation.

(c) The pace at which the research and development is proposed to be conducted.

(d) The applicant's need for leased lands to conduct the proposed research and development, and the projected commercial operation.

(e) The effects on competition of the proposed research and development and the projected commercial operation.

(f) The applicant's need for reserves of the minerals proposed to be produced under his proposal.

§ 3171.4 *Time for Filing.*

No application will be accepted if filed later than five years from the date of publication of these regulations in the *Federal Register*. [The exact date will be inserted when the final regulations are published.]

Subpart 3172—Miscellaneous Provisions

§ 3172.1 *Form of Lease.*

No form of lease is prescribed.

§ 3172.2 *Term of Lease.*

(a) Research Term.

The research term of any lease issued under these regulations shall be designated by the Secretary, but in no event may exceed 10 years.

(b) Commercial Production Term.

The Secretary will extend the term of such lease upon completion of the research term to permit commercial production for so long as mineral products are produced from oil shale in paying quantities from deposits on the land, if he has determined that:

(1) The lessee conducted research activity during the research term substantially in accordance with the plan submitted in his application, or any modification thereof which was approved by the Secretary.

(2) The lessee has, in the course of the research term, developed a mining and processing method, which:

[1] Is commercially feasible;

[2] Provides for optimum recovery of minerals to be produced;

[3] Can comply with requirements determined by the Secretary to be necessary to prevent or minimize pollution of air and water, scenic or esthetic damage to surface resources, to fish and wildlife, and hazards to human safety.

(3) The lessee has complied with all the terms of the lease.

§ 3172.3 *Acreage Designations and Limitations.*

(a) No lease issued hereunder may exceed 5,120 acres.

(b) Upon the issuance of any lease hereunder the Secretary shall designate the part of the leased lands upon which the lessee will be permitted to conduct operations during the research term.

(c) At the time for the grant of any extension of the term of lease as provided in section 3172.2(b), the Secretary will determine the quantity of mineral deposits needed for commercial production, allowing reasonable reserves. The term will be extended only with respect to the area which contains the quantity of mineral deposits so determined.

(d) No person, association or corporation (including a municipality) may take, hold, own or control an interest in more than the total maximum acreage of land included in any lease hereunder, except insofar as natural persons are permitted to hold greater interests under 30 U.S.C. sec. 184(e), by virtue of their 10 percent or lesser interests in corporations or associations holding leases hereunder.

§ 3172.4 *Rentals.*

Leases shall provide for the payment, in advance, of an annual rental of 50 cents for each acre or fraction thereof.

§ 3172.5 *Royalties.*

(a) Leases shall provide for the payment of royalties on production during their commercial production terms.

(b) The royalty rate on production shall be 3 percent on the gross value, at the point of shipment to market, of the mineral products from the oil shale, except as provided in subsections (c) and (d) of this section. Such royalties shall be due and payable monthly on the last day of the calendar month next following the calendar month in which produced.

(c) If the total annual royalty payment on production as computed in accordance with subsection (b) of this section is less than the payment would be if computed in accordance with subsection (d), then the lessee shall pay, by March 1 of the succeeding year, an additional amount equal to the difference between the royalty paid and the royalty as computed in accordance with subsection (d).

(d) The annual net income royalty rate shall be a percentage of net income from the production of mineral products from oil shale to the point of shipment to market.

The net annual income royalty rate is:

Ten (10) percent of that part of the net income which is no more than ten percent of investment.

Thirty (30) percent of that part of the net income which exceeds ten percent and is no more than twenty percent of investment.

Fifty (50) percent of that part of the net income which is more than twenty percent of investment.

As used in this section, "net income" means taxable income, computed without allowance for royalty and depletion. "Investment" means the original cost less depreciation of capital assets used in the aforesaid production and processing of oil shale. The term "investment" does not include oil shale obtained pursuant to a lease issued hereunder.

(e) Lease royalties shall be subject to readjustment at 20-year periods succeeding the issuance of the lease. Lessees will be notified of the proposed readjustment of royalties or notified that no readjustment is to be made. Unless the lessee shall file either a notice of objection and offer to negotiate the proposed readjustment of royalties, or file a relinquishment of the lease within 30 days after receipt of the notice, he will be deemed to have agreed to such readjusted royalties.

(f) The Secretary will, prior to any readjustment under subsection (e) of this section which would reduce the rate of royalty on any lease, publish a notice of intention to make such reduction in the Federal Register, inviting written comments by interested persons, to be filed within 60 days of the issuance of the notice. The Secretary will not readjust such royalties prior to the expiration of such 60-day period.

(g) Leases shall provide for the payment of royalties during their research terms, on minerals and mineral products sold by the lessee. The royalty rates shall be the same as those applicable during the commercial term.

§ 3172.6 *Termination of Lease.*

Each lease issued hereunder shall terminate at the end of its research term unless, prior thereto, the Secretary has authorized the commencement of the commercial production term.

§ 3172.7 *Lease Bond.*

A bond of not less than $100,000, conditioned on performance of the obligations imposed by the lease, the Act, and these regulations will be required prior to the issuance of an oil shale lease. The right is reserved at any time before or after the issuance of the lease to require an increase of the amount of the bond in any case where the Secretary deems it proper to do so.

§ 3172.9 *Other Provisions.*

(a) Protection of the Environment and Human Safety.

The lease will contain such provisions as the Secretary deems necessary to prevent or minimize pollution of air and water, scenic or esthetic damage, damage to surface resources, and to fish and wildlife and hazards to human safety.

(b) Prevention of Damage to Other Mineral Resources.

The lease will contain such provisions as the Secretary determines necessary to protect other mineral resources which may be involved.

(c) Diligence in Pursuit of Plan of Research.

The lease will require that the lessee pursue diligently both the plan of research upon which his lease was issued and operations during the commercial production phase.

(d) Disclosure of Information Developed During the Research Term.

(1) The lease will contain provisions requiring the lessee:

[1] To submit annual progress reports during the research period, in sufficient detail to disclose fully all work accomplished and results achieved.

[2] To submit, within 120 days after completion of all work under the research plan, a final report summarizing the state of the art and covering conclusions and recommendations derived therefrom. The report shall include a complete and detailed disclosure of all materials, processes, and equipment involved, including all the technical and financial data needed to enable any qualified person to carry out the work performed under the lease. Where appropriate, the recommendations shall include proposals for further improvements which would advance the future state of the art based on knowledge acquired in the performance of the work under the lease.

[3] To make such other reports and supply such information regarding the progress of the research as the Secretary may specify from time to time.

[4] To permit access, by persons designated by the Secretary, to the leased premises, all facilities thereon, all other facilities in which any part of the research is conducted, and all books and records which directly relate to the plan of research being conducted.

(2) The lease will provide that no report required under the lease may be copyrighted and the lessee, without additional compensation, therein grants to the Secretary the full right to publish, reproduce and use, and to have others do so, for any purpose without limitations, the reports and any information obtained by the Secretary hereunder. The Secretary will promptly publish the reports received and make the other information he has obtained available to the public.

(3) The lease will require that the lessee agree not to publish, or to make available to others besides representatives of the Secretary, the results of the research work under the lease or any information concerning the same, without prior approval in writing from the Secretary.

(e) Patents.

The lease will contain provisions that the United States will acquire title to all inventions made in the course of or under the research term of the lease, and requiring the lessee to issue licenses at reasonable royalty rates, with respect to such patents as he may own, which are necessary to permit others to practice inventions made in the course of or under the research term of the lease, except that the lease may contain provisions granting greater patent rights to the lessee, in such cases where a proper showing of exceptional circumstances is made, in accordance with the Statement of Government Patent Policy issued by President Kennedy on October 10, 1963, 28 F.R. 10943.

(f) Assignments and Relinquishments.

The lease will contain provisions governing assignments and relinquishments.

(g) Cancellation of Leases.

Upon failure of a lessee to comply with the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act, or of the regulations issued thereunder, or of the lease, and continuation of such default for 30 days after service of written notice thereof by the Secretary, the Secretary may institute judicial proceedings for the cancellation of the lease as provided in section 31 of the Act. Failure to give notice with respect to any particular cause of forfeiture shall not be deemed a waiver and shall not prevent the cancellation and forfeiture of the lease for any other cause of forfeiture, or for the same cause occurring at another time.

(h) Additional Provisions.

The lease will contain such additional provisions as the Secretary deems appropriate.

§ 3172.10 *Antitrust Consultation.*

Prior to the issuance of a lease, the Secretary will forward a copy to the Attorney General, requesting his advice as to whether the issuance of the lease would be consistent with the objectives of the Federal antitrust laws.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, WASHINGTON

[43 CFR, Subpart 2244]

EXCHANGES

Basis and Purpose. Notice is hereby given that the Department of the Interior proposes to amend the regulations regarding exchanges of privately owned lands under the Taylor Grazing Act, found at Subpart 2244 of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, by adding the proposal regulations set forth below.

Interested persons are invited to submit their comments in writing to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, within thirty days of the date of publication in the *Federal Register* of this notice. Persons wishing to present their views orally are requested to communicate with the Director, Bureau of Land Management.

A new section 2244.1–7 is added, as follows:

§ 2244.1–7 Exchanges of Oil Shale Lands

(a) Policy. Exchanges of public lands containing oil shale deposits may be consummated pursuant to Section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act, 48 Stat. 1272 (1934), as amended, 43 U.S.C. 315g (1964), where such action will promote economic recovery of shale oil and associated minerals and is otherwise in the public interest. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection (2244.1–7) such exchanges will be made pursuant to section 2244.1.

(b) Criteria. Exchanges of public lands containing oil shale deposits may be effected under the regulations in section 2244.1 only where each of the following requirements are met:

(1) The offered land is oil shale land having similar geologic and physical characteristics and of a value equal to or exceeding the value of the selected public land.

(2) The exchange will result in the consolidation of the offeror's lands so that they are susceptible of being managed as an economic unit for the recovery of shale oil and other mineral products.

(3) Consummation of the exchange will not result in impairment of proper utilization and management by the United States of its lands, including the land it is to receive in the exchange.

(4) The applicant enters into a written agreement with the authorized officer that he will manage and utilize the selected lands and all neighboring oil shale lands owned or controlled by him at any time in such a manner that (a) there is compliance with all applicable Federal and State statutes and regulations relating to control of environmental pollution, and (b) there is adherence to a coordinated plan of sound conservation practices in the management and use of such lands, including the avoidance of waste.

(c) Application. Application must be made in accordance with section 2244.1–2. Upon the filing of an application, and prior to the making or issuing of any classification decision, the authorized officer shall direct publication of a notice of application in a designated newspaper of general circulation in the county or countries in which both the offered and selected lands are situated. The notice, which shall be published once a week for three consecutive weeks, shall set forth the legal descriptions of the offered and selected lands, together with such other data as the authorized officer may deem pertinent, and shall provide for a 60-day period from date of the notice during which other private exchange applications may be filed for the selected lands pursuant to section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act. Where more than one application has been filed for the selected lands the authorized officer shall take the following additional elements into consideration in determining which, if any, of the exchange offers will best benefit the public interest:

(1) the relative values of the offered lands;

(2) the location of the offered lands in relation to the public lands; and

(3) the willingness of any of the applicants to enter into a written agreement with the Secretary specifying a time schedule and rate of investment reasonable in the circumstances and a plan of mineral operations that will permit optimum recovery of shale oil and other mineral resources from the selected tract and all neighboring oil shale lands owned or controlled by the applicant.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE SUPPORTS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a report on the truth in lending bill, the Department of Commerce recommended its passage with a few minor amendments. The Department believes that the full disclosure of finance charges makes for more effective price competition, and would thereby be beneficial to the American economy and its growth. Unlike several witnesses who testified that the bill would have an adverse impact upon the economy, the Department of Commerce believes exactly the opposite will take place. It is encouraging to know that the Department, with its vast knowledge of the American economy, is able to refute the prophets of gloom who have charged the bill would retard consumer credit sales.

The Department also estimated such a measure would be in accord with the President's program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Department report be inserted in the RECORD.

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

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of this Department with respect to 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."

The purposes of the bill are to promote economic stabilization, to inform consumers adequately and to strengthen competition among institutions extending credit by assuring full disclosure of the cost of credit. The bill would require a creditor to furnish the borrower with a written statement of the terms of the transaction. The statement must include such information as the total amount to be financed, the charges made, and the time and amount of payments.

The "finance charge" must be stated in dollars and cents, and also as an annual percentage rate, computed typically by multiplying the monthly percentage rate by the number of months per year. With respect to revolving or open-end credit plans, a creditor would have to furnish to the borrower prior to agreeing to extend credit under the plan, a written statement setting forth balance, dates, and percentage rates of the finance charge per period and per annum. In addition, the creditor must make periodic reports to the borrower of such information as the amounts of outstanding balances; the finance charge for the period in dollars and cents; and the annual percentage rate used to compute the finance charge for such period. If information disclosed becomes inaccurate because of prepayment, late payment, or other adjustment in the credit agreement consented to by the parties, this inaccuracy would not constitute a violation of the disclosure requirements of the bill.

S. 5 would authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill. Such rules shall describe the methods which may be used to determine the annual percentage rate, prescribe reasonable tolerances of accuracy, and regulate the prominence (of type) with which the information is to be disclosed to the debtor. The Board may provide for classifications and differentiations and for adjustments and exceptions necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Act, prevent circumvention or evasion, or facilitate enforcement of the bill or the rules and regulations. The Board shall establish an advisory committee with fair representation of the interests of sellers of merchandise on credit, lenders, and the public.

The bill would not apply to extensions of credit to business firms or governmental agencies, nor to transactions in securities or commodities in accounts by a broker-dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

S. 5 provides both civil and criminal penalties for violations of the bill. Any creditor who fails to disclose information to any person in violation of the provisions of the bill or regulations issued under the bill shall be liable to such person in the amount of $100, or an amount twice the finance charge, whichever is greater. Liability on any credit transaction, however, shall not exceed $2,000. No recovery could be made if the percentage disclosed is in fact greater than the percentage required to be disclosed under S. 5. Any person who gives false or inaccurate information or fails to disclose information required to be disclosed under the bill or any regulation issued under the bill is also subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

This Department supports the enactment of S. 5, but urges its amendment in certain respects.

This legislation should benefit consumers, stimulate efficiency in distribution, encourage competition in the credit market, and put the credit grantor and the consumer on a more equal bargaining basis. Disclosure to the purchaser of the annual rate for consumer credit charges, as required by the bill, would provide a common denominator by which a consumer may know what he is paying for credit, and how it compares with credit terms of other merchants or lenders. The annual percentage rate for credit can give the consumer a good basis for comparison purposes. Full disclosure of finance charges makes more effective price competition for credit and would thereby be beneficial to the American economy and its growth.

Today consumer credit (not including long term credit such as real estate mortgages) totals about $95 billion. The total level of consumer debt, including long term credit on real estate mortgages, was about $301 billion at the end of 1965. The increase to this figure, from $117 billion in 1955 and $197 billion in 1960, seems clearly to have been a major factor in the growth of our economy. During the same period, installment credit rose from about $29 billion in 1955 to $43 billion in 1960, and to $69 billion in 1965. In view of the size of this type of debt and its potential impact on the economy, it is obviously desirable to have maximum disclosure of information about credit terms.

A few amendments to the bill, however, are highly desirable.

1. This Department recommends changing the name of the bill from "Truth-in-Lending" to the more accurate and appropriate name of "Full-Disclosure-in-Lending Act", to avoid any implication of widespread, deliberate untruth in consumer lending today. While there undoubtedly exist instances of such deception, which tend to pull down the ethical practice of other businessmen to a lower competitive level than they would choose of their own accord, these are the exceptions. Full disclosure will help the consumer to make a more efficient free choice in the market place. Full disclosure will, in practice, free the majority of the businessmen from unfair competition from those making less than full credit disclosures.

2. We urge that section 4(b) of the bill, relating to revolving or open-end credit, be revised to insert the word "approximate" before the words "annual percentage rate" where they appear on page 5, line 20, and page 6, line 13, of the bill.

In a speech before Congress on February 16, 1967, Senator Proxmire, who introduced S. 5, stated his intention to require the statement of finance charges as an "approximate" annual percentage rate. This should be expressly stated in the bill.

3. We recommend that it be made clear that section 5 of the bill, which directs the issuance of rules and regulations by the Federal Reserve Board, is intended to give the Board broad discretionary powers to assure sufficient disclosure of credit terms to carry out the objectives of the bill without seriously restricting the availability of legitimate sources of credit. The Board needs to have considerable latitude in its determinations to make its regulations of maximum usefulness to credit users while minimizing the cost of compliance to extenders of credit and to the consumer who will ultimately bear such costs. Such flexibility in the Board's regulations is most desirable because of the special problems encountered in different types of credit transactions and the many variations in the past practices of different suppliers of credit.

4. We recommend the inclusion of a specific provision in section 6 of the bill indicating that the provisions of this law for disclosure of finance charges are not intended to affect State usury statutes dealing primarily with interest rates (as compared to finance charges covering servicing). Such a provision would make it clear that this legislation is not intended to affect the "time-price doctrine," held in almost all of the States, that finance charges in vendor credit transactions are not equivalent to the term "interest" within he meaning of usury statutes.

5. Finally, we believe that the development and use of standardized charts and tables could greatly lessen the burden upon businessmen. We recommend that the bill specifically authorize their use in satisfaction of the disclosure requirement.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of our report to the Congress and further that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

BURT W. ROPER,
Acting General Counsel.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BIRTHDAY RECALLS SENATE FAILURE TO RATIFY GENOCIDE CONVENTION—LXVII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the world's leading citizens celebrates his birthday today. Our 33d President, Harry Truman, is 83 today.

This truly remarkable man who, with matchless courage and magnificent wisdom, guided our people through some of the most perilous days in the history of our Republic, will celebrate the day quietly with his beloved Bess.

I salute Harry Truman for many battles well fought and for a life well lived. I admire Harry Truman for his invaluable service in behalf of the American people and his unflagging dedication to the great cause of world peace and human dignity.

It was Harry Truman who, at the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference in 1945, spoke these prophetic words:

Unless we can attain these objective (human rights) for all men and women everywhere . . . we cannot have permanent peace and security.

True to his word, President Truman strongly supported the United Nations, and in 1949 submitted the Genocide Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent.

President Truman straightforwardly and emphatically urged the Senate to ratify the Convention on Genocide.

Now, 18 years and three Presidents later, the Senate has still failed to act. Senate ratification, if anything, is even more urgent in 1967 than it was in 1949.

Mr. President, I can think of no more fitting tribute to a great President, nor no more meaningful act by the Senate of the United States on May 8, 1967, than the resolve of this Senate that it will speedily ratify the Convention on Genocide.

DAMAGE TO U.S. TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nation's textile industry, certainly one of the most vital in our economic makeup, is being knocked to its knees by a flood of foreign imports, which are dealing severe blows across the whole spectrum of the industry—from fiber producers to apparel manufacturers. In recognition of this problem, efforts are underway in Congress to reverse this trend before a recession hits the textile industry. Members of Congress from textile-oriented States and others, such as Republican Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, are also gravely concerned and are urging the administration to negotiate and administer trade agreements with the best interests of this country foremost in their consideration.

Mrs. Dolly Darr, staff writer of the Spartanburg, S.C., Herald, has written three penetrating articles on this subject, which appeared in the April 25, 26, and 27 issues of the Herald. Mrs. Darr and the Spartanburg Herald have rendered an important service in publishing these well-researched and incisive articles. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Apr. 25, 1967]

TEXTILE IMPORTS INCREASE FASTER THAN U.S. TURNOUT

(By Dolly Darr)

Webster defines imports as merchandise brought into a country from abroad; then adds in parentheses: usually in plural.

From the U.S. textile industry's point of view, this parenthetical addition is the understatement of the decade.

Not merely are textile imports into this country "usually in plural," they totaled close to three billion square yards last year—a 50 per cent increase over the previous year.

And there, in a large, tough nutshell, is the meaty problem facing U.S. textile men today.

Part of the problem lies in the fact that the imports story itself is so complicated.

Everybody, including the textile industry, agrees foreign trade is necessary to achieve our country's foreign policy goals. But textile imports are growing much faster than our own industry. While U.S. production is up one-third in the past five years, textile imports have tripled.

The international Long Term Arrangement (LTA) reached by 23 countries in 1962 (it expires Sept. 30, this year) covers only cotton textiles and provides for reasonable annual increases in exports to the U.S. Despite this, cotton textile imports have doubled in five years, from an initial high base. Fabrics of man-made fibers, which are completely uncontrolled, have more than tripled in four years, and increased approximately 41 per cent in 1966 over the previous year. Wool fabric imports now are six times greater than they were 10 years ago, and double those of 1964.

There are two frequently heard reactions to these figures: (1) let our textile industry compensate for imports by increasing its own exports; and (2) we shall modernize and increase our own efficiency in order to compete more effectively.

But about 50 nations virtually prohibit importing American textiles and another 20 have tariffs and taxes so high as to effectively shut off these markets.

While the U.S. textile industry continually invests large sums of money and manpower in research and development, as well as in new buildings, machinery, expansions, and modernizations, it still cannot compete with foreign imports in price because of production costs—particularly labor. The average wage of textile workers' pay in this country is $2 per hour, as compared with 53 cents an hour in Italy, 37 cents in Spain, 36 cents in Japan, 25 cents in Hong Kong, 18 cents in Brazil, and 14 cents in India, in 1965.

Many other factors contribute to the full textile imports story. But the chief concern of U.S. textile men is the rapid rate of growth of imports.

The chart above shows the rate of import growth over the last five year period. It also shows that Japan and Hong Kong remain responsible for nearly half our total textile imports, but other countries also have made significant gains in import totals.

The U.S. textile industry doesn't even hope to get these import totals reduced—only to curtail their growth rate.

Imports presently are making a decided impact on our textile and related industries. This impact is showing up in employment figures, profit statements, industry investment decisions, and in many other ways.

Specific ways in which the imports are affecting the textile industry throughout the nation—and in Spartanburg, in particular—will be shown in articles in this series on Wednesday and Thursday.

U.S. textile imports, by major country, for the year ending December 1966

[In millions of square yards]

Country	Cotton		Wool		Man made		Total		Percent of total U.S. textile imports	
	1962	1966	1962	1966	1962	1966	1962	1966	1962	1966
Japan	351.2	412.0	34.7	58.3	110.7	445.0	496.6	915.3	33	33
Hong Kong	269.4	353.4	8.8	20.1	5.8	39.3	284.0	412.8	19	15
Mexico	9.2	152.7	-------	.2	(1)	.8	----------	153.7	------	5
Portugal	101.5	112.8	.9	.2	(1)	1.8	----------	114.8	------	4
Taiwan	84.8	61.6	-------	2.0	6.9	32.9	91.7	96.5	6	3
Brazil	68.6	95.6	-------	.5	(1)	----------	----------	96.1	------	3
Canada	1.6	16.7	.4	2.3	(1)	63.4	----------	82.4	------	3
India	35.5	81.4	.1	.1	(1)	.2	----------	81.7	------	3
Italy	19.9	19.0	41.6	26.1	51.2	29.0	112.7	74.1	7	3
West Germany	15.0	32.1	2.8	2.8	(1)	36.8	----------	71.7	------	3
United Kingdom	11.6	14.5	24.3	21.4	(1)	17.8	----------	53.7	------	2
All others	----------	471.0	-------	43.6	-------	130.5	----------	645.1	------	23
Grand total	1,164.7	1,822.8	141.0	175.3	213.4	797.5	1,519.1	2,795.6	------	100

[1] Country data unavailable.

IMPORTS AND THEIR EFFECT, PART II—THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY IS CRYING, AND IT SHOWS FIGURES TO BACK UP ITS TEARS

(By Dolly Darr)

The U.S. textile industry is characterized by some as a cry baby.

"Textile people cry too much and too often—over the cotton price law, investment tax allowances, government subsidies—and now imports."

This is the attitude of some people, including some government officials, concerning the industry's most recent pleas for controls over textile imports.

So the industry's most powerful organization, American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI), has decided it's time to put on a new public face.

At the ATMI annual meeting in Florida last month, the people who represent the industry—traditionally one of the most publicity-shy—voted to underwrite an advertising program. This will be an important first for the organization.

The program is designed to build a new image with the American public. First it's necessary, some of the industry's top leaders believe, to inform the general public, and especially Washington, of what is happening in the U.S. now as a direct result of the spiraling imports, and of potential dangers.

That many people are unsympathetic is understandable. Looking on the surface one sees a giant industry with more than four million people directly employed in textile-apparel-fiber-producing. There have been reports that production is up one-third since the early '60's, and there are frequent announcements of new buildings, expansions, modernizations, and breakthroughs in technology.

It would appear that the industry isn't hurting all that much.

However, what doesn't show on the surface is that industry profits are slipping in spite of increased investments and even increased sales. ATMI statistics show that for the second quater of 1966, net earnings in textiles were 3.9 cents on each dollar of sales. This doesn't compare very favorably with the 5.9 cents earned on an average by all other U.S. industries.

In 1967, according to one senior analyst, every major textile producer will show a decline in profits, possibly as much as 10 to 20 per cent.

As a result of a market flooded with imports and a declining interest in paying the higher price for domestic goods, U.S. producers are cutting back production and inventories. In answer to the lessening demand, many of the nation's textile plants have reduced operations from a six-day to a five-day week, with some dropping to three and four days periodically.

John Q. Public also doesn't know that unfilled orders have fallen to the lowest point in history for many mills, that increasingly often responsible customers are deferring orders (if not canceling them), and that quiet curtailment is rampant throughout the industry.

Most informed American do realize that employment cut-backs are being made in the textile industry, that that imports are being named as the major cause. But few know the extent of current and coming layoffs. And still fewer stop to think that this unemployment is centered in Appalachia and other "poverty" areas, where the country can least afford it.

Imports of foreign textiles are replacing 200,000-250,000 jobs held by Americans who work directly in textiles—plus another 100,000-150,000 indirectly in those industries which supply materials and services to textiles, according to knowledgeable spokesmen for the U.S. textile industry.

Dr. R. Buford Brandis, director of the International Trade Division of ATMI, earlier this month addressed a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor which is studying the effect of imports on American industry and employment. He said, "The impact of imports . . . has been shattering. Currently, imports are taking more than 10 per cent of the American market. This industry provides 13 per cent of all manufacturing jobs in the entire U.S. economy. Textile jobs are heavily concentrated in Appalachia and other 'pockets of poverty'. Hence their relative social-economic importance is even larger than the 13 per cent overall figure would signify."

He said ATMI, representing 85 per cent of the domestic textile industry, endorses two bills being considered by the subcommittee under the chairmanship of Rep. John H. Dent of Pennsylvania. The bills would empower the President to take necessary action to provide relief for industries where imports are curtailing employment or earning power.

"Unless reasonable controls are placed on import volume," Dr. Brandis says, "there will continue to be a shifting of critically needed jobs and job opportunities out of Appalachia and other underdeveloped portions of our country to foreign nations, some of which are highly industrialized."

"A healthy, dynamic, expanding textile industry in the U.S. is essential to our economic well-being and our national defense. We are willing in our country's international political interest to share the growth—but only the growth—of our markets with our friends abroad."

The import problem is having a significant effect in Spartanburg and nearby counties, as will be shown in the final part of this series tomorrow.

LAST PART OF A SERIES—TEXTILE IMPORTS: PLANT CUTBACKS REVEAL THE STORY

(By Dolly Darr)

The textile import problem begins at home.

In Spartanburg County, second largest textile-producing county in the state, employment of mill workers fell 200 in March, according to information released last week by the local state employment office.

The county's total employment in textile mill products was 21,400 last month, compared with 21,600 in January and February. This reflects a steady decline from November's high of 21,800.

The average textile workweek declined one full hour earlier this year compared with the previous year, with some types of operations much harder hit than others.

Growing inventories of finished goods and order deferments have caused many mills in the county to cut back production schedules, covering up some looms or switching them to other types of production.

Several textile plants have revealed cuts in capital expenditures of up to one-third from last year's levels.

Several other local mill groups predict workweek schedules will be cut from six to five days by mid-summer; some departments may get as low as three or four days. Current periodic and temporary layoffs may become permanent.

Several textile companies with mills in Spartanburg County have announced significant decreases in profits for the first quarter of this year.

All of these things are attributable, directly and indirectly, to foreign textile imports, local manufacturers believe.

Last year's surge in imports continues to disturb the industry. The Commerce Department reports that cotton textile imports for instance, totaled 160 million square yards in January, up 20 per cent from December.

Here's how some of the local mills are being affected:

—Spartan Mills group: Walter Montgomery, president, reports, "Our unfilled orders have gone down faster than I've ever known them . . . orders are being deferred . . . responsible customers don't cancel, but they do ask for deferments . . . this is happening now."

—Arkwright Mills group: Barry Hayes, vice president: "Imports are hurting us more and more . . . Cotton gray goods are showing the largest increase in imports recently . . . If something is not solved our production schedule could be cut from six days to five . . . I see a possibility of this happening if no action is taken by June . . . Canton flannel, product of our new plant, is a low import problem . . . but our other two plants, coarse sheeting, denims, etc., could be hurt after June."

—Deering Milliken mills: the record speaks: 600 white-collar employes discharged companywide, recently; a shifting of operations away from fine goods into more industrials; further diversification (DM is now engaged in an attempt to buy more than 50 per cent of common shares of Albany Felt Co., manufacturer of dryer felt for paper machines); DM's Farnsworth Mill in Lisbon Center, Maine, and Cowan Mill of Lewiston, Maine, will be sold at auction May 24. Farnsworth Mill was closed two years ago but left in operable condition in the hope that steps would be taken to curtail the amount of wool fabric imports, according to a company spokesman.

—M. Lowenstein & Sons (of which Lyman Printing and Finishing Co., largest employer in Spartanburg county, is a division): Earnings declined 11.4 per cent, sales by 10.7 per

cent for the first quarter that ended April 1, this year.

—Dan River Mills, Inc. (owner of Clifton Mfg. Co. here): Net sales for the quarter ending April 1 are estimated at $65½ million, a decline from approximately $73½ million in the first period a year ago. Robert S. Small, president, said in a report to stockholders at the annual meeting this month that part of the reason for the decline was unrestricted textile imports.

Mills in nearby counties also have been affected:

—J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., (which has operations in this county): laid off an undetermined number of workers at its Maples No. 2 plant at Piedmont "because of lack of demand for its products."

—Rutherford County textile plants have slowed down production in recent months.

—Gaston County, N.C.: some textile mills have been running three and four-day weeks since last February.

—North Carolina textile employment: decreased 3,200 in February from the previous month to 256,600. Employment there, too, has been dropping since last November.

Spartanburg's Frederick Dent, president of Mayfair Mills at Arcadia, and president-elect of ATMI, sums up the industry-wide problem: "Textile imports in 1966 totaled 2.8 billion square yards, a level 300 per cent greater than in 1961. During the past six months cotton textile imports continued upwards of 12 per cent greater than a year earlier. Man-made fiber textile imports in January and February, this year, were 50 per cent greater than in 1961. The escalation of textile imports has weakened the U.S. Textile market.

"With over four million people directly employed in the textile-apparel-fiber producing complex and many more in related industries and service, it is hard to believe that the federal government will fail to take action to see that our jobs are not exported to areas where wage rates are 36 cents per hour down to the 18 cents level."

MARSHALL McNEIL WRITES OF BILL TO COMPENSATE INNOCENT VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Marshall McNeil, of Scripps-Howard, has recently written an excellent article summarizing the rationale for compensation to victims of crime. I am much pleased by the article's favorable mention of my bill, S. 646, which would establish a program for providing compensation to injured victims of crimes occurring in the District of Columbia, and other areas of Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. McNeil rightly stresses the opinion of the President's Crime Commission, which in its recent report stated that—

The general principle of victim compensation especially to persons who suffer injury in volent crime, is sound and that the experiments now being conducted with different types of compensation programs are valuable.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Crime: What of the Victim?" published in the Washington Daily News of May 4, be printed in the RECORD.

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

BILL SEEKS COMPENSATION—CRIME: WHAT OF THE VICTIM?

(By Marshall McNeil)

Pity the poor victim of a mugging. He could be you.

If a suspect is caught, the fellow is instantly enveloped in new protections fabricated out of the Constitution by the Supreme Court.

The police must treat him with care. They cannot question him unless his lawyer is present. If he hasn't got a lawyer, they'll get him one. He needn't say a word. But if he confesses, chances are his admissions cannot be used against him.

He is guaranteed a fair trial in which his attorney employs all his skills to cast reasonable doubt on the tale of violence told by the victim.

If the defendant is convicted, a reasonable effort most often is made to treat him humanely and to see that he is adequately housed, clothed and fed while he pays his "debt to society." With the help of experts hired with tax funds, an attempt is made to "rehabilitate" him so that he may rejoin this society cured of whatever ailed him.

But his victim? That's another story.

Once he might have carried a gun to protect himself from violence in the streets. He can do that no more. Instead, he is assured of protection by "society," which uses his tax money to create a police force to shield him from the mugger.

HAS ALMOST NO RECOURSE

When this protection for which he has paid and which he has been taught to expect fails, the victim has almost no recourse.

He loses his money. Perhaps he is seriously injured in the assault. Maybe he loses an eye. He has doctor bills to pay. His employment, and his wages, may be interrupted. He could even be incapacited to the point where he cannot resume his work.

What of the victim then?

In 48 states and the District of Columbia, the answer is "nothing" . . . except, of course, he can seek damages under civil law. But what are the chances of his assailant having money with which to pay?

That's the reason Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D. Tex.), in company with nine of his colleagues, has just re-introduced his Criminal Injuries Compensation Bill.

FEDERAL VIOLENT CRIMES COMMISSION

It sets up a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which would decide whether, and how much, compensation should be paid out of general tax funds—the same funds that support the police force—to the victims of crime or their heirs. It covers 18 offenses generally grouped under the headings of homicide, assault, and sexual offenses.

It covers only areas where the federal government exercises general police power, such as the District of Columbia, ships at sea, national parks, military reservations.

It is not intended to compensate completely for all losses suffered by victims of violence. No more than $25,000 could be paid in any one case.

But even so, Sen. Yarborough is convinced that to the extent now possible it would settle in part the debt he believes society owes when there is a failure by its organized protective force to shield a citizen from violence.

Sen. Yarborough is trying to get hearings on his bill and in this he has the backing of the President's national Crime Commission.

HEARINGS PROVIDE NATIONAL FORUM

"The commission believes," its final report said, "that such hearings would provide a national forum for a much-needed debate over the philosophy, assumptions and potential advantages and disadvantages of such a program, and the relative merits and design of a program on the Federal level in particular.

And there are disadvantages. There is opposition to this idea of state compensation to victims of crime. Some call it "socialism." Others fear it will produce phony crimes just to allow "victims" to dip their hands into the public treasury.

But California has passed a law for compensation of victims of crimes. So has New York. There are similar laws in New Zealand and Britain.

Sen. Yarborough holds with the opinion of the President's Crime Commission that "the general principle of victim compensation, especially to persons who suffer injury in violent crime, is sound."

He hopes his bill, when enacted, will be a model for the states.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a leading editorial was printed in the Baltimore Sun of today entitled "MORSE Should Know."

The editorial indicates that—

People who follow labor developments will be impressed by Senator Wayne L. Morse's support of the President's proposals for settling the rail labor dispute.

If for no other reason than the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has participated, in a significant capacity, in many disputes over more decades than he or I care to remember, there is no question about the Senator's ability, integrity, and understanding of this most complex and complicated problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MORSE SHOULD KNOW

People who follow labor developments will be impressed by Senator Wayne L. Morse's support of the President's proposals for settling the rail labor dispute. Morse knows as much as any man alive about the way the National Railway Labor Act declined from almost invariable success in settling rail labor disputes to almost invariable failure. Morse was the chairman 26 years ago of the special emergency board set up to handle a nationwide strike threat on the eve of Pearl Harbor. When his board brought in its expert, quasi-judicial fact-finding recommendations, the Administration failed to support them.

Instead direct negotiations were reopened with the unions involved and the union spokesman himself testified in open hearings that the White House had encouraged him to demand more. Recalling the episode in debate on the Senate floor some years later, Morse assured his colleagues that trade unions would never be content with the proposals of disinterested boards if they felt better deals were available by direct intervention of the White House.

What has grown up in the country is simply a feeling among energetic union leaders that the due process held out in strike-settling legislation is insufficiently productive from the labor point of view. If the direct coercion of strike or strike threats promises to yield more, no union leader eager to maintain face and following will forgo the challenge to the White House.

But in the latest rejection by rail workers of not one but two official board reports, Mr. Johnson seems to be saying simply that White House intervention this time is unlikely to outbid expert and unbiased proposals already filed. Senator Morse approves and his approval, as we say, is important. After all, rehabilitation of fact-finding on the rails might bolster it in general industry under Taft-Hartley and could conceivably pace a gradual return in American employment relations (industrial and otherwise) to the idea that law and order pay best. Surely vin-

dication of present laws would be better than new legislative plunges toward compulsion.

THE NECESSITY OF BEING A DISSENTER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this week's Outlook section of the Washington Post carried an essay by former White House aide, Richard N. Goodwin, on "The Necessity of Being a Dissenter." I commend him for his restatement of a principle that bears constant repetition, if we are to stay free:

It is the blessing of our system that we not only permit, but urge, each man to follow the inner call of his conscience to the most spacious limits of our legal and constitutional freedoms.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Goodwin's article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE NECESSITY OF BEING A DISSENTER

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Nothing is more depressing about today's Washington than the mounting reluctance of the official community, and some of the press, to treat dissent on its merits, to view it as a reflection of conscience and conviction and to examine it not for motive but for its intellectual force, relevance and truth.

Does Sen. Fulbright challenge our foreign policy? Immediately the mutterings begin that he is a "bad" Foreign Relations Committee chairman, doesn't control his committee (although when the committee defeated the President's Latin American resolution it was his fault) or, even worse, is lazy. And so it goes. Sen. Wayne Morse is a "wild man." Intellectuals are cowardly or alienated or don't like Texans. (Except for those in Government who, presumably, are brave, committed and in love with Texas.)

Of course, if you are a Republican, everything is changed. You have a reason for dissent: to defeat Democrats. That is something Washington can understand. Those whose opposition can be traced to institutional self-interest are accepted. Men who speak out of passion or belief are scorned and their motives searched. For the ultimate, incomprehensive offense is that anyone should endanger his public career simply out of conviction.

Merely to admit this possibility would challenge and endanger the tranquil consciences of the hundreds who are busy every day enforcing a policy they do not believe in.

THE RISE OF DEMAGOGY

I speak here especially about the critics who have been involved in public life. I do not believe they criticize President Johnson because of his "style" or because he is from Texas. I myself like Texas very much; countryside, ranches, barbecues, long and marvelous anecdotes and the immense stamina and vitality which the President recreates. Like many others now in dissent, I was always treated with much sympathy, generosity and warmth.

But that is not the issue. The issue is that many sincere and moderate men believe we are engaged in a steadily more hazardous war and a war which greater skill and wisdom could have brought to an honorable settlement consistent with America's self-interest.

The attitude toward this dissent has allowed the rise of dangerous and undemocratic demagogy. It takes many forms. Dissenters, we are sometimes told, are cowardly and timid. Yet it does not take excessive courage to send men off to war. Were all those who conducted wars valiant and those who opposed them cowards?

It is a view with horrendous and unacceptable implications. It may even at times take more courage to oppose the massive political power which conducts conflict. What bravery is there in saying "The President is right"? After all, none of us—on either side of the debate—are going to be shot or burned or bombed.

THE CHARGE IS MURDER

Another form of assault charges the advocates of moderation with responsibility for the loss of American life. Dissent is not only unpatriotic, it is murder. How cruel a lie this is. The fact is that not a single American has died because of a bombing halt we did not begin or a moderate course we have not pursued. And thousands of persons are dead from what we have in fact done.

If we are willing to concede the sincerity of those who are actually killing human beings, we are forced to concede the humane and peaceful motives of those who offer an alternative view. Certainly it requires as much vision and humanity to preserve the living as to justify the dead. To pursue the debate at any other level is a deliberate effort to arouse irrational and irrelevant passions unworthy of this Nation and its leaders.

The most shameful demagogy of all is to accuse those who dissent of unpatriotically prolonging the war by increasing the confidence of the enemy. How curious it is to claim that those who wish a decent and honorable peace are continuing the conflict while those who have plunged us into war take upon themselves the mantle of peace.

This war has seriously eroded the world leadership, international position and moral power of the United States. By ending it honorably we can restore some of the strength for which millions have died and millions have worked for generations and which now is being carelessly and wantonly cast on the unnecessary fires of Vietnam.

ACCOMPLICE TO HORROR

Hanoi may draw what conclusions it likes. That is irrelevant. Our concern is with the United States and with opposing the acts of those who are damaging our country. That is the only course of true and courageous patriotism.

Vietnam is not just another political issue. Every day fellow human beings are being crippled and scarred and killed. Those who support our present policies believe this devastation and carnage is necessary to higher aims. Others disagree.

For anyone who dissents in his heart, not to dissent with whatever weapons he has—words or speeches, petitions or demonstrations—is to find in the secret depths of his own mind the silent accomplice to horror.

It is the blessing of our system that we not only permit, but urge, each man to follow the inner call of his conscience to the most spacious limits of our legal and constitutional freedoms. That, after all, is what even the most militant tell us the Vietnamese war is all about.

THE VICTORY OF CINCO DE MAYO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this Nation is justly proud of the rich heritage bestowed on this land by the many Americans of Mexican descent. They have given to America not only a strong spirit of national consciousness, but an indomitable sense of courage and independence.

In my own State of California, we are particularly proud of our over 1½ million Mexican American citizens. They represent, in a very real sense, the devotion and love for country which a small band of gallant Mexicans displayed in 1862 when they defeated a large foreign army on the fifth of May.

Each year on this day, the Republic of Mexico and Spanish-speaking citizens of Mexican descent celebrate this historic victory of Cinco de Mayo. This battle symbolizes the overwhelming power of the human spirit over all military odds.

In the 1860's, Mexico was a struggling young nation fighting to retain its independence. European nations, particularly France under Napoleon III, cast greedy glances on this new and vibrant country.

In 1862, 6,000 French soldiers set out from Veracruz to Mexico City to the victory they were sure would be theirs. But their confidence was unwarranted, for on May 5, they encountered a small, courageous band of Mexican patriots at Puebla, a strategic city halfway between Veracruz and Mexico City. The French Army was thrown back and the victory at Puebla became a national legend. The valor of these patriots in the face of superior odds and their heroism led to the creation of Cinco de Mayo as a national holiday for Mexico.

The fifth of May commemorates a day upon which courage and love for country triumphed over the threat of a foreign power. The strength, valor, and patriotism of those men has served as an inspiration to the entire world for over 100 years. It is these same inspiring qualities which Spanish-speaking people of Mexican descent have given to California and America.

In honor of those fine citizens and in memory of the brave men who fought so valiantly at Puebla, I take great pleasure in extending greetings and warmest best wishes to the Republic of Mexico and to all Mexican Americans on this, the 105th anniversary of Cinco de Mayo.

ANDREAS PAPANDREOU AND THE SITUATION IN GREECE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, all Americans have a stake in the welfare of the Greek people and nation, but many Minnesotans have a special concern for recent events there.

In the hearts of the university community especially, Andreas Papandreou is a Minnesotan. During his 8 years on the faculty there, he made a deep impression not only on his colleagues in the department of economics but also on his students and his many friends in the community and in the State.

In recent days I have received many inquiries and requests to help insure the rights of the Papandreou family in particular and political prisoners in general, as well as many expressions of concern over the unfortunate fall of the constitutional Government in Greece.

Mr. President, I have been greatly heartened by the news reports and personal responses that I have received concerning our Government's involvement in this matter. I am informed that our Ambassador, Mr. Talbot, has continually been involved in obtaining assurances of proper treatment of political prisoners. Furthermore, I understand that our Government has very clearly expressed the

concern of Americans for a return to constitutional government at the earliest possible time.

And of course, Minnesotans, and many other Americans, are especially concerned for Andreas Papandreou. We know him as a man who is genuinely interested in social reform. I have been told that the strong feeling in this country for Andreas Papandreou has also been made clear to the military junta.

I was pleased, Mr. President, to note the newspaper story this morning that President Johnson has assured academic leaders in this country that he is willing to intercede personally on behalf of Andreas Papandreou to make certain that he will not be summarily executed. Last week the New York Times raised the question whether the present atmosphere in Greece provides any possibility of fair treatment of any of those who are being held prisoner. Given that atmosphere, it seems to me that our Government could press with good conscience for the release of elected political leaders who are being detained in Greece.

It is extremely important for this Government to bring every appropriate diplomatic pressure to bear to insure the return of constitutional rights to the Greek people. We must, of course, give the Government an opportunity to demonstrate that its real concern is for the Greek people and not for its own power. But we must be prepared as well to demonstrate that we look with extreme disfavor on this tragic but hopefully temporary setback for democratic institutions in Greece.

Mr. President, I join with my constituents of Greek heritage, with my constituents who admire and love Andreas Papandreou, and with supporters of free institutions everywhere in lamenting the military takeover in Greece and in urging the Government of the United States to continue its efforts to protect political freedom in that country and assist in the restoration of constitutional government.

We must not relax our efforts until the verbalizations of the military government have been translated into acceptable specific actions. Until that happens, we must refrain above all, from any actions on our part which would enable the Greek junta to claim that it has support from the American Government.

STEEL IMPORTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania adopted, on April 19, 1967, a resolution on the effects of foreign imports on the steel industry. The health of the Nation's steel industry is of vital concern to the economy and to the national security. The resolution memorializes the U.S. Congress to take steps to provide the domestic steel industry with temporary relief from the increasing inflow of foreign steel imports. I agree with the resolution and wish to bring it to the attention of all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Pennsylvania Senate be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas, Imports of foreign steel have increased from more than one million tons in 1957 to eleven million tons in 1966; and

Whereas, In 1966 these imports accounted for eleven per cent of the total domestic steel market; and

Whereas, The current world excess steel producing capacity of approximately seventy-five million tons and projected facility additions for Western Europe and Japan indicate that imports will account for an increasingly greater share of the domestic steel market in the years to come; and

Whereas, The current high level of importation is largely due to the many actions of foreign governments to encourage their steel industries to export, coupled with the significantly lower employment costs in those countries; and

Whereas, If present trends continue, the loss of volume caused by the rapidly increasing imports will pose a serious threat to the profitability of the steel industry; and

Whereas, A healthy domestic steel industry is vital to our National security, is instrumental in maintaining a high level of employment in Pennsylvania and other steel producing states, and is a significant factor in stemming the drain on the United States balance of payments; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorializes the United States Congress to take all necessary steps to provide the domestic steel industry with temporary relief from the increasing inflow of foreign steel imports until equitable and fair competition is established; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two United States Senators from Pennsylvania and to each member of the House of Representatives from the Commonwealth.

A TREASURY VIEW OF BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS STRATEGY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the balance-of-payments problem is one which is of continuing concern to the United States, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the discussions taking place concerning international monetary reform.

The Honorable Winthrop Knowlton, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, discussed the balance-of-payments question on May 2 before the World Affairs Council at a meeting in Boston. Because his statement is that of an administration officer intimately concerned with the subject, I believe his exposition is worthy of note. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE U.S. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM: A LONG-RANGE STRATEGY

(Remarks by Hon. Winthrop Knowlton, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, at the luncheon meeting of the World Affairs Council, Sheraton-Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass., May 2, 1967)

I. INTRODUCTION

I want to discuss with you today a problem that is *statistical; sexless; senseless,* in the eyes of some; and *remote* in the minds of most. In other words, the United States balance of payments.

Despite these distasteful characteristics, the subject has recently been embraced with considerable conversational fervor; the light shed upon it appears to vary in inverse proportion to the conversational heat.

You are all no doubt familiar with the problem in a general way—and many of you are familiar with its intricies. For every year but one of the last seventeen, the United States has paid out more dollars to foreigners than it has taken in. Some of these dollars have moved into the hands of foreign monetary authorities who can convert them into gold if they so desire. In 1956 the amount of liquid dollars held by foreign countries totaled $14.6 billion, and our gold stock totaled $22.1 billion. By the end of 1966 foreign liquid dollar holdings had grown to $27.9 billion ($13.7 billion in official hands), and our gold stock had dropped to $13.2 billion.

As the problem persists, individual sectors of our society tend increasingly to blame other sectors for the deficit. The prescription of some (outside the Administration) is to have us bring back our troops from Western Europe or drastically to reduce our foreign economic assistance programs. Some (not in the financial business) would reduce or eliminate various types of private capital outflows. Others (presumably not members of the jet-set) select the American tourist, conveniently pictured as sipping champagne and ogling bare-bosomed girls in a Paris night club, as the villain. And still others (usually those doing poorly in trade) would have us erect trade barriers. Each group views its *own* contribution to the deficit as morally sacrosanct and economically viable in the long run—even if costing us a few dollars in the short run.

As if this chorus were not sufficiently diverting for the policy makers, there is a simultaneous dialogue in progress over whether the steady increase in U.S. liquid liabilities and the steady decline in reserve assets is really a problem at all. Here our advice ranges from that of distinguished professors who view the process as one of normal banking intermediation and exhort us "not to do something but just stand there" to the disciplinary exhortations of foreign central bankers, who pursue cure of the deficit with the religious zeal of Captain Ahab in pursuit of the White Whale.

We are confronted, on the one hand, by those who would have us break the link to gold (the only question being whether to do it now, with $13 billion left, or to let it all drain out first) and, on the other, by those who would apply a good dose of old-fashioned economic discipline, stagnate the economy, and, presto, bring ourselves into equilibrium. Somewhere in between are advocates of a "dollar bloc."

None of these groups—in my view—lives in the real world as it exists today, or as we want it to exist in the future.

II. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Today, I want to discuss United States balance of payments problem—and our strategy—in what I hope is a more frontal and pragmatic way. Time does not permit me to discuss the closely-related problem of international liquidity and the negotiations in progress for the reform of the international monetary system.

With respect to the United States balance of payments per se, I will assume that:

It *is* a problem.

The problem *must* be solved.

It can *only* be solved through effective, long-range measures.

It *need* not be solved by restrictive measures and *can*, as a practical matter, be solved largely by a combination of increasing our private balance of payments receipts and exercising restraints over our Government outlays.

It requires an organized approach in which the talents and resources of the Government

and private industry are more effectively coordinated.

And, finally, it *cannot* be solved without positive action by other countries.

III. THE SHORT-TERM STRATEGY

I will comment on the short-run picture only in passing by saying that shorter term measures include:

The Interest Equalization Tax, which we are attempting to extend and strengthen;

The Voluntary Federal Reserve Program to restrain capital outflows from banks and other financial institutions;

The Voluntary Commerce Program designed to moderate direct investment outflows.

Like the shots of cortisone pumped into Sandy Koufax's left elbow, these measures have enabled us to produce a respectable balance of payments performance during a difficult—and presumably temporary—period in which Vietnam costs have had an important adverse impact. They have enabled us to reduce our liquidity deficit in the last two years to $1.4 billion, on average, compared to $2.8 billion, on average, in the preceding five years; they helped reduce our official settlement deficit to $0.5 billion, on average, in the last two years, compared to $2.2 billion, on average, in the preceding five years.

IV. THE LONG-RANGE STRATEGY

A. Goal

The United States' long-range balance of payments objective—stated most simply—is to reach and sustain the degree of equilibrium necessary to preserve confidence in the stability of the dollar as a *transactions* and *reserve* currency. (I use the word *preserve* advisedly. Confidence in the dollar exists today. The fact that 94 percent of our gold losses to foreign central banks in the last three years are attributable to purchase by *one* central bank suggests these drains relate to factors other than lack of confidence in our currency.)

B. Structure

We must achieve this objective in the right way. I suggest that the most rational and desirable profile for balance of payments equilibrium would be one in which:

The United States would meet its fair share of international commitments on behalf of *mutual security* in the Free World and *economic development* in the poorer nations of the Free World.

The United States would export private capital. We have the most efficient capital market in the world; to deprive a world that needs capital of access to this economic resource would, over the long run, constitute an act of economic perversity.

To cover these Government outflows and private capital outflows, the United States would increase *its balance of payments receipts* from a variety of sources, of which the most important are *exports of goods and services,* including travel; *direct investment income,* including royalties; and *foreign portfolio investment.*

C. Implementation

Let me now suggest specific ways in which we can *increase the receipts* and *limit the payments* in question. As you will see, achievement of the desired balance of payments profile will require new actions, better planning, and a greater sense of urgency on the part of many people. It also requires, in my opinion, far greater self-confidence in ultimate success than many analysts in Governments, in business, and in the academic community have lately professed.

1. Increasing Our Trade Surplus

The time has come for us to improve our trade surplus by launching a powerful long-range export drive. Price and cost stability are essential ingredients of success in this endeavor. After out-performing our major competitors with respect to costs and prices in the period 1960–65, we did no better than hold our own in 1966. If we are to increase our market share in the future, as we must, we must again out-perform our major competitors in this important respect.

With respect to *export promotion,* the Commerce Department has already greatly intensified its efforts.

U.S. Trade Missions, begun in 1954 largely as good will tours, have been entirely recast as vehicles for hard-selling of American products, services, and investments abroad.

Attendance at Commercial Trade Fairs has climbed from 1.6 million persons in fiscal 1963 to an estimated 5 million in fiscal 1967 to date. The number of U.S. firms participating in these fairs has jumped from 147 in 1963 to 522 thus far in 1967 and may well exceed 1,000 by the end of the year.

Commerce is now storing in computers vast new quantities of information on the international trading interests of 23,000 U.S. corporations. Of these, 10,000 are not now exporting but have indicated an interest in doing so. Commerce helps these novice exporters by suggesting a variety of established channels for distributing their products overseas.

The recent report of the National Export Expansion Council (the so-called Kimberly Report) struck just the right note, in my view, when it stated:

"An export expansion program, projected for ten years, should be planned to analyze the total potential for American exports, market-by-market, based upon three kinds of growth: (1) a normal growth based on an expanding world economy; (2) a penetration growth based on taking business away from foreign countries which are competitors; and (3) the introduction of new products and services which are presently unavailable in world markets.

"There should be an expansion of electronic data processing involving market information, trade opportunities, identification of prospective exporters, and the compilation of export data to permit tabulation of results."

With respect to *export financing,* we have made progress in the last year in streamlining the operations of the Export-Import Bank. It has simplified its procedures. It has a new rediscount facility. New loan authorizations by the Bank are up 70 percent to an annual rate of $3.7 billion in fiscal year 1967. Additional measures to improve the quality and quantity of support the United States can give exporters in the field of finance are under active consideration by the Administration and the Congress.

In the *tax* field, we have in the last year streamlined regulations relating to exports. The Government has under continuing review the relationship between tax systems here and abroad; if differences exist or should materialize that would put our exporters at an unfair disadvantage, we intend to take appropriate measures to correct the situation.

The United States is extraordinarily competitive at the two extremes of the export spectrum—agriculture and advanced technology. The world food outlook is such that we can be optimistic about the demand for our agricultural production and our ability to supply greater quantities of food to help meet it. In advanced technology, our computer industry—to cite one example—has in the last fifteen years reduced the cost of making 100,000 calculations from $1.38 to 3½ cents—the kind of price reduction that does not show up in official statistics measuring national competitiveness. The nature of modern technology is such, furthermore, that it quickly "attaches itself" to other, more "humdrum" manufactured products (the machine tool is now often "computer-controller") so that our technological lead—if maintained—should manifest itself across a growing range of export products.

Thus, given an economic policy in which cost and price stability are emphasized, given adequate support by the Government in the fields of *promotion, finance,* and *taxation,* and given adequate interest by exporters themselves, we ought to increase our trade surplus substantially in coming years. *We should certainly have that as a major national policy objective.*

A United States trade surplus $3–$4 billion higher than the $3.7 billion of 1966 is not going to create havoc domestically in an economy with a gross national product of $760 billion or in an expanding international trading world in which the exports of all countries currently exceed $200 billion. We have had a trade surplus of this magnitude before, in 1964. A return to such a level—or new high ground—is essential to a healthy solution of our payments problems.

2. Increasing Our Travel Receipts

As one Washington economist likes to point out, a travel gap is really no different than a banana gap, or a steel gap, or a widget gap. The kinds of institutions and measures necessary to stabilize or narrow the travel gap—$1.8 billion in 1966—are, in fact, similar to those necessary to increase our merchandise trade surplus.

Last year, the U.S. Travel Service operated with a minuscule $3 million budget—a budget that compares with $10 million for Canada, $10 million for Spain, $7 million for Mexico, $5 million for France, and $5 million for Greece.

Imagine what could be accomplished with a major budgetary effort on the part of the U.S. Government—more funds not only for the U.S. Travel Service, but also for improved customs and reception centers, translation services, better park facilities, and so on. One can let one's imagination run wild in terms of a variety of actions—governmental and non-governmental—that would increase foreign travel to the United States. For example:

Why can't we have an attractive, comprehensive guide book for the United States, translated into a variety of foreign languages?

Why can't we give foreigners "standby" status on domestic airlines similar to that given to students and military personnel?

Why can't we fill thousands of empty university dormitory beds at vacation periods, provide revenues to the universities in question, and low cost lodgings to foreign student travelers?

Why can't we develop a system of certified guides using U.S. students with a high level of foreign language proficiency and familiarity with U.S. history and points of interest?

Why can't our airlines fight harder at international air conferences for differential air rates encouraging traffic to the United States?

Why can't we have a permanent World's Fair of Science and Technology—a scientific Disneyland, located somewhere in the United States—that would attract tourists and promote U.S. exports as well?

We need more interest, more action, and more imagination by both the Government and the private travel business. I am hopeful that the new travel task force about to be appointed by the President will make recommendations for institutional arrangements and for increased budgetary support of such an effort.

3. Increasing Our Direct Investment Income

There is much debate about the effect of direct investment on our trade balance. Some Analysts contend that the construction of manufacturing plants abroad preserves markets and promotes American exports. Others allege that the transfer of production from the United States to the foreign country results in a loss of U.S. exports.

One does not have to resolve this debate to reach the conclusion that *at the very least*

direct investment must be sufficiently profitable to permit corporations to send home a steadily increasing stream of dividend and royalty income. *The surplus of income over direct investment outflow must grow.* Recent performance on this score has been disappointing.

Since the beginning of 1960, U.S.-controlled corporations have invested $42 billion (net of depreciation) in new plant and equipment and working capital outside the United States. The annual amount of such investments—financed from earnings retained from abroad, other foreign funds, and funds from the United States—rose from $3.7 billion at the beginning of the decade to nearly $10 billion in 1966. According to our estimates, this $42 billion investment has produced an incremental return in the form of earnings and royalties of only about 7 percent. (I include retained as well as repatriated earnings in this calculation.)

Since only about 37 percent of the financing for this investment came from the United States, the performance in balance of payments terms has been better but still inadequate. The annual excess of dividend and royalty income over direct investment outflows doubled, from $1 billion to $2 billion, in the period 1960–62. It has since remained on a $2-billion plateau.

These poor results can be attributed, in part, to a number of special factors—hopefully largely non-recurring.

It would be difficult for corporate managements to increase *domestic* investments across a broad range of industries as rapidly as these expenditures have been climbing abroad in recent years without making mistakes. The business of making investments abroad is inherently more difficult than making them here—there are the added difficulties of language, distance, finding personnel. Mistakes have undoubtedly been made, and it seems reasonable to assume that recent rates of increase cannot be sustained on sound business grounds.

There has undoubtedly been an element of "fashion" in recent overseas spending. A study last fall by a New York investment banking firm of 40 U.S. corporations accounting for 70 percent of U.S. direct investment in Western Europe indicated that almost half gave the desire "to be a worldwide enterprise" as the most important reason for making the investments in question; only 10 percent gave the desire to "earn a higher rate of return or profit margin" as the most significant motivation.

Even the best conceived investments of the last two years may not yet be providing maximum potential rates of return because of start-up costs.

Growth rates in certain important countries have slowed; favorable results have thus been delayed.

The cost of financing abroad is higher than here. In response to the voluntary programs administered by the Department of Commerce, firms have been financing a larger percentage of their investment with funds obtained outside the United States—67 percent in 1966 as against 54 percent in 1960. The higher cost of foreign financing should have only a minor impact over the long run—but it has its most telling impact in the early stages of operation.

Past investment ought to become more profitable as mistakes are corrected, and operating rates improve. Future investment decisions by business should be more selective and prudent. If these favorable trends can be coupled with a moderate further reduction of direct investment outflows from the United States as European capital markets adjust to higher levels of overseas borrowing by U.S. corporations, the excess of our dividend and royalty receipts annually over direct investment outflows—could and should increase by $2–$3 billion by the end of the decade.

Our present program and our long-range strategy are based on this premise.

4. Increasing Foreign Portfolio Investment in the United States

Just as the United States travel industry must regard the sale of U.S. travel facilities to foreigners as an *export*, so the financial community should look upon U.S. securities as exports.

In exercising its fiduciary responsibilities, the investment community cannot, of course, put itself in the position of never recommending sales of domestic securities by foreigners. However, a number of the factors that make the United States a natural exporter of capital (its efficient money and capital markets make it cheap and convenient for foreigners to raise funds here) also make it a natural importer of *certain types of foreign capital over the long run.* The breadth of trading in our securities, the quantity and quality of information available on corporations, the speed with which information is transmitted to stockholders, the variety of investment instruments that are available (a new kind of mutual fund has recently been invented) make the United States a place where every long-term investor should put a portion of his savings. If he does, then outflows of other needed types of capital from the United States will be offset, in part, by these inflows, and we will have a more rational, if not perfectly balanced, two-way flow of funds.

The Fowler Task Force Report of 1965 addressed itself to this problem. Passage of the Foreign Investors Tax Act, designed to end tax discrimination against foreign investors, represents the latest and most important effort of the Government to implement the recommendations of that group.

The financial community is already hard at work selling securities to foreigners. It can probably do more.

Is there any way in which the industry can organize itself, on a cooperative basis, to provide foreign investors with more up-to-date, consistent information on changes in securities regulations? to translate brokerage material into foreign languages and to encourage more corporations to translate reports into foreign languages?

Can foreign investment decision-makers be brought here more often and in larger numbers to visit companies uniquely American in managerial approach and in technological and merchandising skill? If such visitors were interested in obtaining first-hand exposure to United States economic policy-makers—whose views are not irrelevant in investment decision-making—top government officials would be at their disposal.

Looking to the more distant future, should our stock and commodity exchanges view themselves in more global terms, open for longer hours, providing material in all major languages, and beaming quotations via communications satellites to the major financial centers of the world?

There may be considerable scope also for investment in a variety of medium- and long-term U.S. instruments by those stewards of central bank assets who are more concerned with the creative utilization of their nation's reserves than with the preservation of sterile and outmoded traditions. As the Bible tells us, the steward who buried his master's talent in the sand was dismissed; those who wisely invested the talents entrusted to them earned their master's trust and praise.

5. Limiting Government Foreign Exchange Expenditures

We in the Government must not delude ourselves or others that the balance of payments deficit will disappear automatically when the Vietnam fighting stops and our foreign exchange costs in Southeast Asia drop. They *will* drop—and hopefully quite substantially—but like the month of June, they may "bust out all over" again, in other forms, unless we exercise self-discipline and insist that other nations do their fair share—in the military and economic assistance field—in meeting joint responsibilities.

We have already made quite an effort to hold down the foreign exchange costs of our military and economic assistance programs.

We have tied our *bilateral* aid so that virtually all of our aid money returns to us in the form of *exports.* Our job now is to make sure that the exports we receive from aid-tying do not simply substitute for exports we would have received anyway. A Treasury-Commerce-State-AID team will begin visits later this month to a number of major aid-recipient countries to see how performance can be improved.

We must intensify our technical assistance efforts, training personnel in less developed nations in the skills needed to sell and service U.S. products in their home countries. The United States Government should consider bringing more technicians from developing countries to the U.S. for training, not only in order to obtain exports while our aid programs are in progress but also after they have phased out.

In the field of *multilateral* economic assistance, the emergent Asian Development Bank with 20 percent of the capital provided by the United States, and the rest by Japan, Canada, Western Europe and other regional donors represents the kind of burden-sharing necessary if the industrial nations are, together, to promote economic progress in the less-developed world in the decades ahead.

With respect to other multilateral institutions, an increased U.S. contribution to the World Bank's soft loan window (International Development Association) will be contingent upon satisfactory balance of payments safeguards. The Executive Directors of the Inter-American Development Bank are looking at ways in which the balance of payments burden of their operations can be more equitably distributed.

In the *military* field, the Defense Department has already taken a broad range of steps—in the handling of procurement, construction, and personnel—to minimize the balance of payments costs of its activities. It has accelerated the sale of military equipment. Trilateral discussions between Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States, the results of which are to be announced today, have included consideration of the problem of equitable financing of required troop levels.

The determination of a nation's "fair share" of economic and military assistance is not a simple matter. As Secretary Fowler recently stated, this issue can no longer be resolved solely by relating the size of a given country's contribution to the size of its gross national product. The form in which a donor provides aid, the terms of its aid, and its international liquidity position must be taken into account.

With U.S. negotiators approaching these critical matters in this spirit, I am confident we will cut the foreign exchange costs of our various overseas commitments from present levels when the fighting in Vietnam stops.

V. SUMMARY

What I have been suggesting today is that a marginal change in world trading patterns, spearheaded by a well organized, long-range U.S. export drive, can increase our trade surplus by $3–$4 billion; that more profitable overseas, direct investment and a continuation of our present strategy, which calls for financing more of that investment from overseas sources, will lead to a $2–$3 billion gain in our direct investment accounts; that a more vigorous effort in the travel field will enable us, at worst, to prevent further deterioration in the travel deficit; that better organized efforts to sell U.S. securities by the U.S. securities industry will lead to a secular uptrend in foreign port-

folio inflows compared to the flat trend of recent years; and that governmental discipline and hard-headed negotiations on burden-sharing will enable us to reduce official foreign-exchange expenditures.

Together, these changes—which do not alter the character of the United States' role in the international world—could bring a dramatic *over-all* change in our balance of payments results.

It would be naive to expect all of these things to happen quickly, or easily, or all of them to fall into place together in a given year.

As we move toward equilibrium by reducing our deficits, other countries with payments imbalances in the form of surpluses must also move into equilibrium. The program that I have outlined above for the United States calls for adjustment in the trade surpluses of these countries, improvement in their capital markets, and the export of more capital from them on more generous terms to the less-developed world.

Many countries have been seduced by the belief that time alone would yield a solution to their deficit. Milton Gilbert of the Bank for International Settlements has put it as follows:

"In case after case in the post-war period we have seen deficit countries procrastinate and play around with half measures while the situation deteriorated, while reserves were drawn down, and while liquid resources were borrowed from abroad—not because the need for policy action was not clear but because political difficulties stood in the way of firm action. And then, as the means of financing the deficit became scarce and a crisis developed, such obstacles were brushed aside; the policy actions previously claimed to be impossible and unworkable suddenly became possible and did work."

In the last resort, other deficit nations have invariably turned to a variety of restrictive devices to solve this problem: among them, controls on capital flows, on tourism, on trade; deflationary measures that have slowed demand for imports, increased exports, and at the same time thrown hundreds of thousands of individuals out of work. Surely these are not appropriate measures for the United States. Surely the United States has the time to solve this problem through the application of sound long-range measures.

Today, I have tried to list the kinds of *positive, expansionary* measures that I believe will solve our problem. Taken alone, certain of the measures I have described will have a trivial impact. *But the cumulative impact of all these measures could be great*—resulting in better business for the American businessman, greater long-range flexibility for the United States Government in international affairs; and a larger—not a smaller—economic pie for the world.

THE NECESSITY OF BEING A DISSENTER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, former White House Assistant Richard N. Goodwin is the author of a highly perceptive article which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday under the title, "The Necessity of Being a Dissenter."

That view is one which I, among others, have felt keenly in the present state of affairs with relation to Vietnam. Mr. Goodwin has described a position which is shared by many, when he says that "many sincere and moderate men believe we are engaged in a steadily more hazardous war and a war which greater skill and wisdom could have brought to an honorable settlement consistent with America's self-interest."

Yet there has been attack upon dissenters, attack which charges those who dissent with "unpatriotically prolonging the war by increasing the confidence of the enemy."

How curious it is—

Says Mr. Goodwin—

to claim that those who wish a decent and honorable peace are continuing the conflict while those who have plunged us into war take upon themselves the mantle of peace.

It is, indeed, as Mr. Goodwin says, the blessing of our system that—

We not only permit, but urge, each man to follow the inner call of his conscience to the most spacious limits of our legal and constitutional freedoms. That, after all, is what even the most militant tell us the Vietnamese war is all about.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Goodwin's article may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE NECESSITY OF BEING A DISSENTER

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Nothing is more depressing about today's Washington than the mounting reluctance of the official community, and some of the press, to treat dissent on its merits, to view it as a reflection of conscience and conviction and to examine it not for motive but for its intellectual force, relevance and truth.

Does Sen. Fulbright challenge our foreign policy? Immediately the mutterings begin that he is a "bad" Foreign Relations Committee chairman, doesn't control his committee (although when the committee defeated the President's Latin American resolution it was his fault) or, even worse, is lazy. And so it goes. Sen. Wayne Morse is a "wild man." Intellectuals are cowardly or alienated or don't like Texans. (Except for those in Government who, presumably, are brave, committed and in love with Texas.)

Of course, if you are a Republican, everything is changed. You have a reason for dissent: to defeat Democrats. That is something Washington can understand. Those whose opposition can be traced to institutional self-interest are accepted. Men who speak out of passion or belief are scorned and their motives searched. For the ultimate, incomprehensible offense is that anyone should endanger his public career simply out of conviction.

Merely to admit this possibility would challenge and endanger the tranquil consciences of the hundreds who are busy every day enforcing a policy they do not believe in.

THE RISE OF DEMAGOGY

I speak here especially about the critics who have been involved in public life. I do not believe they criticize President Johnson because of his "style" or because he is from Texas. I myself like Texas very much; countryside, ranches, barbecues, long and marvelous anecdotes and the immense stamina and vitality which the President recreates. Like many others now in dissent, I was always treated with much sympathy, generosity and warmth.

But that is not the issue. The issue is that many sincere and moderate men believe we are engaged in a steadily more hazardous war and a war which greater skill and wisdom could have brought to an honorable settlement consistent with America's self-interest.

The attitude toward this dissent has allowed the rise of dangerous and undemocratic demagogy. It takes many forms. Dissenters, we are sometimes told, are cowardly and timid. Yet it does not take excessive courage to send men off to war. Were all those who conducted wars valiant and those who opposed them cowards?

It is a view with horrendous and unacceptable implications. It may even at times take more courage to oppose the massive political power which conducts conflict. What bravery is there in saying "The President is right"? After all, none of us—on either side of the debate—are going to be shot or burned or bombed.

THE CHARGE IS MURDER

Another form of assault charges the advocates of moderation with responsibility for the loss of American life. Dissent is not only unpatriotic, it is murder. How cruel a lie this is. The fact is that not a single American has died because of a bombing halt we did not begin or a moderate course we have not pursued. And thousands of persons are dead from what we have in fact done.

If we are willing to concede the sincerity of those who are actually killing human beings, we are forced to concede the humane and peaceful motives of those who offer an alternative view. Certainly it requires as much vision and humanity to preserve the living as to justify the dead. To pursue the debate at any other level is a deliberate effort to arouse irrational and irrelevant passions unworthy of this Nation and its leaders.

The most shameful demagogy of all is to accuse those who dissent of unpatriotically prolonging the war by increasing the confidence of the enemy. How curious it is to claim that those who wish a decent and honorable peace are continuing the conflict while those who have plunged us into war take upon themselves the mantle of peace.

This war has seriously eroded the world leadership, international position and moral power of the United States. By ending it honorably we can restore some of the strength for which millions have died and millions have worked for generations and which now is being carelessly and wantonly cast on the unnecessary fires of Vietnam.

ACCOMPLICE TO HORROR

Hanoi may draw what conclusions it likes. That is irrelevant. Our concern is with the United States and with opposing the acts of those who are damaging our country. That is the only course of true and courageous patriotism.

Vietnam is not just another political issue. Every day fellow human beings are being crippled and scarred and killed. Those who support our present policies believe this devastation and carnage is necessary to higher aims. Others disagree.

For anyone who dissents in his heart, not to dissent with whatever weapons he has—words or speeches, petitions or demonstrations—is to find in the secret depths of his own mind the silent accomplice to horror.

It is the blessing of our system that we not only permit, but urge, each man to follow the inner call of his conscience to the most spacious limits of our legal and constitutional freedoms. That, after all, is what even the most militant tell us that Vietnamese war is all about.

PROPOSED COURT REFORMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Committee on the Administration of Justice of the Judicial Council of the District of Columbia, after more than a year of study, has issued initial recommendations to improve the processing of business and the quality of justice in the courts of the District. The total of 45 recommendations, involving each of the courts, presents a range of suggestions that would modify in important respects the personnel, facilities, and practices

of the judicial institutions of this community.

These recommendations deserve our most dedicated attention, and I stand ready to cooperate with the judicial council to insure that appropriate action is taken. Although many of the recommendations can be implemented by the courts themselves, it is clear that in some instances legislation by Congress will be necessary. I can promise my best efforts to see to it that Congress does not neglect that task.

One of the committee's most important recommendations is their request for a comprehensive management study, especially of the District Court and the court of general sessions. Some of the recommendations of the committee would be furthered by a court study, especially those relating to statistical reporting by each of the courts, reevaluating pretrial and settlement procedures, improving the handling of requests for continuances, and modernizing court facilities. I have been cooperating with the judicial council during the past months in a search for funds for such a study. My staff and I have turned to private foundations for the approximately $400,000 required for a proper management survey. It is my hope that Federal funds will also be available to assist in this effort. There are initial signs that we will be successful in raising the money, but it would be premature to make that promise now. I hope to present a clearer picture of the results of our effort within 6 weeks.

Many of the committee's recommendations, however, need not await a management study. The salaries of the judges of the District of Columbia court of appeals and of the court of general sessions should be increased, as recommended, to a level commensurate with the heavy responsibilities those judges bear. There is a need, as well, for additional supporting personnel in all of the courts. At present, for example, judges and professional staff, such as social psychologists and probation officers, consume their time involved in tasks that could be performed by supporting personnel. Providing more people able to relieve that burden would, in the long run, achieve an economy of operations through a better allocation of manpower resources.

Certainly the probation staff of the juvenile court needs to be increased. And the legal aid agency that has been serving the needs of the poor is drastically undermanned. More legal aid agency lawyers would be needed, for example, to implement the recommendation that each child appearing in juvenile court have benefit of counsel. Under present conditions, the lawyers and staff of the legal aid agency have not been able to handle adequately the load in the court of general sessions alone.

I want to call attention, Mr. President, to the efforts of the District of Columbia Bar Association in providing legal services through its criminal trial panel program. I join the Committee on Administration of Justice in endorsing this excellent program, and in congratulating the members of the bar for their unselfish efforts to provide adequate legal aid to residents of the community whose needs might otherwise go unheeded.

The committee recommendations also indicate that the juvenile court is not "making effective use of all available time," and that "greater coordination and communication between the judges" is necessary. It is well known to the bench and bar of the District of Columbia that the judges of that court, through personal disagreement concerning the processing of cases, do not function together in the best interest of the administration of justice. We must fill the current vacancy on that court, and perhaps that will alleviate existing strains, but it is necessary as well that the judges of the juvenile court take immediate steps to resolve their disagreements so that the interests of the public will be properly served.

The initial recommendations of the committee will be helpful in informing the public that the courts of the District of Columbia have been working with drastically inadequate resources. Public support for reform should then encourage Congress to respond to existing needs. Legislation and funds are urgently needed, Mr. President, to permit the courts to function at the level of excellence to which they aspire. The people expect and deserve no less. And I pledge my effort as a U.S. Senator, and more particularly, as a member of both the Judiciary and District of Columbia Committees to help the courts meet the expectations of this community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Administration of Justice be printed in the RECORD at the close of these remarks.

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

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, MAY 1967

ORIGIN AND PURPOSE

The Judicial Council of the District of Columbia Circuit is composed of the active members of the Court of Appeals. By statute the Council is charged with responsibility for making all necessary orders for the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within the circuit. The Council has been particularly concerned with the growing civil and criminal case backlog and attendant delays in the administration of justice, the lack of adequate supporting services for the courts, and the urgent need to develop more effective procedures for the day-to-day administration of court business.

On March 15, 1966, the Council unanimously appointed a Committee on the Administration of Justice consisting of the undersigned nine lawyers selected from the private bar of the circuit.

The Committee was directed to make recommendations concerning the organization, composition and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia courts and related institutions, either existing or to be established, the transfer or retention of certain judicial functions by those courts, the methods of appointment and tenure of judges of certain courts, and such other matters as may be pertinent to the effective administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

The Committee is not an investigating committee which is called upon to present detailed findings and conclusions. Rather, its role has been to draw upon the knowledge of the judges, court personnel the bar, experience in other jurisdictions and various prior studies and in the light of the practical experience of its members make concrete recommendations for improving the administration of justice in the Nation's Capital. Its function and focus were not to study why conditions now exist but to suggest concrete and practical ways to improve those conditions. In preparing this report the Committee and Subcommittee members have conferred at length with judges of the various courts, and particularly with the Chief Judges of the trial courts in the District.

A generous grant from the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation has supported one full-time and one part-time staff and provided a small office and secretarial assistance. Much of the work of the Committee has been carried out by able subcommittees,[1] which the Council authorized the Committee to appoint.

It is clear from the Committee's work to date that there is no single or simple solution for the problems confronting the administration of justice in the District of Columbia courts. It is apparent that cases take far too long to process, that the courts do not have sufficient administrative assistance and supporting services to deal effectively with the increasing volume and complexity of their caseload, that physical facilities are in many cases wholly inadequate, that there is a pressing need to develop improved systems for controlling the calendaring and processing of cases through the courts, and that there is a vital need for accurate statistics against which the progress or lack thereof can be measured by the courts themselves and the community.

The Committee decided to issue its initial recommendations at this time because there is opportunity for immediate progress with the support of the courts, the bar, the Congress, and the community at large. Certain of the recommendations can be implemented by the courts on their own initiative. Others will require budgetary appropriations or implementing legislation. Progress can and will be made if a wide community interest and support in these areas is maintained, if the courts' docket performance can be periodically measured, and if new solutions continue to be sought where results are discouraging.

This initial series of recommendations has the unanimous approval of the Committee and in outline form presents a program for immediate action. The Judicial Council has endorsed each of the proposals and authorized their public release. The Committee, in line with the suggestion contained in President Johnson's Goal for the Nation's Capital message of February 27, 1967, is forwarding the recommendations to the Attorney General and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It is continuing its work, and will forward further recommendations to the Council in due course.

Gerhard A. Gesell, Chairman; George E. C. Hayes, Vice-Chairman; Sarel M. Kandell, Executive Director; Mrs. June L. Green, John Pickering, John H. Pratt, James Francis Reilly, Daniel A. Rezneck, Samuel Spencer, Edward Bennett Williams.

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends as follows with respect to each of the following courts:

I. Juvenile court

1. The Juvenile Court should submit regular quarterly reports to the bar and the public showing statistics as to the number of juvenile cases and the number of adult cases pending before the court. The report

[1] The chairman and members of the subcommittees are listed at the end of this report.

should show in some detail the number and type of cases awaiting initial hearing, trial and disposition hearing, together with information as to the time which has elapsed in each category since petitioning. This report should be accompanied by whatever comments and explanations the Chief Judge wishes to make for the information of the bar and the public as to measures being taken by the court to improve the situation, steps to be taken by the bar to work toward elimination of backlog, and other matters relating to the efficient administration of the court.

2. The Committee does not recommend any additional judges for the court although the existing vacancy should, of course, be promptly filled. The procedures of the court for calendaring and processing cases need revision and call for greater coordination and communication between the judges. On the basis of the information available, the Committee does not feel that the court at present is making effective use of all available judicial time.

3. No child should be detained beyond the next court day without being brought before the court for either an initial hearing or a detention hearing.

4. Counsel should be appointed in every case where a child appears without an attorney. Such appointment should be made after Intake has interviewed and petitioned the child, but before he is brought before the court. A system of complete legal representation modeled after the New York law guardian system should be instituted. A first step in providing adequate representation in the court should be an invitation by the court to the bar and appropriate legal aid agencies in the community to institute such a program. The lawyer representing a child should be given access to the social records in connection with the disposition hearing.

5. The Corporation Counsel should take a greater role representing the community's interest in Juvenile Court proceedings. They should advise Intake on any legal questions relating to petitions or the sufficiency of the evidence. In any event, they should be brought into the case immediately upon denial of involvement by a child and have responsibility for preparation and handling of the case from that time. Legislation should be enacted amending D.C. Code, Section 11–1583(a)(1) to strike "upon request" so it will read:

"The Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants shall: (1) Assist the Juvenile Court in hearings arising under Section 11–1551."

6. Neglected and dependent children should not be placed in the same facility as those charged or adjudicated as delinquents. Separate facilities should be provided.

7. The criteria used by the Youth Aid Division and the Intake Division of the court for detention should be studied and reinterpreted to bring their divergent application of criteria into alignment with each other.

8. More effective community services should be developed and both Youth Aid Division and Intake urged to make greater use of these services by referring greater numbers of children to them on a voluntary basis, rather than petitioning them to court.

9. The duties of the social work staff should be reallocated so that non-professional workers perform the clerical and collection functions, thereby releasing the social workers for professional tasks.

10. The Probation Department should be decentralized and some evening hours instituted to enable the officers to spend more time in the neighborhoods and to meet with working parents and with children who are normally in school during the daytime. This may well involve appointing additional probation officers but the number cannot now be determined since other administrative changes are first required. Whatever staff additions would be necessary to reduce the case load of probation workers to 50 cases, as recommended by the U.S. Children's Bureau and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, should be made.

11. The social records should be reorganized and brought up to date. Additional clerical staff necessary to accomplish this should be provided to work with the archivist who has been loaned to the Juvenile Court for this purpose.

12. An operating manual to guide the staff of the court on general policies and procedures should be prepared and kept up to date and abbreviated materials of the same kind should be available for guidance of parents and attorneys.

13. Although efforts have been initiated to improve the psychiatric facilities and services available to Juvenile Court, particularly in the area of diagnosis, there is an urgent need for additional adolescent in-patient and out-patient treatment and facilities.

II. Court of General Sessions

1. The court should submit regular quarterly reports to the bar and the public showing the caseload, backlog, and other statistics. This report should contain some detail as to the number of civil and criminal cases docketed, number of cases ready for trial, number of cases tried, settled, and disposed of in each branch of the court, together with the number of cases in each category pending by age since filing. The report should be accompanied by whatever comments and explanations the Chief Judge wishes to make for the information of the bar and the public as to measures being taken by the court to improve the situation, steps to be taken by the bar to work toward elimination of backlog, and other matters relating to the efficient administration of the court.

2. The Court of General Sessions should be increased by five more judges, making a total of 26. The present backlog of criminal jury cases is over 1,300 and about 500 additional jury demands are filed every month.

There is presently a civil backlog of 3,500 cases. The time from joinder of issue to disposition of a civil jury case in the Court of General Sessions is now 21 months. In 1963 it was four months. The civil backlog increased by over 100 cases within the last month, as the court attempted to diminish its criminal backlog. The court, at this stage particularly, needs the appointment of skilled lawyers with substantial civil litigation background.

From these figures it would appear that unless the Court of General Sessions is increased to 25 judges it will be impossible even to remain abreast of the current caseload, let alone make any inroads on the backlog or begin to provide for any gradual transfer of some jurisdiction from the District Court. This proposal will require an amendment to D.C. Code, Section 11–902(a).

3. The salaries of the judges of the court should be increased. The judges receive $23,500 per year and the Chief Judge receives $24,000. Salaries in general trial courts in other jurisdictions with large municipal centers range between $25,000–$37,000, with a median range around $27,000 to $28,000. It is suggested that the salary should be $27,500 for the associate judges and $28,000 for the Chief Judge. The legislation should assure greater tenure for judges of proven competence after serving a probationary period.

4. A night court should be instituted, providing the court is enlarged to 26 judges. It should be given sufficient jurisdiction to utilize fully one judge's time. As well as handling presentments, sentencing, preliminary hearings, and other criminal matters, it should have authority to conduct criminal non-jury trials and to handle Traffic Court, Small Claims and Landlord and Tenant matters, with leeway to set special hours for operating those sections. It would appear that this can be accomplished by court rule.

5. A new courthouse is needed to house the Court of General Sessions, Juvenile Court, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and supporting services. These courts—and in particular the Court of General Sessions, which is presently occupying four buildings—have been operating under severe difficulties due to inadequate physical facilities. There is a request in the D.C. Budget for $100,000 for a preliminary study for a new courthouse and the Committee supports this request. Pending the construction of the new courthouse the Committee recommends that the Court of Military Appeals be transferred to another location and that the facilities now occupied by that court be used by the D.C. Court of Appeals, thus providing additional court space for the Court of General Sessions in its own Civil building.

6. Improved library facilities should be provided. There is a highly inadequate library in the Civil Building. The judges in the other two buildings are without any research facilities whatsoever. The Committee recommends that the D.C. Commissioners request a supplemental appropriation in the current Budget for this purpose.

7. The Committee supports the immediate Budget request of $115,700 for ten additional Legal Aid Agency attorneys and eight supporting positions so that the Agency would be in a position to handle up to 40% of the indigent cases in the Court of General Sessions. Last year the Legal Aid Agency handled 502 cases in the Court of General Sessions. With the additional staff it should be in a position to handle approximately 2,000.

8. The Committee supports the appointment of a coordinator and staff to implement the Criminal Justice Act. The D.C. Budget requests an appropriation of $24,300 for a staff of three persons for this purpose. More than 200 attorneys have thus far registered for appointment under the Act. Of the approximately 8,000 defendants per year to be interviewed, over 4,000 qualify under the Act and some form of coherent administration is necessary to interview the defendants, make recommendations as to indigency, and verify and process vouchers. The budget request should be supported. In view of the need to evaluate fully the performance of the Criminal Justice Act panel of lawyers and the need to bring in new defense attorneys and orient them to court procedures in addition to the routine work of making recommendations and processing vouchers, favorable consideration should be given to Judge Greene's request for a supplemental appropriation to increase the coordinator's staff.

9. The Committee endorses the creation of the Criminal Trial Panel program of the District of Columbia Bar Association.

10. The Chief Judge should assign the judge sitting on pretrial matters to sit as a settlement judge in civil cases. At the present time four months elapse from joinder of issue to pretrial and 17 months from pretrial to trial. Possibly pretrial should be rescheduled for one month before trial.

11. The probation staff should be enlarged by 23 positions and its pay scale increased. The Probation Department is presently staffed by 13 officers, each of whom supervises over 100 cases per month, as well as preparing an average of 18 presentence reports and conducting intake screening on additional cases. This results in a workload for each officer which is about three times the nationally recommended average. The highest grade of pay is GS–11. Since the District Court pays GS–12, once probation officers become experienced and would be of most use to the department, they switch to the District Court staff. A supplemental appropriation to the current Budget will be required for the staff increase.

12. Law clerks should be provided equal to the number of judges and assigned by the Chief Judge. A supplemental appropriation to the current D.C. Budget should be requested for this purpose.

13. The witness fee in the Court of General Sessions should be raised to the same

level as the District Court. It is presently only 75 cents with no travel allowance. This increase would be in accordance with Section 905(a) of the proposed D.C. Crime Reduction Act of 1967, amending 15 D.C. Code, Section 714(a), presently before Congress.

14. Adult non-support and paternity cases should be transferred from the jurisdiction of Juvenile Court to the Domestic Relations Branch of the Court of General Sessions. This would require substantive legislation amending D.C. Code, Sections 11–1555, 11–1556 and 11–1141. Support cases should no longer have a criminal character but should be handled solely as civil actions.

15. A management study of the entire operation of the court should be conducted. We urge that funds be made available for a study, possibly concentrating on calendaring and scheduling problems, procedures and personnel required to develop adequate statistical data, ways to relieve judges of administrative duties, and supporting service needs.

III. D.C. Court of Appeals

1. The Court should publish quarterly statistics as to the state of its docket and indicate procedures which it believes will expedite disposition of appeals.

2. The number of judges should be increased from three to six and appropriate legislation should be enacted to enable the expanded Court of Appeals to sit in panels of three. The provisions should be analogous to 28 U.S.C. § 46(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 175, which authorize the U.S. Court of Appeals and the Court of Claims, respectively, to sit in panels. A bill (H.R. 8582), which would implement this recommendation, is presently before the House Committee on the District of Columbia. When the D.C. Court of Appeals was formed in 1942 it handled appeals from the ten-judge Court of General Sessions. Its caseload in fiscal year 1943–1944 was 104 cases. As of fiscal year 1965–1966, the caseload was 392 cases and it is presently handling appeals from the 21-judge Court of General Sessions. With an increased number of Criminal Justice Act appointments of counsel, more cases being reported by court reporters, a greater number of defendants out on bail under the Bail Reform Act provisions, and the possibility of increased requirements for counsel in Juvenile Court, it is likely that there will be an even greater increase in the number of appeals within the coming year. A further increase can be predicted if the Court of General Sessions is increased to 26 judges and its jurisdiction expanded. When the legislation is up for amendment, provision should be made to permit retired judges greater participation in the work of the court following retirement.

3. The salaries of the judges should be raised. At present the Chief Judge receives $25,000 and the associate judges receive $24,500. Salaries of judges in comparable intermediate appellate courts range between $27,000–$41,000, with the median range around $33,000. An increase to $29,000 for the Chief Judge and $28,500 for the associate judges is recommended. This would require legislation amending D.C. Code, Section 11–702(d).

IV. U.S. district court

1. The District Court should submit regular quarterly reports to the bar and the public in standard form showing by categories of the criminal and civil dockets, separately, number of cases docketed, number of cases pretried, number of cases ready for trial, number of cases settled, number of cases tried and disposed of, together with a breakdown of the number of cases in each category pending by age since filing. This report should be accompanied by whatever comments and explanations the Chief Judge wishes to make for the information of the bar and the public as to measures being taken by the court to improve the situation, steps to be taken by the bar to work toward elimination of backlog, and other matters relating to the efficient administration of the court.

2. The Chief Judge should devote the preponderance of his time to the administration of the court's affairs. The extent of his authority is presently unclear and should be clarified by resolution of the Judicial Council. Specifically, the Chief Judge should have authority comparable to that granted by statute to the Chief Judge of the Court of General Sessions[2] and it should be made clear, among other things, that the Chief Judge can assign particular judges to particular parts of the calendar, assign a particular case to a particular judge with directions to conduct the trial, and obtain such reports and other data from individual judges about their work as may be required in his task as administrator. The Chief Judge should review the monthly forms now prepared for submission to the Administrative Office and should undertake to improve the detail and specification of these reports. The Chief Judge should take direct, immediate responsibility for expediting and improving the docket and his authority should run to both active and retired members of the court.

3. The court does not have sufficient funds for the effective administration of its affairs. The Chief Judge requires an enlarged administrative staff. Provision for an Administrator to handle problems under the Criminal Justice Act is essential. In addition, there is an inadequate staff of probation officers. The Clerk's Office and the Assignment Office are seriously undermanned and in no position presently to provide the statistical data and assistance which are necessary for effective administration of the court. Higher grade levels in certain job categories appear to be required. The budget of the court should be given separate and special consideration by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts since its docket is quite unlike that of any other District Court.

4. It is believed that the docket backlog can be substantially reduced if one or more members of the court sit as settlement judges. As far as civil cases are concerned, Rule 11(h) could be modified to provide for a call of the civil calendar three times per year at which settlement discussions will be had. A rule applicable to the civil jury calendar might be drawn along the following lines:

"There will be a call of all civil jury cases on the general calendar during the months of October, February and June in each year, or such other time as the Court may direct. At such time, discussions of settlement will be had and counsel for the respective parties will be expected to cooperate with the Court in attempting to bring about a prompt disposition of those cases."

The calendar call would be conducted by the settlement judge.

With respect to the criminal docket, it is suggested that the Chief Judge or his designee review all pending criminal cases for disposition purposes with counsel for the Government and the defendants at least twice a year.

5. The operations of pretrial require a major continuing study by the court and the Committee. Pretrial procedures must be made more effective. The rules should be more strongly supported at the trial level by the court.

6. The court is, on occasion, too permissive in handling requests for continuances made by the prosecution or members of the private bar. There should be less leniency in this regard.

7. Consideration should be given in complicated protracted civil cases to the assignment of such cases to a single judge on an individual calendar basis for purposes of pretrial motions, trial and disposition. As experience develops with a limited individual calendar for this type of case, consideration should be given to some expansion of this method of assignment for other civil cases.

8. A detailed management survey of the District Court is required to assist the Chief Judge by 1) pointing up where different procedures in the processing of cases will result in greater expedition and prompter disposition, and 2) disclosing manpower shortages, the correction of which could result in more efficient administration. The survey should also develop the types of statistical information required by the Chief Judge for effective administration of the docket and should recommend appropriate procedures and personnel necessary for the prompt accumulation and development of such statistics.

V. U.S. court of appeals

1. The court should publish quarterly statistics as to the state of its docket and indicate procedures which it believes will expedite disposition of appeals.

2. An undue amount of court time is presently required to deal with petitions for rehearing. This is largely the fault of the bar. The court should undertake to make a clearer statement of the factors which it considers requisite to the granting of a rehearing either by the original panel or en banc.

3. The court should clarify the conditions under which appeals will be heard during the summer months inasmuch as there is considerable confusion among the bar on this point and there is apparently time under the existing summer schedule for hearing additional cases.

5. Additional funds are needed to provide with an additional law clerk and related secretarial assistance.

5. Additional funds are needed to provide personnel for the administration of the court's affairs and the effective operations of the Council.

VI. Judicial Conference

Representatives of the Court of General Sessions, the D.C. Court of Appeals and the Juvenile Court should be made members of a Judicial Conference concerned with problems of the D.C. legislative courts.

---

[2] D.C. Code:

"§ 11–903. The chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall administer generally and superintendent the business of the court. He shall give his attention to the discharge of the duties especially pertaining to his office and to the performance of such additional judicial work as he is able to perform.

"§ 11–904. (a) The chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall, from time to time and for such periods as he determines designate the judges to preside in and attend the divisions and several branches and sessions of the court. He may:

"(1) . . . determine the number and fix the time of the various sessions of the court; and

"(2) arrange the business of the court, and divide it and assign it among the judges.

"Each associate judge shall attend and serve at the division, branch, or sessions of the court to which he is assigned.

"§ 11–907. (b) Each associate judge shall submit to the chief judge a monthly written report, in a form prescribed by the chief judge, of the duties performed by him, specifying:

"(1) the number of days attendance in court of the judge during the month covered;

"(2) the branch courts upon which he attended;

"(3) the number of hours per day of his attendance; and

"(4) such other data as the chief judge requires."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE COURT

ALEXANDER B. HAWES, *Chairman.*
JOSEPH P. McCORMICK.
KENNETH W. PARKINSON.
KATHERINE M. STALEY.
PATRICIA WALD.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON D.C. COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND D.C. COURT OF APPEALS

THOMAS A. FLANNERY, *Chairman.*
BARBARA BABCOCK.
SYLVIA BACON.
JUDAH BEST.
ADDISON BOWMAN.
ALBERT BURKA.
JOYCE CAPPS.
WILLIAM J. DONNELLY.
DAVID EPSTEIN.
WILLIAM GREENHALGH.
HONORABLE TIM MURPHY,
THEODORE R. NEWMAN.
JACOB A. STEIN.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON U.S. DISTRICT COURT AND U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

STEPHEN AILES, *Chairman.*
EDMUND D. CAMPBELL.
PAUL R. CONNOLLY.
JAMES V. DOLAN.
RICHARD W. GALIHER.
BELFORD V. LAWSON, Jr.
RICHARD MILLMAN.
DANIEL O'DONOGHUE.
THOMAS M. O'MALLEY.
JOSEPH SITNICK.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM NOT GOOD SHORT-RANGE CONTRACYCLICAL TOOL BUT IT STRENGTHENS ECONOMY, RANDOLPH-JANEWAY INTERVIEW SHOWS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are numerous ways in which the partnership program involved in Federal-aid to the States for highway purposes can affect the national economy and various industrial and commercial segments of the economy. In an interview recently with one of our country's leading consulting economists and newspaper columnists, Eliot Janeway, this subject was explored by us in an effort to evaluate the road program's value as a fiscal tool.

Mr. Janeway expressed the judgment that the Federal highway program, being a form of public works spending outside the budget, because it is financed from the highway trust fund, will expand. He said that—

> The size of the highway program, and the country's need for it, add up to one good reason why the public sector of the economy is so big and is slated to grow so steadily.

And here he added—

> War or no war.

At the outset of our interview, Mr. Janeway remarked:

> It appears that (highway) trust fund monies have been used to serve a contracyclical purpose—first against the threat of inflation in 1966 and now against the threat of recession in 1967.

He asked me:

> How effective will the release of highway funds (by order of the President) be in averting recession.

I said that, in general, a highway program is not a good short-term contracyclical tool. We learned that in the 1930's—and again during the 1958 recession. And, by the time the program took hold in 1960, we were fighting inflation again. Inasmuch as the highway program was in forward thrust when the slowdown was ordered late last year, and because it is really a continuous program, the release of the funds which had been ordered held back should be effective in swinging the tide away from recessionary tendencies. This is made more probable because, for the most part, highway plans and projects already are available for immediate implementation.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Janeway as to what timelag exists between funding for highway construction and stimulus for heavy industry activity, I offered the estimate that the overall lapse in time between the start of a new program and the peak of its impact would seem to be approximately 2 years. Because it no longer is a matter of placing men at work with picks and shovels to construct roads, the concept of highway investment as an antidepression workmaker has been overplayed. The very real technological advances in highway construction require highly skilled workers. This is a fact which emphasizes still another reason for taking the stop-go out of the funding of the highway program. Skilled persons simply will not remain in industries which blow hot and cold with every change in the Washington weather.

With reference to the question of the impact on homebuilding and on car sales by highway construction, I expressed the view to Mr. Janeway that the impact of the rate of highway construction on homebuilding and commercial and industrial development is substantial. But whether or not highway building has an affirmative influence on car sales is difficult to say. I suggested, however, that the present lag in the rate of automobile sales may possibly have some relationship to the fact that highway construction in some categories is lagging behind forecasted highway needs.

Mr. Janeway brought up in our interview the question of the possible impact of highway expenditure cutbacks or slowdowns on accident insurance costs—a very important element of the economy and the cost of living. My response was that I do not doubt that newer highways are safer, but there seems to be no way definitely to show the correlation of highway construction funding cutbacks with accident insurance costs.

But, as I also pointed out, we have embarked on two major safety programs, one dealing with equipment and vehicle safety and the other with highway traffic safety. Sound administration of these two programs probably will do more to hold down insurance costs than will any other.

Mr. President, I am grateful to Mr. Janeway for having afforded me the opportunity to discuss vital questions with him in an area of my prime responsibility in my capacities as chairman of the Committee on Public Works and chairman of its Subcommittee on Roads. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the "Point of View" column by Eliot Janeway, consulting economist for the Chicago Tribune Press Service, as it appeared in that newspaper on April 27, 1967, under the headline, "U.S. Road Program's Value as Fiscal Tool."

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 27, 1967]

U.S. ROAD PROGRAM'S VALUE AS FISCAL TOOL

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, April 26.—When recession is thought to be a danger, public works programs are relied on as a standard remedy. When inflation is feared as the big problem, people argue about cutting back on the nonwar part of the budget. But the federal highway program is a form of government public works spending outside the budget. Its size, and the country's need for it, add up to one good reason why the public sector of the economy is so big and slated to grow so steadily—war or no war.

For an X-ray of the federal highway trust funds at work in the economy, this column interviewed Sen. Jennings Randolph [D., W. Va.], chairman of the public works committee.

JANEWAY. It appears that trust fund monies have been used to serve a contra-cyclical purpose—first against the threat of inflation in 1966 and now against the threat of recession in 1967. As a practical matter, how effective will the release of highway funds be in averting recession?

RANDOLPH. In general, a highway program is not a good short-term contra-cyclical tool. I think we learned that in the 1930's—and again during the 1958 recession: By the time it took hold in 1960, we were fighting inflation again. Since this program already is under way and continuous, however, with plans and projects ready for immediate implementation, the release of this money now should be particularly effective in swinging the tide against recession. It will certainly be a boost to business psychology.

JANEWAY. Just what is the federal highway program and where do the trust fund monies come from?

RANDOLPH. Highway trust fund monies come from special taxes paid by highway users—such as the 4-cent a gallon gasoline tax, taxes on tires and tread rubber, and on new truck equipment and parts. The federal-aid highway program is a partnership between the states and the federal government, for which 4.4 billion dollars of federal funds have been authorized for fiscal 1968. In general, the matching ratios are 90 per cent federal to 10 per cent state for the interstate highway system, and 50–50 for primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions. The total annual expenditure for construction and maintenance of our nation's highways is approximately 15 billion dollars.

JANEWAY. Does the rate of highway construction have a great impact on car sales and home building?

RANDOLPH. The impact of highway construction on home building and commercial and industrial development is very great. Whether highway building has an influence on car sales, or whether it is the other way around, is difficult to say. Certainly highway construction is lagging behind forecasted highway needs.

WOULD PRESSURE ECOMONY

JANEWAY. Would you favor Export-Import bank financing to get American industry the business Russia wants to place here to further her own highway needs?

RANDOLPH. At the present time, with the multiple demands being made on our own industrial capacity because of Viet Nam, and our own accelerated highway program, I feel

that incentives to foster a foreign market would put undue pressure on our own industry's ability to deliver what we need for our own program.

JANEWAY. When we hold back on highway expenditures, do accident insurance costs go up?

RANDOLPH. There's no doubt that newer highways, because of improved technology, are safer; but there is no way of showing the correlation you suggest. We have recently embarked on two major safety programs, one dealing with vehicle and equipment safety and the other with highway safety. Execution of these two programs will probably do more to hold down insurance costs than anything else.

TIME LAG IS 2 YEARS

JANEWAY. What is the time lag between appropriations for highway construction and stimulus for heavy industry activity.

RANDOLPH. The over-all time lag between the start of a new program and the peak of its impact appears to be about two years. But the concept of highway investment as an anti-depression work-maker has certainly been overplayed. It is no longer a matter of putting men to work with a pick and shovel and coming up with a road. The great technological advances in highway construction require highly skilled workers—a fact that emphasizes still another reason for taking the stop-go out of the highway program. Nowadays, skilled people simply won't stay in industries which blow hot and cold with every change in the Washington weather.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempport (Mr. METCALF). The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will report.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar 80 (H.R. 6950) a bill to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1967:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Eugene M. Becker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice W. Brewster Kopp.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8, 1967:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

William A. Garrett, Fort Payne.
James M. Ford, Gadsden.
Clarence N. Bryant, Jr., Hollywood.
Donald E. Driskell, Loxley.
Rudolph Harrison, Marion.
James R. Morrow, Mulga.
Charles W. Thomas, Tuskegee Institute.

ARKANSAS

Berty A. Williams, Beech Grove.
Ellie L. Chaney, Coy.
Dean P. Duboise, Hackett.
James C. Holt, Jr., McRae.

CALIFORNIA

Josephine D. Dahlstrom, Ballico.
Veda M. Davis, Campo.
George R. Saunders, Carlsbad.
Patricia A. Shields, Del Mar.
Ben R. Taylor, Durham.
Clayton W. Fountain, El Granada.
Lloyd G. Wood, Idyllwild.
Wesley G. Barnes, Loomis.
Gerald McGinnis, Lynwood.
Richard S. Long, Needles.
Carl H. Winnefeld, Nipton.
Stella L. Davis, Walnut.

COLORADO

Ida J. Kettle, Austin.
Walter B. Lovelace, Boulder.
Vernamae C. George, Breckenridge.
Emil G. Johnson, Durango.
Carl B. Larned, Golden.
Paul F. Dearmin, Idaho Springs.
Burdette S. Stone, Rifle.
Beryl E. Lambert, Yuma.

DELAWARE

Bernard P. Lynch, Frankford.
G. Edgar Williams, Middletown.

FLORIDA

Audrey B. Golden, Alva.
J. Willard Marcom, Brandon.
Joseph M. Webb, Fort George Island.
William O. Neal, Mango.
Clifford C. Betts, Okeechobee.
Bruce W. Lloyd, Oklawaha.
Walter G. Edwards, Sneads.
Thomas A. Williams, South Bay.
John L. McLee, West Palm Beach.

GEORGIA

T. Hartley Hobbs, Dublin.
Runette B. Cronic, Hull.
William W. Ware, Ringgold.
George H. Gunby, Tennille.
Dessie P. Jeanes, Union City.

HAWAII

Hon Chung Chee, Honolulu.

IDAHO

Lenorah G. Shaeffer, Nezperce.
Lorin F. Widdison, Rexburg.
Cameron H. Edgar, Troy.
John A. Albertini, Wallace.

INDIANA

Eugene J. Gabriel, Fort Wayne.

IOWA

Donald E. Klumpp, Albert City.
Ward Foster, Jr., Altoona.
Ralph N. Wilson, Anthon.
Thomas K. Hardy, Bloomfield.
John C. Halvorson, Clermont.
John E. Tomb, Eldora.
Donald E. Roseland, Gilman.
Frank P. Simon, Lake View.
Opal A. Bonynge, Lester.
Wyatt W. Vance, Milton.
Naomi A. Galbraith, Newell.
Leland J. Hart, Oskaloosa.
Dorothy M. Petersen, Pierson.
William C. Miller, Pilot Mound.
Rupert R. Thorpe, Salix.
Lowell D. Morehead, Westfield.
Rodger L. Johnston, West Liberty.

KANSAS

Marion W. Mooberry, Cheney.
Frank Lill, Emporia.
Ernest H. Barton, Geuda Springs.
Victor A. Wasinger, Hays.
James H. Kusel, Kensington.
Ronald Sidebottom, Kinsley.
Virgil W. Green, Mount Hope.

KENTUCKY

Carol W. Graves, Adolphus.
Alta D. Morrison, Big Clifty.
William S. Jenkins, Central City.
Lark K. Box, Cynthiana.
Edwin T. Elliott, Harrodsburg.
Barbara B. Brand, Jeffersonville.
Thomas R. Abell, Leitchfield.
Joseph R. Cox, Livermore.
Edward K. White, Perryville,
Jack Stumbo, Prestonsburg.
G. Evelene Myers, Salt Lick.
Nina M. Williams, West Van Lear.

LOUISIANA

Robert N. Williamson, Dubach.
Marie D. Johnson, Hackberry.
Quincy J. Lemoine, Moreauville.

MAINE

Dwight L. Simonds, Friendship.
John L. Ross, Gorham
Hayden E. Fairbanks, Phillips.
Leonie M. Lagasse, St. Agatha.

MARYLAND

George E. Rosensteel, Emmitsburg.
Daniel C. Robertson, Gaithersburg.
Nada L. Joines, Highland.
Hubert L. Harden, Olney.
Melvin B. Grimes, Owings Mills.
W. Sherman Mellott, Williamsport.

MINNESOTA

George H. Judish, Browns Valley.
Dwaine D. Babb, Cambridge.
Daniel C. Schnyders, Edgerton.
Edwin L. Wegleitner, Forest Lake.
Alvin O. Rosenthal, LeRoy.
Kermit W. Thorsland, Milan.
Robert F. Doyle, Owatonna.
Carlton G. Hess, Pipestone.
Morris A. Johnson, Renville.
Ragnvald N. Aaker, St. Hilaire.
John L. Bystrom, Sauk Rapids.
Wayne M. Viesselman, Trimont.
Vernon R. Heggen, Wheaton.

MISSISSIPPI

William L. Laughter, Batesville.
Thomas B. Woodruff, Burnsville.
M. Deaton McAuley, Byhalia.
Mildred M. Blair, Caledonia.
Eugene R. Stamper, Chunky.
James S. Thornton, Clarksdale.
Louel B. Fisher, Como
Charles E. Monroe, Dennis.
John B. Waller, Enid.
George E. Reid, Enterprise.
Delois W. Lowery, Georgetown.
Edward S. Thompson, Grenada.
Francis L. Townsend, Lena.
Lettie H. Johnson, Louise.
E. Lamar Reynolds, Lumberton.
Julian P. White, McComb.
William G. Collins, New Albany.
Roy L. Webb, Newhebron.
Jesse H. Carter, Philadelphia.
William A. Moser, Richton.
William A. McLaurin, Sr., Sandersville.
Clyde S. Faust, Sledge.
Annie L. Greene, Sumner.

MISSOURI

James R. Burge, Craig.
John J. Strode, Grandview.
William A. Reader, Oak Grove.
Ellis M. Huston, Windsor.

MONTANA

Edward C. Clark, Ennis.
Katherine L. Heikkila, Roberts.

NEBRASKA

Glen W. Hayes, Hershey.
Cecil G. Hutt, Lexington.
Carl F. Eman, Oxford.

NEVADA

Betty F. Keep, Jackpot.
Theobald G. Travers, North Las Vegas.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Norman T. Fecteau, Exeter.
Ralph J. Lavallee, Goffstown.
Russell P. Merrill, Jr., Hampton Falls.
Victor J. Dean, New London.

NEW JERSEY

Alfred W. Conrads, Andover.
George P. Ross, Belmar.
Lee M. Evans, Newport.
Belford L. Cox, Port Elizabeth.
Frank J. Antine, Secaucus.
Dolores Sweetman, Townsends Inlet.
Walter A. Forrest, Westwood.

NEW YORK

Helen E. McEniff, Amenia.
Samuel N. Sackett, Apalachin.
Frank J. Viola, Bronx.
Robert G. Havens, Center Moriches.
James J. McTamaney, Cornwall.
Kathryn S. Rose, Elka Park.
Franklin G. Bassakalis, Ghent.
Emory J. Branning, Hancock.
John E. Foley, Harrisville.
Helen B. Santay, Henrietta.
Thomas P. O'Toole, Hensonville.
Regina V. Myers, Kill Buck.
Patrick J. Reilly, Larchmont.
Joel C. Stein, Locust Valley.
Merwin W. Jester, Meridale.
James L. Bloomfield, Meridian.
Lloyd R. Milliman, Palmyra.
Joseph R. Fallon, Pittsford.
Anthony F. Biscone, Ravena.
Anthony F. Gadzinski, Riverhead.
Dyas W. Carden, Scarsdale.
Katherine I. Bristol, Schuylerville.
Ida M. Marlatt, Shokan.
Huldah J. Murphy, Silver Lake.
Edgar H. Jay, South Dayton.
Ernest C. Warga, South Salem.
Felix Masterson, Valhalla.
Betty J. Kelver, Wales Center.
Forrest M. Lanfair, Warrensburg.
Walter F. Brady, Watertown.

NORTH CAROLINA

Crayteen A. Brown, Cedar Falls.
Ralph C. Jones, Crumpler.
Roscoe D. Franklin, Glade Valley.
Robert E. Sharpe, Greensboro.
Gilbert L. Ferguson, Kernersville.
Charles C. Brown, Sr., Kittrell.
Jeannine W. Winstead, Leasburg.
Paul D. Johnson, Jr., Siler City.
Norris C. Long, Southport.

NORTH DAKOTA

John P. Wheelihan, Ellendale.
Delores E. Moore, Emerado.
Roger O. Lunde, Mohall.
George J. Lemieux, Rolla.

OHIO

Joan C. Dickerson, Alpha.
Joseph L. Clark, Amlin.
Darrell E. Fawley, Chillicothe.
Forest A. Baird, Chippewa Lake.
Edward J. Hinde III, Huron.
Paul L. Rider, Lancaster.
Don M. Davis, Minerva.
Russell J. Krueger, Oberlin.
Keith L. Rutledge, Rockford.
Donna V. Miller, Somerdale.
Charles E. Franz, Sr., Stony Ridge.
Charles F. Smith, Utica.

OKLAHOMA

Harvey R. Bettis, Atoka.
Thomas L. Detherage, Fairland.
Jetta J. Wiseman, Gate.
Laura E. Vaughan, Kiowa.
John I. Washecheck, Sr., Piedmont.
Harry J. Frasco, Savanna.
Frank C. Coon, Stilwell.
Denver L. Turner, Wister.

OREGON

Harry M. Stevenson, Canyonville.
Jean C. McDougall, Deadwood.
Patricia M. Hescock, Fort Klamath.
Claude B. Allen, Gold Hill.
Norman J. Fischer, Mount Hood.
Mildred V. De Mastus, Unity.

PENNSYLVANIA

Martha D. Ridgway, Allenport.
Mario J. Gabrielli, Avella.
James F. Beck, Center Valley.
Raymond C. Hall, Coal Center.
John M. Dranzo, Cokeburg.
Genaro G. Landi, Cresco.
Elzer N. Coates, Jr., High Spire.
Sheldon E. Kleintob, Huntington Mills.
Victor E. Blank, Kinzers.
Rayburn R. Krause, Laurys Station.
John H. Shaffer, Millersburg.
James W. Mengel, Mount Pleasant Mills.
Anson L. Bigham, Normalville.
Harold C. Lorah, Oley.
Floyd F. Plasterer, Shippensburg.
Myra B. Pifer, Tarrs.

PUERTO RICO

Luz Piazza, Adjuntas.

SOUTH CAROLINA

David L. Benson, Fairforest.
Frederick W. Dantzler, Holly Hill.
Eugene Craven, Joanna.
Marise B. DeVore, Kinards.
Douglas W. McMillan, Mullins.
Donald A. Yongue, Orangeburg.
Duncan L. Crawley, Jr., Ruby.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Merlon M. Kotila, Frederick.
Raymond F. Cerney, Geddes.
Dale N. Rezac, Highmore.
Delmar J. Nelson, Rosholt.

TENNESSEE

Roe H. Price, Erie.

TEXAS

Mary L. Montandon, Aiken.
Louise E. Baker, Barnhart.
Herbert M. Cole, Beaumont.
Lee R. Moreland, Canyon.
Ruby E. Seat, Cayuga.
Webster T. Graves, Coleman.
Jack Q. Durham, Cotulla.
Armando E. Gonzalez, Edcouch.
Jack D. Watson, Fort Worth.
W. Kenneth Suddeth, Hubbard.
Jack King, Junction.
Donovon A. Boyett, Moran.
Laura M. Maney, Natalia.
Mark A. Phillips, Jr., Port Lavaca.
Ross Hodges, Ranger.
Lloyd E. Million, Jr., Stamford.
William R. Brooks, Sterling City.
Willa M. Chandler, Tuleta.
Charles E. Baum, Whitesboro.

UTAH

Ned B. Mitchell, Altamont.
Velda J. Jensen, Castle Dale.
Carlene N. Reed, Manila.
Laurella D. Holley, Tropic.

VIRGINIA

Harold H. Copenhaver, Atkins.
Herbert D. Jones, Coeburn.
Doris H. Noel, Daleville.
George A. Johnson, Fort Blackmore.
Leon R. Waters, Luray.
Cecil W. Wood, Meadows of Dan.
Lester L. Hall, Montpelier.
Daniel R. Lynn, Randolph.
Mary E. Moshenek, Ringgold.
Katherleene D. Rountree, Whaleyville.

WASHINGTON

Gloria P. Wharton, Carlsborg.
Billy M. Moyer, Dayton.
George I. Simmons, Kennewick.
Helen M. Scott, Langley.
Louis L. Valentine, Mount Vernon.
John W. Hull, Port Orchard.
Leona M. Wing, Tracyton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Glenn W. Thompson, Barboursville.
Glenn L. Crane, Capon Bridge.
Stephen J. Moore, Leon.
James L. Scarberry, Ona.
Carl W. Lang, Philippi.
Earl F. Wellman, Prichard.
Johanna M. Guadino, Triadelphia.

WISCONSIN

John W. Wied, Amherst.
William P. Brennan, Barneveld.
Richard B. Dougherty, Ellsworth.
John R. Thompson, Elroy.
William E. Leonhard, Greenleaf.
Oswald R. Curtis, Hazel Green.
John F. Mooney, Janesville.
Walter J. Wessely, Kewaunee.
Howard L. Newman, Markesan.
Robert A. Otzelberger, Menomonee Falls.
Emil W. Plain, Oconto Falls.
Norman L. Myhra, Stevens Point.
Gerald J. Lonzo, Suring.
Frederick A. Mohrmann, Viola.

IN THE ARMY

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Lowell Joseph Bradford, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Carl Leslie Buck, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Carl Jens Dueser, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Rowland Falconer Kirks, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. William Hartwell Prentice, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Laddie L. Stahl, [redacted].

To be brigadier generals

Col. John Warmington Atwood, [redacted], Signal Corps.
Col. William Harvey Birbari, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Rafael Gabriel Dufficy, Jr., [redacted], Medical Corps.
Col. Stephen Scott Ferebee, Jr., [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Lester Wallace Grawunder, [redacted] Infantry.
Col. Joe Grady Hanover, Jr., [redacted], Corps of Engineers.
Col. Kermit Read Hansen, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. James Gilliam Hughes, [redacted], Medical Corps.
Col. Robert Loren Johnson, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. John Joseph King, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Milton Alfred Pilcher, [redacted], Civil Affairs.
Col. William Early Reynolds, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. Thomas Jackson Thorne, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. William Albert Tidwell, Jr., [redacted], Army Intelligence and Security.
Col. John Estes Whiting, [redacted], Civil Affairs.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles Howard Brady, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. Frank J. Dalley, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. Don L. Doane, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. Roy Wesley Hogan, [redacted], Armor.
Col. Nicholas Peter Kafkalas, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Boleslaw Henry Pokigo, [redacted], Artillery.

Col. Gaylord Edward Shepard, [redacted], Artillery.

Col. Clarence Binder Shimer, [redacted], Infantry.

Col. D. A. Thompson, [redacted], Armor.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Clarence Schnipke, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Joseph Mark Ambrose, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Thomas Bonner, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. William LaFayette Ward, Jr., [redacted], Artillery.

Col. LaVern Erick Weber, [redacted], Infantry.

Col. Charles Vawter Wheeler, [redacted], Artillery.

Col. Erbon Wilbur Wise, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be generals

Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Louis Watson Truman, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. August Schomburg, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. William Frew Train, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Richard Davis Meyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, [redacted], U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

Brig. Gen. Robert Bruce Shira, [redacted], Dental Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3040, 3442 and 3447.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Byron Ludwig Steger, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Estes Blount, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joe Morris Blumberg, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Thomas McGibony, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The following-named Medical Corps officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Philip Wallace Mallory, [redacted], U.S. Army.

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Col. Kenneth Dew Orr, [redacted], U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Nels C. Johnson, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Harold G. Bowen, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

William C. Abhau	Woodrow W. McCrory
Walter V. Combs, Jr.	Philip A. Beshany
Earl R. Crawford	Robert W. McNitt
Walter F. Schlech, Jr.	Raymond F. Du Bois
Thomas S. King, Jr.	Ralph Weymouth
Ed R. King	Evan P. Aurand
John J. Lynch	Vincent P. de Poix
David B. Bell	Thomas J. Walker III
Donald M. White	Eugene P. Wilkinson
Roger W. Mehle	Frederic A. Bardshar
Frederick H. Schneider, Jr.	Lawrence R. Geis
	C. Edwin Bell, Jr.
Ralph W. Cousins	Frank C. Jones
Donald "G" Baer	Paul A. Holmberg
Richard G. Colbert	Donald M. Showers
Walter L. Curtis, Jr.	Harry C. Mason
John E. Dacey	Jamie Adair

Medical Corps

Frank T. Norris
John S. Cowan
Harry S. Etter

Supply Corps

Kenneth R. Wheeler
George E. Moore II

Civil Engineer Corps

Robert R. Wooding

The following-named officers, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Joseph M. Lyle, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. John McN. Taylor, U.S. Navy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Robert B. Bell

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Douglas J. Peacher

Charles T. Hagan, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Jack M. Pollin, to be professor of mathematics, U.S. Military Academy, and ending Jack A. Ziemke, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 17, 1967.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Jack G. Airlie, Jr., to be ensign, and ending Patrick J. Hephner, to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 21, 1967.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Blair P. Conway, to be second lieutenant, and ending Robert D. Rogers, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 21, 1967.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Robert L. Baker, to be captain in the Navy, and ending Alan C. DeCrane, to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 3, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

A faithful man shall abound with blessings.—Proverbs 28: 20.

Eternal Father of our spirits, we rejoice in the glory of a new day and in the beginning of another week. During this time when the foundations of the world seem to be shaken and the bite of bitterness would blight the best of men, we would use this hallowed moment of prayer to be assured of Thy presence and to tap the spiritual resources we need as we face the pressing duties of these hours.

May we feel Thy spirit leading us as we make our decisions, may we possess Thy power which holds us steady amid the constant pressures of daily life, and may our trust in Thee deliver us from those tensions which would tear us to pieces, and from those worries which would wear us out. All through this day may we think our best, do our best, and be our best, and thus be worthy of our calling to this high office.

Hasten the day when justice and love shall rule the hearts of men and reign

in the lives of all people. In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1967, 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 bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090).

S. 443. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122).

S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 3399) entitled "An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission."

COMMENDATION OF STATEMENT MADE BY CYRUS VANCE, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the public can well applaud the statement made by the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, to the 90th annual convention of the Diocese of West Virginia at Martinsburg, W. Va., on May 6. He spoke with forceful logic which again spelled out the reasons for America's commitments in South Vietnam. He contrasted the clear and unmistakable difference between the efforts of the United States to help the South Vietnamese to establish a sound and stable government with the brutality and wanton terrorism used as deliberate tools by the Communists in an effort to enforce their will.

There are a number of passages which are of particular significance in his well-prepared statement. For instance, he declared:

Knowing these things—knowing the true face of the war, on both sides—I find it difficult to understand the convoluted logic which leads some to condemn this nation for "immorality" and to defend terrorism as a heroic struggle for "independence."

In reply to the argument that the United States has no vital interest in Southeast Asia, Secretary Vance said:

The national interest of the United States is international . . . our role of leadership is inescapable.

This does not mean that we must become the policeman of the world.

He said:

It does mean that we must stand behind the commitments we have made if we hope to preserve peace rather than permit raw and naked power to govern.

In his conclusion, Mr. Vance declared:

I would say to the young divinity students then: I share your abhorrence of war, but the sacrifice of principle and the loss of freedom are worse than the loss of life. Both principle and freedom are at stake in Vietnam, and so I believe that we are engaged in a just battle.

I believe, too, that the national interest of a great nation is involved wherever principle, freedom and the peace and stability of the world are imperiled. Thus, for these very reasons, I think we should be in Vietnam and we should stay there until the aggression ends.

RETIREMENT OF CARROLL KENWORTHY

Mr. MORGAN. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that on Tuesday, Carroll Kenworthy will retire after 26 years as head of the foreign department at United Press International.

After early experience on the Hartford, Conn., Courant; the Tokyo, Japan, Advertiser, and the Wall Street Journal, Kenworthy began his UPI career while the organization was still the United Press, in 1930.

For a decade he covered the diplomatic beat, the foreign committees of Congress and other international news centers, and wrote about such great continuing stories of that era as the great depression, the Philippines independence campaign, the Roosevelt New Deal, the rise of Hitler, and the mounting war tensions in Europe and Asia.

Soon after being named head of the foreign department in August 1941, he scored a remarkable triumph with a story exactly 1 week before Pearl Harbor, which said talks between Secretary Hull and the special Japanese envoy, Saburo Kurusu, "are near collapse" and "it is believed Japan may strike."

His story was cited by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson at the joint congressional committee which after World War II investigated the lack of preparedness at Pearl Harbor.

His newspaper colleagues and many great and near-great news sources in Washington will miss his cool judgment and reliability. I wish him well on his retirement.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. SELDEN. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the cause of academic freedom and higher education was seriously set back last week when former Governor of Alabama, George C. Wallace, was forced to leave a speaking platform at Dartmouth College as the result of mob action.

Both the president and dean of Dartmouth have condemned this attempt to silence Governor Wallace, which was led, according to press reports, by a faculty member from another nearby New England college.

However, apologies aside, the fact remains that the raucous and undemocratic mob action of members of an audience at Dartmouth stands in direct contrast to the reception given speakers by the faculty and students at the University of Alabama.

For example, I think it is generally understood that the junior Senator from New York is not likely to win any Gallup or Harris poll popularity contests in Alabama or Mississippi. Yet, not many months ago Senator KENNEDY came to the campuses at Tuscaloosa and Oxford, the University of Alabama and the University of Mississippi, and he was received and his views were given a hearing by the faculty and students at those institutions, regardless of any differences in opinion which may have existed between speakers and audiences.

Again, in contrast to the outrageous conduct at Stanford University and Harvard University toward, respectively, the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense, I had occasion recently to accompany the Secretary of State to the University of Alabama campus, where he delivered an address on foreign policy. Mr. Rusk was cordially and respectfully received by the faculty and students at Tuscaloosa, as befits a Cabinet member of the U.S. Government who is a guest at an institution of higher learning in this country.

We are forced to conclude, then, that the "tolerance" level of Stanford, Harvard, and Dartmouth, as well as some other institutions thought to be enlightened leaders of American academia, may not be so high after all. And we are also forced to conclude that there must be a vital element missing in the standards being set and taught at these institutions.

As a Member of Congress and as a citizen, I am, therefore, greatly disturbed over the serious implications of this trend to political disorder and intolerance in many of our country's major educational institutions. Obviously, the "right to dissent" as it is understood by some students on these campuses means the right to dissent so loudly as to deny any other point of view being heard. This, then, is not academic freedom, but a form of academic license that infringes upon the freedom of others.

We can all regret the need for the president and dean of a major American university to apologize for the unruly conduct of a student audience, as occurred last week at Dartmouth. But I must also admit to a considerable degree of pride that, in my own State of Alabama, the principles of patriotism, respect for our system, our Government, and our fundamental freedoms remain the solid foundation to our institutions of learning.

Mr. Speaker, although it is a rare occasion when I find myself in agreement with a general editorial statement of the Washington Post, that newspaper on May 5, 1967, expressed the growing concern of the country regarding the campus trend of which I speak.

This editorial follows:

STORM TROOPERS

When college children behave like children, as they sometimes will—engorging goldfish, infesting telephone booths, raiding panties from women's dormitories—one can laugh or sigh according to one's disposition and tolerance. But when they behave like Hitler Youth members—chanting slogans, stifling speech and wreaking violence—they betray their status as students. It would be folly to make light of such behavior or to treat it as a prank or even to condone it as an expression of adolescense. It hacks at the roots of freedom. It amounts to a very sick symptom of the unhappy polarization taking place in the American community.

The latest case in point, at Dartmouth College on Wednesday, involved a former Governor of Alabama, George Wallace, who had been invited to the campus by the college newspaper. He was heckled and physically threatened when he spoke; and after he had completed his speech, his car was surrounded, damaged and nearly overturned by a mob of fledgling storm troopers. The incident was, of course, money in the political bank for George Wallace who behaved with infinitely more dignity, intelligence, and wit than his assailants.

Dartmouth apologized, of course—as Howard and Harvard have recently had to apologize for similar unseemly happenings. But one wonders what they teach at these institutions. They had better begin teaching something about the real meaning of free speech and the democratic process and the rule of reason. Pretty soon, the way things seem to be going, they'll be burning books on college campuses, instead of reading them—because they don't like the authors.

FALSE NEWS PHOTOGRAPHS

Mr. LONG of Maryland. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a falsely captioned news photograph alleging American atrocities in Vietnam.

The photo to which I refer has been used by the magazine, the Minority of One, for the cover of its May issue. On the board of sponsors are Bertrand Russell, Linus Pauling, Prof. Pitirim A. Sorokin, and Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, U.S. Army, retired.

The picture shows an American soldier at the controls of a U.S. Army tank looking backward at the body of a man being dragged by a rope. The photo caption states that "In U.S.-'Aided' South Vietnam: 'Dusty Death' Is Administered to Guerrilla Suspects Caught by U.S. Military Personnel." The accompanying photo, from World War II, shows Nazis dragging live Polish partisans behind jeeps.

Upon inquiring at the Departments of State and Defense, I learned that the Vietcong shown in the photo was already dead, and that his body was pulled away with a rope to guard against the Communist practice of booby trapping bodies left on the battlefield, in order to blow up U.S. soldiers sent to bury them. Since the Buddhist religion requires prompt burial, a body left at the scene of battle is immediately suspect as a trap. In other instances, bodies are pulled away with a rope when they are badly decomposed.

I have asked the Post Office and Justice Departments to investigate the possibility that this false photo is an act of treason. But the main purpose of these remarks is to call attention to the tactics being used by some of those who obviously hold little love for their own country. At a time when America's young men are dying in Vietnam in defense of freedom, such lies betray their sacrifice and mock the free speech for which they fight.

GOVERNMENT JOBS

Mr. JONAS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the May 4, 1967, issue of the Christian Science Monitor carried the following Associated Press dispatch:

The State Department has ordered a 2 percent cut in its employment ceilings here and around the world. The order abolishes an estimated 273 jobs and apparently is aimed both at economy and at curbing what critics contend is overstaffing in the big foreign-affairs agency.

This announcement reminds me that I gave the House an opportunity on April 26, 1967, to reduce the approximately 80,000 jobs in the Department of Interior and related agencies by 2 percent. This opportunity was given in an amendment I proposed that day to the bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. The amendment was rejected in the Committee of the Whole.

My amendment was based upon the fact, as disclosed on page 18 of part I of the hearing record, that at December 31, 1966, there were 4,820 job vacancies in the Department. Some of the vacancies came about as a result of a circular issued by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget last September directing that employment levels be rolled back to the level of July 1, 1966, but some of it came about because of the inability of the Department to fill all jobs money had been appropriated for.

If the Department of Interior could operate throughout 1966 with 4,820 fewer jobs than were appropriated for last year, I cannot see why, in view of the critical budget situation that we face and the substantial deficit contemplated next year, the Department could not get along without increasing employment by 1,662 jobs.

My amendment would have done for the Department of Interior exactly what the State Department has now announced it is going to do on its own responsibility, as reported by the Associated Press. This is a clear example of how Congress has lost control of the purse strings—by appropriating money for more jobs than the executive departments need. Perhaps we will now begin to scrutinize more closely the agencies' requests for higher and higher levels of employment.

The State Department comes in for a great deal of criticism from time to time but in this instance it is setting Congress a good example. I hope we will take it to heart and stop giving departments more money than they actually need.

SUPPORT LEGISLATION PROHIBITING FLAG DESECRATION

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

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

There was no objection?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support measures now before the Judiciary Committee that would stiffen the penalties imposed on anyone found guilty of flag desecration. The States now have their own laws, and the penalties vary from a fine of a few dollars to $100, but my concern is that the States would be helpless to act when a violator crosses State lines. This legislation would allow the Justice Department to enter the case and prosecute. The founders of our Nation, when they wrote our freedoms into the Constitution, certainly did not intend for any of those freedoms to permit mutilation of the Nation's emblem. Mr. Speaker, I join the efforts of my colleagues who represent the beliefs of outraged Americans that contemptuous flag burning and mutilation have to cease.

CRIME AND POPULATION GROWTH

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the standard rebuttal of those who say crime is no crisis in America is that "we have more crime because we have more people." That rebuttal simply will not stand analysis.

The FBI crime report covering the

1960 to 1965 period shows that the incidence of major crimes increased by 46 percent; in the same period, the Nation's population increased by only 8 percent. Crime grew nearly six times greater than population.

Neither is it accurate to say that population concentration in cities is the cause of urban crime growth. Dr. Clement S. Mihanovich, professor of sociology at St. Louis University, recently published total crime statistics for 18 major cities compared to population changes reflected in official Census Bureau figures. For the 10-year period, seven of those cities had population increases ranging from 10 percent to 71.42 percent while crime increases ranged from 47.29 percent to 186.80 percent. In only one of these seven cities, Dallas, was the rate of crime increase less than the rate of population increase.

The other 11 cities showed, not an increase, but a decrease in population ranging from 0.28 percent to 13 percent. Yet, all 11 cities had a total crime increase ranging between 11.64 percent and 168.44 percent.

The inescapable conclusion is that there is little correlation and probably only a negligible causal relation between demographic factors and our modern crime epidemic.

ERIC SEVAREID AND HIS COMMENTARY ON THE NEWS

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend a news story reported that CBS news commentator, Eric Sevareid, has had discussions with leading Democrat officials from the State of North Dakota, regarding his possible candidacy on that party's ticket for U.S. Senator, against incumbent Republican Senator MILTON YOUNG.

With all the attention that has been given recently to the question of congressional ethics, I think this news story raises a question of journalistic ethics, which cannot be ignored by CBS.

To put this situation in proper perspective it must be recognized that Eric Sevareid's major responsibility with CBS is not to report the news, but to interpret and comment upon it.

This open admission by Sevareid that his sympathies lie with the Democrat Party would seem to raise questions about his own objectivity in political commentary on national and international issues. In my mind this has long been evident. The same obviously applied to former CBC commentator, Howard K. Smith, now with ABC.

The situation becomes even more critical because of the fact that the great television networks are not affected by the equal time provisions of the law, as they apply to local stations. The networks do not recognize any equal time requirements. It is doubtful that CBS would ever consider giving a Republican Party spokesman the opportunity to have 5 minutes of each evening on CBS news to reply to Sevareid, when his subject matter involves issues of political significance.

Assume, for example, that Sevareid is commenting upon a national issue in which the Republican Senator from North Dakota takes a different stance than Sevareid. Would such commentary from a supposedly nonpartisan or journalistically objective source, not enhance Sevareid's potential as a political candidate? And would it not have at least a subtle impact on constituents of all Republicans officeholders, whose views and positions almost by definition also differ from Sevareid's?

I realize that an effort might be made to draw a parallel in this instance to Gov. Ronald Reagan who is presumed to have drawn some advantage from his public exposure as a performer on television. But Reagan was not a political analyst on a network television program and it would indeed be stretching a point to make any valid comparison. Indeed, he was only helping market "progress" as the most important product of you know who.

I submit, there is a very real question of ethics involved in this situation which CBS cannot afford to ignore.

If CBS does not see fit to replace Sevareid, it might at the very least consider adding a disclaimer each evening to the effect that the views of this possible Democrat candidate for public office does not necessarily represent the views of CBS news—or do they?

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—PERMISSION TO SIT TOMORROW, TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967, DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit tomorrow, Tuesday, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE CANADIAN SENATE, THE HONORABLE SYDNEY J. SMITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a letter from the President of the Canadian Senate, the Honorable Sydney J. Smith. He requests that I advise the House of the appreciation and gratitude of the Canadian Senate for the expressions of this House's congratulations to Canada contained in House Resolution 280, agreed to on March 20, 1967.

The letter follows:

SPEAKER OF THE SENATE,
Ottawa, Canada, April 28, 1967.

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

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been requested by my colleagues in the Canadian Senate to convey to you on their behalf, and to all Members of the United States House of Representatives, our appreciation and gratitude for the Concurrent Resolution introduced on March 14th last and adopted shortly thereafter. This thoughtful gesture of extending congratulations on the occasion of our Centennial of Confederation was received with gratitude and affection by all my colleagues, as indeed were the generous remarks made by the sponsors of the Resolution.

I have been honoured to place the Resolution, together with the remarks of its sponsors, on the official record of the Canadian Senate on April 19th, last, and I am sure that this is a most fitting prelude to the Tenth Meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, which we will be pleased to welcome to Canada in two weeks' time.

I am, my dear Mr. Speaker,
Yours sincerely,
SYDNEY J. SMITH.

THE TEACHER CORPS AS AN EXPRESSION OF AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL IDEALISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today there is hardly a school district, a school, or a community in America that is not looking for new tools for educational innovation.

What does innovation mean today? It means new schoolrooms. It means new ideas about who gets what in our schools. It means new machines and new equipment. But most of all it means new teachers, additional teachers, teachers imbued with the spirit of serving those who have been too little served by our public school system in the United States.

Under the forceful leadership of President Johnson the Congress established a national teacher corps to meet the educational needs of the rural and urban poor. The funds allocated for the program were limited compared with other expenditures. The number of teachers recruited was small. Yet the impact of the program has been great in every school district affected.

It is the intention of the administration to continue and strengthen the Teacher Corps. Under the committee's bill, the Commissioner of Education will be able to continue to arrange with the local school board—at their request—to send Teacher Corps teams to local schools. This completely preserves the local character and local control of the Corps.

In addition, committee amendments to the act provide that the poorest States

will receive the largest number of Teacher Corps members, if the supply of corpsmen exceed demand from other States. This provision links the Teacher Corps teams intimately to title I of the act which is geared to the number of low-income school children in a district.

The purpose of the Teacher Corps is to supply increased numbers of qualified educational personnel to needy children whose learning has suffered from educational and economic deprivation.

The Teacher Corps is probably one of the most idealistic yet practical education experiments which this country has undertaken in 25 years. It will test our resolve. It will test the ability of our youth. It will benefit our children—the leaders of tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to join me in assuring all our children the grand opportunity furnished to them through the Teacher Corps. Let us all support the approved committee version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967.

BENEFITS OF MODEL CITIES PROGRAM ALREADY SEEN IN TULSA, OKLA.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are daily reading about the benefits already flowing from the model cities program. On March 30, the Tulsa Tribune published an editorial, entitled "A Side Benefit," which described the efforts of Tulsa in preparing their application for a model city.

This editorial noted:

Regardless of the outcome of this application, however, the efforts of the many Tulsans involved will not have been wasted . . . For the committee debates should strengthen the entire city.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has long been searching for ways to stimulate our cities and our State governments to take an active role in planning for the future of their communities. The activities to date clearly shows that the model cities program is doing just that. It is motivating our mayors, our citizens, our business and civic leaders to take an active part in seeking new solutions to their problems.

I suggest that the model cities program has already proven successful in its initial stages. Tulsa, Okla., is but one example of successes across the country. With sufficient funding I believe the program will be even more successful.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues this informative and interesting editorial by inserting it in the RECORD:

A SIDE-BENEFIT

Tulsa now has a network of citizens' committees at work on the problems associated with poverty and blight in this community.

One group of committees, appointed by the mayor, is exploring Tulsa's chances of participating in the Model Cities program, which is a major national-local effort to revitalize poor neighborhoods.

The plans are for the future, but one side-benefit is already in view. Preparing these applications takes a lot of time and community-wide effort. Simply getting people and agencies together to work on these problems is "strengthening the abilities of cities to cope with their own problems."

That observation comes from the Massachusetts consulting firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., which has been active in developing Model Cities programs across the nation. It is true here, too. The firm reports:

"For the first time in a number of cities, the problem of planning a program application has brought together city agencies that have never met before in the same room. It is evident, too, that new groups of citizens and private firms are being brought into the development effort."

Tulsa has six such committees with dozens of members and they have been working toward a deadline which falls tomorrow. The discussions are truly community-wide, and that is good.

The Model Cities act, passed by Congress in 1966, emphasizes local initiative and responsibility. It calls for not just urban renewal, but expansion of job opportunities, less dependency on welfare payments, better educational opportunities and concerted attacks on disease, delinquency and crime.

The consulting firm urges cities to be "idealistic in purpose, yet pragmatic in approach." It recommends that cities set up specific and obtainable objectives, and that they protect themselves by building flexibility into their programs.

In this way, they "can avoid the situation where the validity of a single project or assumption could determine the success or failure of the entire program."

This is sound advice. To date, Congress has appropriated only enough money for a limited number of cities to undertake the initial planning phase. Competition for funds is bound to be keen.

Regardless of the outcome of this application, however, the efforts of the many Tulsans involved will not have been wasted if the plans are, as Arthur D. Little Inc. says, pragmatic and flexible. For the committee debates should strengthen the entire city.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF SUBVERSIVES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BEVILL. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my position on House Joint Resolution 544, which I introduced last week, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the matter of employing subversives in the public schools.

The need for the proposed amendment arises from a majority opinion handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court this January, in the case of Keyishian against University of New York. The opinion to which I refer denies to a State government the right of refusing employment in the public schools to a schoolteacher on the grounds that he or she is advocating the violent overthrow of government in the United States or is knowingly a member of an organization advocating such doctrine. House Joint Resolution 544 is designed to overrule the decision of the Court in the case of Keyishian against University of New York.

In seeking to protect the individual American in his right to the free expression of political opinion, the Supreme Court has simply gone too far. It has declared, in the name of the Federal Constitution, that the State cannot refuse employment to a person openly advocating the destruction of the State. And that does not make sense. Surely, the authors of the Federal Constitution did not intend to include in the document the seeds of the destruction of the several State governments and of the Federal Government itself. Surely they did not intend to tie the hands of persons sworn to the protection of our constitutional principles, State and Federal alike. To have so intended would have set us on a course of national suicide, from the very beginning.

House Joint Resolution 544 empowers a State, following full judicial review, to disqualify from teaching in the public schools any person found guilty of willfully advocating the forceful overthrow of any Government in the United States, or of printing, publishing, editing, or selling any book or paper advocating such doctrine, or of willfully and deliberately becoming a member of an organization advocating such doctrine.

It must be admitted that in every case wherein a vaguely worded or ambiguous law is passed, concerning the political beliefs of public officials, there is always a chance that the law will be misused; that demogog may seize upon it, simply to embarrass their political opponents.

No such possibility exists here, however. The law is clearly stated. There is nothing ambiguous about it. The only persons it can touch are those who advocate, in one way or another, the overthrow of a Government in the United States, by violent means.

And if nothing is done to reverse the position of the Supreme Court in this regard, what then? My opinion is the same as that of the four justices of the Supreme Court who voted against the majority opinion in the case of Keyishian against University of New York. From their point of view, the doors of American education have been opened to communism—to the enemies of the Republic—who are free, therefore, to spread their propaganda, in the guise of schoolteachers. And even if discovered, they cannot be removed from their positions.

I heartily concur with the dissenting justices of the Supreme Court, and I urge the favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 544, as a means of preventing the continuation of this fantastic state of affairs.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the controversy that has arisen with respect to the proposal offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] which would provide Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools in the form of block grants, has prompted many concerned residents of Michigan's Sixth Congressional District to write to me. Because I wish to respond to these inquiries as rapidly and as fully as possible, I insert in the RECORD materials which I believe should clarify this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that there has been much misunderstanding regarding the intentions and the expected consequences of this effort to insure both the most effective use of aid funds and the future freedom and independence of our schools. No one having a long-range interest in the education of our youth should pass judgment on this new approach without carefully studying the following statements by members of the House Education and Labor Committee:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES E. GOODELL, OF NEW YORK

In the current debate involving the Quie amendment to the administration's education bill, some points require emphasis. They can be stated quite simply, and I hope all individuals concerned with this issue will take the time to read the following:

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL ISSUE

The Quie amendment was specifically designed to avoid the church-state issue. It adopts exactly the same procedure as in present law, requiring public school officials to make equitable provision for private school students. Although the Quie amendment did not contemplate commingling of Federal and State funds, some private school officials raised this specter and said commingling would cut out private school students in 33 States that have strict church-state constitutional provisions. To reassure all concerned, Mr. Quie added a specific provision clarifying that there could be no commingling under his amendment. Other clarifications were added to the Quie amendment to meet all the initial reservations raised by private school officials. In addition, from the very beginning the Quie amendment has provided that the Commissioner could bypass any State that failed to make adequate provision for private school students. Under such circumstances the Commissioner could, in effect, proceed as under present law.

In truth, the private school officials are now divided over the Quie amendment. They agree that the bill itself makes sincere and ample provision for private school students, even expanding present provisions of the law. Some private school officials, however, now say in effect: "The only way you can guarantee adequate participation of private school students is to have authority centralized in an all-powerful Commissioner of Education in Washington. We cannot trust State school officials to include private school students." That is the real issue posed by those private school officials who still oppose the Quie amendment. No matter what provisions are added, as long as the Quie amendment gives greater flexibility and control of education at the State and local level, these particular private school officials will oppose it. Fortunately, many people concerned about fair treatment for private school students disagree vehemently with such opponents of the Quie amendment.

2. NO PUBLIC HEARING

The original Quie proposal, embodying a number of provisions beyond the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was introduced March 20, and was before the committee when hearings were held. Virtually every witness was questioned carefully as to the Quie proposal. The administration bill was refined in the light of committee hearings; so was the Quie amendment. It can be fairly said that most of the educational experts testifying agree with the basic approach of the Quie amendment.

3. LESS MONEY TO SOME STATES

The Quie amendment changes the allocation formula. In its original form it would have reduced money to New York, the District of Columbia, and Alaska. Education spokesmen contended a large number of States would receive less money under the Quie formula, including most Southern States. Mr. Quie denied this. In order to resolve any question in this regard, Mr. Quie added a specific provision that under no circumstances shall any State receive less money than it received under the previous allocation.

In sum, the Quie amendment represents a giant stride in the direction of giving State and local officials more discretion and control over education. It guarantees that private school students will be taken care of exactly as they are under present law. The real opposition to the Quie amendment is from those who favor continued centralized control of Federal education funds. That will be the choice before the House of Representatives when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is debated.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT H. QUIE, OF MINNESOTA

A number of misconceptions have been circulated about my amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), known as the Quie Amendment. It is extremely unfortunate that the Church-State issue has been introduced into the debate over the merits of my amendment and the amendments proposed by the Administration, H.R. 7819.

The Quie Amendment to ESEA is designed solely to return Federal aid to public and private school pupils in the form of "block grants" to the states, rather than through categorical grants. This method of getting aid to pupils would, in my view, be much more efficient and beneficial to students.

The rumor has been circulated that the Quie Amendment would take benefits away from private (parochial) school pupils. This is not true. The Amendment would continue every form of assistance now available for private (parochial) school pupils and teachers. In fact, it would even extend some of those benefits.

When I prepared the amendment, I deliberately wrote in sections to make certain that private school pupils would continue to receive the same benefits they enjoy under the present Act.

Programs in the local schools funded through the block grant must include arrangements for private school pupils to participate. In fact, no State plan could be approved unless it met requirements designed to safeguard pupils in private schools, because the funds must be used for the benefit of students both in public and private schools to the extent consistent with the number of children attending each. This is exactly the same as provided in ESEA. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 704. (a) (3) provides that, to the extent consistent with the number of children attending private elementary and secondary schools in school attendance areas selected for programs under Section 703, provision will be made on an equitable basis for including special educational services and arrangements (such as, but not limited to, dual enrollment, educational radio and television, mobile educational services and equipment and other special educational arrangements) in which such children can participate;"

Federal funds for textbooks and library materials (a minimum of $120 million under the Quie Amendment) must include an equitable distribution on a loan basis for private school pupils and teachers. Moreover, my amendment expands to the present Act by including laboratory and other instructional equipment among these materials. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 704. (a) (4) provides that arrangements (whether through the State educational agency or some other State agency or commission) for the distribution of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and audiovisual equipment and materials for the use of teachers and pupils shall include provisions for the loan of such resources, textbooks, equipment and materials on an equitable basis for the use of teachers and pupils in non-public schools;"

My amendment includes still another safeguard for private schools, the so called "bypass" mechanism. If a State cannot legally provide for the loan of textbooks, instructional equipment and materials for private school pupils and teachers, the U.S. Commissioner of Education would arrange for such loans directly to them on an equitable basis from the funds allotted to these States, thus avoiding any State constitutional limitation. This is exactly the arrangement under which the ESEA and the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) presently operate. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 705. (b) In any State which has a State plan approved under Section 704(b) in which no State agency is authorized by law to provide library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, or other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in any one or more elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for such testing and for the provision on an equitable basis of such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials and equipment for such use and shall pay the cost thereof for any fiscal year out of the State's allotment."

In addition, since the Quie Amendment will specifically prohibit the commingling of Federal with State funds, no State is restricted by its legal requirement on State funds in carrying out arrangements for the participation of private school pupils.

In conclusion, let me emphasize again, the Quie Amendment will not take benefits away from pupils who attend private (parochial) schools.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES JOHN N. ERLENBORN, OF ILLINOIS, AND WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, OF IOWA

Let us say, first of all, that we are Roman Catholics, and that both of us are products of parochial schools. We believe that erroneous information and even more erroneous interpretation has been circulated about this amendment.

It is not an anti-Catholic amendment, but it is anti-Federal bureaucracy. It intends to give school children better educational opportunities; and it intends to afford school administrators—both public and parochial—a better chance of bringing those opportunities to the children in their care.

MINK RANCHERS NEED EMERGENCY FHA FINANCING

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have called on the Department of Agriculture and the Farmers Home Administration to use their authority in providing emergency financing to U.S. mink ranchers who find themselves caught in a financial vise between current high operating costs and deflated prices on current pelt stocks caused by free-flowing cheap imports.

In a letter to the Department and FHA, I noted that our Nation's mink farmers are in desperate need of financial credit to sustain them through this period of low prices for their pelts, caused by increased mink imports, and high overhead costs as the kitting—birth of young mink—season gets underway.

Mr. Speaker, emergency help is needed right now, while we work on the long-range problem of restoring the American mink industry to a profitable level through legislation such as mine to limit the increasing glut of mink pelts into the country. The U.S. mink industry, after spending millions of dollars to promote mink throughout the Nation and the world, now find cheap foreign imports have increased to the point that the imports account for 42 percent of domestic consumption. The result was an average auction price drop of about $4.50 per skin. In Minnesota, for instance, the mink industry estimates that over 50 percent of the current crop remains to be sold. Unless the price rises, the ranchers face economic disaster at the very moment when they are experiencing their yearly peak in feeding expenses as the young mink are born.

Production credit associations have been able to lend assistance in a few cases and local banks have helped some. But the greatest need is for priority treatment by the Farmers Home Administration in its loan program. With American mink buyers stepping up purchases of mink from foreign sources, the U.S. auction companies are no longer in a position to provide the primary credit to domestic producers, as has been the practice in past years.

That is why FHA should exert every effort to help mink farmers get through this crucial period of low prices, high imports, dried-up credit sources, and high carryover rate of last year's stocks.

FLAG DESECRATION SHOULD BE MADE A FEDERAL CRIME

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the House Judiciary subcommittee now holding hearings on legislation to make desecration of the flag a Federal crime will approve the strong provisions of my bill, H.R. 3925, at the earliest possible time.

Unquestionably there is widespread public resentment against recent flag-burning and flag-marring incidents. The burning of our national flag at so-called peace demonstrations last month in New York should be reason enough for Federal legislation to prohibit such shameful and despicable incidents. Also in April, a college instructor in Indiana burned an American flag in class on a dare, while denying there was anything unpatriotic about the incident.

Accordingly, we must deter and punish any further efforts to deliberately damage the flag, which is the symbol of our freedom and proud heritage. At a time when American soldiers are engaged in a war halfway around the world, Congress should not hesitate to insure proper respect and protection for our national flag at home.

Under my bill, those who mutilate or desecrate the flag would be punished by imprisonment up to 5 years or a fine up to $10,000, or both. This penalty is the same as that prescribed for draft card burners by a 1965 amendment of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

As further need for this legislation, I recall several flag-marring incidents which received nationwide publicity last year: An Illinois schoolteacher trampled on the flag in front of his class; demonstrators in Georgia pulled down the flag from courthouse grounds and proceeded to tear it, trample and spit on it; a speaker on a college campus in Indiana spit on the flag, then ripped it into pieces, threw it on the floor and stomped on it; and a New York theater sponsored the burning of the flag on stage.

It is my earnest hope that the subcommittee and full Judiciary Committee will see fit to approve this legislation to make desecration of the flag a Federal crime.

RENT CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 I sponsored the rent certification program which was included in the Housing Bill of 1965. The administration now refers to this as the section 23 program. This enables the Housing Assistance Administration to make use of privately owned, privately operated properties, paying full taxes, for low income people who are eligible for public housing. The program—when I last checked—was in use in all parts of the country, in 27 States and 94 cities. The HAA had a total of 21,512 units applied for, about 13,000 units under contract and approximately 10,000 people under roof.

I believe this is an excellent record on the part of the Housing Assistance Administration and its Housing Management Division. I hope that the successful operations to date continue.

It has come to my attention, however, that certain restrictive conditions are being added by the HUD secretariat, to the contracts made by the individual housing authorities. This was not the intention of the Congress.

To be specific, in Washington, D.C., the secretariat allows no rent certificate "section 23" units to be utilized except when they have been rehabilitated. The justification for the secretariat's action is that there is a low vacancy rate in Washington and to do otherwise might drive rents upward.

This may or may not be so. There were, however, no such intentions in the Congress at the time at the time of the Housing Act of 1965's enactment. Such conditions could not be added by any interpretation I can conceive. I regard the nature of such conditions as a contravention of the intent of Congress. It breaks faith with the people who so badly need decent, safe, sanitary housing. If such housing is available and does not need rehabilitation they should have its use.

Had the secretariat consulted Congress as to these restrictive conditions which it intended to add to contractual relationships, things might have been different. In this particular case, however, I find that once against the administration is trying to remake the rent housing program, which is working, so it will serve as a handmaiden to the rent supplement program which is not working. Consequently, I have today introduced legislation which will prevent the secretariat of HUD from misinterpreting the intent of Congress by adding restrictive conditions.

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues today in paying our respects to the late Victor A. Johnston, director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee and formerly executive director of the Republican Party of Wisconsin.

Vic, who recently made his home during part of the year in the State of Florida, was highly respected as an adviser to senatorial Republican officeholders and aspirants. His impact both on the Republican Party and on the national political scene was substantial during his 18-year career as director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

Victor A. Johnston was one of the unsung heroes of the two-party system. He went about his tasks out of the public limelight. We can be sure, however, that his memory will shine brightly in the hearts of those who had the privilege of

working with him. Vic will be missed both as an individual and as a party adviser in the years ahead.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a farmer in Lincoln County, Minn., commenting on the difficulties that his family has faced because of the critical agricultural situation. It certainly sums up the plight of our rural areas, and points to growing insistence by the people that something must be done—and done now.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share this letter with my colleagues in the House, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

I am a farmer living in Lincoln County, married and have three boys, ages 21, 17, and 13. Don't ask me why I'm in agriculture because my wife and I have had it up to our necks. We milk 25 cows, raise hogs, cattle, and chickens. At the present time, I'm sure we aren't breaking even on milking cows and today our milk check showed another 3 cents *drop* in price. Hogs used to be mortgage lifters but now you have to be pretty sharp to break even. Eggs are 19–20 cents per dozen, have been for six weeks or more, so the laying hens go to the soup factory next week. Holstein bulls are a good price which shows people are eating baloney and hamburger instead of steak.

What's to become of Lincoln County and all counties you represent under conditions like this? What kind of an administration do we have in Washington? Why doesn't someone give some consideration to the family farmers, who are raising some of the finest children in the world, and produces the food which *is so vital* to everyone's existence? LBJ worries more about foreign aid, putting a man on the moon, his poverty program and scores of other unnecessary things than what's really his chief concern—agriculture. Last night we heard a Catholic priest from Elkton, South Dakota speak on the farm problem at Tyler. He had attended the meeting in Ames, Iowa, where our Honorable Secretary Orville Freeman met with farmers and had made the remark that, "I can't see anything wrong out here, everything looks good and there's no problem in Agriculture"! Tell me, if you can, Mr. Zwach, is he really that stupid or doesn't he want to see for fear he'll lose his Federal pay check?

I'm speaking for 95 percent of the people in Lincoln County when I say LBJ better pull his head out of the sand along with his aids, because all over farmers are getting a raw deal. We can't hang on much longer and you better believe this.

Government spending the way they do, can't go on. This Viet Nam war is needless. Money, men, and munition plants are the ones gaining, at the cost of human life. If you or I had pulled the crooked deals of Adam Clayton Powell, Bobby Baker and scores of others have done, would we be around? You know the answer.

Do all you can to push the bill for postal driveway delivery to all farms. We have been driving over a mile for our mail for over 50 years and yet the school bus picks up our boys at the driveway every day. Mail service is terrible and gets worse all the time in spite of hikes in postal rates.

Consumers of milk scream their heads off by having to pay 23 to 25 cents per quart for milk, but say nothing when they pay 80 cents per quart for beer.

The N.F.O.—Farm Bureau—Farmers Union and the Grange should all get together and form one good, solid farm organization and demand a price for their farm products. Without it we have nothing and will get nothing.

DOCUMENTATION OF CITIZENSHIP FOR CHILDREN BORN ABROAD

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined my colleague the gentlemar from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN] in introducing a bill to reform the method of documentation of U.S. citizenship for children born overseas to American parents.

Under this bill, Department of State certification of American citizenship would be adequate proof of this citizenship. This would do away with the hardships and burdens on thousands of American families who return home to face an administrative burden trying to prove their children are actually American citizens.

This situation occurs because there is no law requiring the acceptance of this State Department certification of birth as evidence of U.S. citizenship. The bill I am joining my colleague [Mr. MACHEN] in proposing, would simply require the U.S. Attorney General to issue a certificate of citizenship to those persons who hold the State Department certification of birth, and thus simplify an otherwise complicated process.

I am personally well aware of the problems involved in the present process. When I was called back into the service during the Korean conflict, my daughter was born in Germany. And today, with our increasing involvements and commitments in the free world, there are more American citizens facing similar situations overseas.

This bill would be a simple answer to these problems and I urge my colleagues to take quick action to adopt it.

LOWER PRICES AND HIGHER COSTS—THE MAJOR PROBLEM FACING AGRICULTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from Mr. H. L. Selvig, a farmer who lives at Plaza, N. Dak. He sums up, in a few words, the major problem facing agriculture—lower prices and higher costs. Mr. Selvig writes:

In looking over our farm records this morning we find in 1947 on a ½ sec. of land, our wheat sold for $2.60 and flax $5.85 per bushel. And taxes were $67.08. In 1966, or 20 years later, we got $1.40 for our wheat and $2.80 for the flax and taxes $286.68. And we have rec'd. notice that our taxes will be a lot more in 1967.

With Freeman fixing grain prices we better sell this land.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, PRESIDENT TRUMAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is both a great honor and a matter of personal pride to stand here in the well of the House again today, as I have done on this occasion since 1959, to pay tribute to so great and distinguished an American, and to claim proudly as a constituent, former President Harry S. Truman. On this day as he celebrates his 83d birthday, I wish to extend to him, on behalf of millions of his fellow Americans, and on behalf of his fellow Missourians and fellow townsmen, the fondest wishes for continued health and happiness.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to our majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished Member of this body who has the honor to represent former President Truman and the Fourth District of Missouri in this House.

Great Presidents are usually measured in terms of their contribution to their day and generation. Once in a while a man comes along who serves not only his generation but many generations.

In my mind, Harry Truman is one of those men. He cut the pattern for American foreign policy not only for his own administration but for many administrations to succeed him. President Truman's accomplishments and foresight loom larger with every passing year; both by the judgments of his day and of future generations he certainly will be listed among the most distinguished of our Presidents.

I commend the gentleman on calling the attention of the House to the fact that this is the birthday of this eminent American and I join him in wishing happy birthday to President Truman. Mrs. Albert and I hope that he will have many more birthdays and that they will all be happy.

Mr. RANDALL. I am very grateful for the contribution of our majority leader.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, although former President Truman was a President of these United States as a

Democrat, and although on occasions he has been somewhat critical and harsh of those of us on this side of the aisle, I think all of us regardless of political affiliation, wish him many more years of health and happiness on this, his 83d birthday.

Mr. RANDALL. I appreciate very much the kind remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join Members on both sides of the aisle who are wishing the former occupant of the important chair of the Presidency of the United States, my own fellow Missourian, Hon. Harry S. Truman, many happy returns.

It has been my privilege since serving in the executive branch during World War II under his administration to have been designated by him on occasion, although poles apart politically perhaps, as the acting White House physician when he journeyed into the Ozarks or when the White House physician or his present doctor, Dr. Graham, was not available. I have always honored this.

We have had him in our town to dedicate armories and other institutions named Truman, and after his cousin, Gen. Ralph Truman and others who have been great men in the history of our country.

Indeed, former President Truman did bring history into the concept of evaluating matters and the future trend of this Nation's problems.

We hope he has many happy returns and that the arthritis which plagues him on his 83d birthday may disappear before his 84th birthday rolls around.

Many happy returns, President Truman.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my colleague from Missouri.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I had occasion to become involved in a conversation with Sir Robert Menzies, who at that time was Prime Minister of Australia. He spoke in glowing terms of his friend, Harry Truman. He said that there were three things that stood out in his mind about Harry Truman. One was his personal integrity and another was the fact that he was loyal to his friends, and the last was his great capacity for making a decision when the decisionmaking was very difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I share those sentiments and I, too, want to join my colleagues in wishing our former President a happy birthday and many more of them.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, very much for bringing us this appraisal of Mr. Truman from the former Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate and commend the gentleman from Missouri for calling to the attention of the House this fine day, the 83d birthday of former President Truman. I certainly join my friend in the well in extending to President Truman best wishes on this day, with every wish for his health and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and appreciate the fact that he took this time today to give some of us an opportunity to express our great admiration and our best wishes to the great former President on his birthday. I served the complete number of years that Harry Truman was Vice President and President, and one of the things that sticks in my mind in regard to this great man from Missouri is the fact that he had the capacity to make decisions, rough, hard, difficult decisions, in times of need.

I go back to the time when he had to carry on the work of the United Nations which had been started by his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I go back to the time when he made the decision to use the atomic weapon in Japan.

I go back to the time when he made the decision to find out if it was feasible to make the hydrogen weapon. I have often wondered what would have happened had he not made that tremendously important decision at the time he made it, because on the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we told him that we thought this thing had to be explored to find out if you could unite and fuse the light elements of hydrogen to cause this tremendous explosion a thousand times greater than the fission of the atom in the atomic weapon.

At that time he made the right decision on the recommendations that we and others had proposed. It was a decision fraught with the greatest possibilities for humanity and the world. We did not know at that time that the Soviets were working on a hydrogen weapon; but we had every reason to believe that this was being done. Nineteen months after we successfully exploded the hydrogen device, the Soviets exploded a hydrogen device.

Now, think for a moment; if at that time in the world's history the Soviets had had sole possession of the hydrogen bomb, could they or would they have issued ultimatums to the other nations of the world? Would they have said, "Get out of Europe or we will let you have one of these weapons at a strategic place"? What would our position have been? What would have been the positions of the nations of Europe at that time? If that kind of ultimatum had been given to them, would they have borne the responsibility of an impact of a weapon of this kind in case the Soviets decided to use it?

We were not in that position. We were not in that position due to the fact that Harry Truman made the decision to spend, if necessary, a billion dollars to find out if you could have a hydrogen weapon.

We began to have it in inventory in a usable fashion at the time the Soviets proved that they could also fuse the light elements of hydrogen. World history, there is no doubt in my mind, was affected because we were in a position of strength due to the decisiveness of Harry S. Truman. We were in a position where we could not be intimidated or threatened as we would have been had another course been taken; that is, if we had appointed a commission to study the problem, for instance, for a couple of years.

So this man made many other decisions, but these are three of the great decisions that I want to call to the attention of Members today and to add my tremendous respect and admiration for a man who served his country and served it well. I thank you very much.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman. Those remarks are most welcome because they come from one who is knowledgeable and speaks with authority as a member and former chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

As we are given only one opportunity on this earth to develop our skills and to make some contribution to the betterment of mankind, the manner in which we develop our talents determines our place in history. And as time mellows our historic perspective, the greatness of our forebears is revealed. Each generation is faced with challenges which force it to seek out men of leadership, determination, resourcefulness, and courage, thrusting upon them the responsibilities for decisions which literally mold the course of history and charging them with the responsibility of maintaining the peace and security of humanity.

The Truman years were years of challenge, years in which the security and peace of the world were threatened, and thus thrust upon the shoulders of this great man were burdens and decisions almost unequaled and certainly unparalleled throughout our history. I would never want to be one who took a part in trying to distort any event in history, but I am sure I am correct in saying I believe history will support the claim that President Truman will go down in the records as one of the truly great American Presidents of our time.

His courage was outstanding in those critical hours of decision which seem to run the whole gamut of his administration. His confrontation with Stalin at Potsdam, his acceptance of the responsibility for the use of the atomic bomb, his unhesitating response to the challenge against the United States in Korea, the fortitude which caused him to carry through the 1948 election campaign to an electoral triumph that had been widely regarded as an impossibility—these attest to his courage, bravery, fortitude, and, yes, his greatness.

To courage, he added a gift for seeing issues clearly and for stating them in plain and sometimes blunt terms; but

ones which were clearly understood by his countrymen. Many Americans esteem this gift of his—a rare one in political life; in and of itself a special form of courage.

Now, to merely reiterate the accomplishments of the Truman years would be a dry recitation of facts of which I am sure the Members are all aware. But to try to perceive them in the perspective of the time in which they were necessitated would reveal some of the impact and significance of Mr. Truman's mark upon history.

On March 12 of this year, we took time to observe the 20th anniversary of the Truman doctrine, the cornerstone of American postwar diplomacy.

It was on March 12, 1947, that Mr. Truman went before a joint session of the Congress to announce a policy that was to prove to be a milestone in U.S. history. Under the terms of that policy, American military and political power were extended throughout the world.

President Truman's immediate purpose on that March 12 day in 1947 was to request $400 million in economic and military aid with which to rescue Greece and Turkey. Greece was on the edge of political and economic collapse, in grave peril from the Communist guerrilla movement. Turkey, along with Greece, was about to lose her military and economic support from Great Britain.

One of the first great decisions of that administration which became the cornerstone of American postwar policy, is today called the Truman doctrine. Under the direction of this policy, the United States has assumed the burden and, yes, the responsibility of world leadership as the mightiest nation on earth. The core of the Truman doctrine, as it has been known, is that the United States declared her willingness and determination to support free peoples resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

It operated under the premise that totalitarian regimes imposed upon free peoples by direct or indirect aggression undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.

But the responsibility of world leadership did not stop with the creation of the Truman doctrine. Three months later the Marshall plan was instituted—one of the most humanitarian ventures ever undertaken by one nation for the benefit of its fellow states. It led to the economic recovery of the states of Europe and the development of bonds of friendship.

The Truman doctrine led, in a series of related steps, to the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to the entire policy of containment of communism by a network of military alliances stretching from the United States to Europe and across Asia.

Recently—very recently, in fact—there was a meeting of what is called the Council of Europe. The Council held a session a week or so ago to observe the 20th anniversary of the Marshall plan, which at the depths of the post-war depression helped to rebuild the devastated economies of France, England, Belgium, the Netherlands, and other allies.

Significantly, at the time of that meeting, there was not a single Frenchman, not one single member of the Gaullist government, who got up to say a word in memory of the Marshall plan. But there was an old gentleman, the 90-year-old dean of the French National Assembly, Marius Moutet, who could not stand it any longer, and who jumped to his feet to say:

> Maybe the Gaullists don't want to mention the Marshall plan, but I am going to mention it. France owes a great debt of gratitude to the United States and we will never forget it. If the French Government wants to remain silent, I will not.

Deputy Moutet went on to say:

> My voice will speak out for the people of France. We will always remember the Marshall plan.

The Truman years witnessed many challenges to America's determination to maintain peace.

The impact of the Truman doctrine upon the events abroad was immediate and powerful. Turkey and Iran were fortified against Soviet pressures. The previous attitude toward the power of the Communists in Western Europe was so altered that the Communists were dropped from the Governments of France and Italy within about 2 months.

American policies and actions growing out of the Truman doctrine have been successful in maintaining international order, in helping nations to preserve their independence, in promoting economic and social progress, and in keeping the peace.

The United States came a long way from the isolation and noninvolvement policies of our Founding Fathers by the end of the Second World War, but not until the leadership of the Truman administration did she fully and permanently assume the responsibility for this new leadership.

In the years of the Truman Presidency, mankind took tremendous steps toward the unsure future—steps unparalleled almost throughout the entire previous course of history.

I will mention two, which we believe to be of great significance:

First, we must remember that here we are dealing with the transition period, the transition from the pre-atomic era into the age of nuclear energy, into an age of advanced technology and science. The advancement into the nuclear age, or atomic age, challenged and tested man's ability to maintain peace and with that peace the responsibility for the future of humanity.

The atomic era challenged mankind, and especially its leaders, with the choice of using nuclear energy, on the one hand, for the benefit of mankind, or, on the other hand, for the destruction of mankind and civilization. Never before in the history of the civilized world had any one nation possessed the ability to destroy in an instant that which had been built up over the thousands of years of history or with the same power of the atom to build and expand the horizons of human achievement.

Realizing only through peace could mankind ever hope to achieve the peaceful utilization of the atom rather than the destructive force and power that it had, he fostered and encouraged the plans for the creation of a permanent organization in which the nations of the world could peacefully meet. I refer to the United Nations.

Much to the credit of President Truman, the United Nations found its home here in the United States. A President forced, because of the exigencies of the time, to be a President of war, found a way also to be a President who thought in terms of the future peace and security of the world. The establishment of a lasting international organization dedicated to the cause of peace in a time of turmoil was the second great transition in the thinking of the world which occurred under the Presidency of Harry S. Truman. The Truman years saw the materialization of the United Nations, an organization dedicated to peace, at about the same time man became possessed of the capability to destroy his neighbor as well as himself.

I think we might take a moment to turn to recall some of his triumphs in terms of the domestic programs proposed and accomplished by Mr. Truman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANDALL. I am pleased to yield to our beloved Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is well that we pause on an occasion like this to pay our respects to one who has occupied the most responsible position in the world, the office of the President of the United States, whether one has passed into the great beyond or is living, as is our dear friend Harry Truman today.

I join with my friend from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] and others in congratulating former President Harry S. Truman on his birthday anniversary. I know it is with the sincere hope and prayers of all of us that God in His infinite wisdom will bestow upon him countless future similar anniversaries. I know I express the sentiments of all of my colleagues when I also convey to Mrs. Truman our kindest regards, because we all know the very important part that Mrs. Truman has played in the life of Harry S. Truman.

Harry S. Truman, the 33d President of our country, is already recognized as one of the outstanding Chief Executives in our entire Nation's history. It was my pleasure and it is my pleasure to have known him very closely, to have been very closely acquainted with him, and to have carried out as leader of the House the programs that he recommended to the Congress of the United States both in the field of foreign affairs and in the field of domestic affairs. We all remember the dramatic recommendations in the confrontation with international communism that Harry Truman made. We all remember the difficulty in connection with some of them, in having them pass through the two branches of the Congress and be enacted into law.

We remember the courage of Harry Truman in West Berlin, Greece, Korea, and elsewhere. We remember the decisiveness with which he approached any question with which he was confronted.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman was a man

who consulted with others and obtained their advice. But the whole world knew that when a decision was made that should have been made on the presidential level, Harry Truman made that decision.

Mr. Speaker, his years of experience developed within him extraordinary abilities and outstanding courage, a very important element in all walks of life, particularly in public life and more particularly when one is the chief executive of our Nation.

And, over and above all, he must possess the quality of courage. Even those who did not like him while he was in public life, admit that Harry Truman was abundantly possessed of that necessary quality, the quality of courage. I attended many of the meetings—all of the meetings with the leaders that took place, as I have with other Presidents, without regard to party—concerning the national interests of our country. I introduced the lend-lease bill in this body, a bill known as 1776, a very important piece of legislation, highly emotional.

The bill, as we look back, was a bill that strengthened the peoples of the free nations of the world against the attempts of international communism to subvert both from within and without, or as the result of a combination of both.

I remember the criticism directed against Harry Truman when he ordered the atomic bomb to be dropped in Hiroshima.

Mr. Speaker, when that criticism was directed against Harry Truman, my mind went back to an occasion when I was with former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, prior to his death, at a time when we were taking back the Philippines from the Japs and at a time when General MacArthur was mopping up. I was with Franklin D. Roosevelt on one occasion, and he told me that he had before him at that moment three different plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the next action to be taken by our country. Two of them were in different parts of continental China and one was right direct to the heartland of Japan. I never have forgotten—and I never shall forget and I can mention it now although I could not mention it at the time—Franklin D. Roosevelt told me that if the estimates of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—if he made the decision that the next invasion, or next move, would be the heartland of Japan, that invasion inevitably would result in 1 million American casualties.

As I left there I knew Franklin D. Roosevelt would make that decision if it was necessary. But then he passed into the great beyond, and it was necessary for Harry Truman to make that decision.

There is another moral question involved. What about his concern for 1 million American casualties that the Joints Chiefs of Staff in their recommendations, or in their report, or in their plan, whatever you want to call it, said would be involved when they made their report to the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt? The decision he would have to make involved the possibility of 1 million American casualties.

In World War II that meant approximately 200,000 dead and 800,000 wounded in varying degrees. So there was a moral question of dropping the bomb on the poor people of Hiroshima. But there was also the moral question of 1 million American casualties.

I have often addressed the question to myself: "What would I have done under the circumstances if I had been President of the United States?" and with all humbleness I am frank to state I would have made the same decision Harry Truman made.

So I saw Harry Truman in action, as a man whose intuition was remarkable, as a man who could look into the future, and with those intuitive instincts of his unerringly to see history in the making. Such intuition is a remarkable possession for any person. Very few of the male sex have it, although it is more or less abundantly possessed by those of the female sex, but Harry Truman had a powerful sense of intuition, and he certainly exercised it in the national interest of our country. So I repeat that his contributions are history.

He not only helped make history, but he made history at times where action was simultaneous with the decision he made.

It is well that we pause to pay tribute to a great man, a humble man, one who if he were here would remonstrate at our praising him as we are, and thinking of him as we are. He is all the greater because of his humbleness. He is a man whose place in history will grow more and more when the historians of tomorrow—two generations from now—are able to objectively appraise without the emotionalism of a living generation, the motives and the purposes of individuals who participated in the making of history and in the one man who, under our form of government, in the final analysis makes the decision—the President of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, we all wish Harry Truman—not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans—every happiness on this day, and hope God will permit him to be with us for countless years to come.

Mr. RANDALL. I am sure I am right when I say, when Mr. Truman reads the remarks which have just been made on this observance of his 83d birthday, he will be pleased. I know his gracious lady will also be pleased with these remarks because they come from one who was on the scene. Both will know the observations just made were not hearsay but were made by one who was majority leader of this House during those years, and by one who was in the very center of the action of which he spoke about and a part of the very important events which transpired in the days described in the remarks of one who for so many years was the majority leader of the House and now is our distinguished Speaker.

Lest we forget to recall some of the important domestic accomplishments under Mr. Truman, I want to mention just one. Another great triumph of the Truman years and the postwar period was the Employment Act of 1946 whose goals were maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

On the 10th anniversary of that act, former President Truman wrote—

> There is almost no other piece of domestic legislation enacted while I was president to which I would attach greater importance or greater significance.

This legislation proclaimed a new responsibility of government: namely, the promotion of conditions for employment opportunities for the able, willing, and those seeking to work.

The act was not only a milestone in the development of modern democratic government, but it has also had a deep and, I believe, a wholesome influence on the private economy.

Businessmen, labor leaders, and consumers can now plan their activities with more confidence that the Government will take action if a major downswing or deflationary pressure should develop as well as action to control inflationary pressures.

The act required the President to transmit to Congress, within 60 days from the beginning of each regular session, a detailed economic report that included recommendations for legislation that the President deemed necessary or desirable for stimulating or regulating the economy.

The Employment Act set up a three-man Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President. The council's duties were to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Economic Report, to study economic developments and trends, to appraise the policies of the Federal Government in the light of the policy objectives of the act, and to recommend to the President policies which would attain the purposes of the act.

On the legislative side, provision was made for a joint congressional committee charged with the function of making a continuing study of the American economy. This joint committee was required by the act to file a report each year with the House and the Senate containing its findings and recommendations concerning each of the main recommendations made by the President in his economic report.

In establishing these administrative and legislative requirements, Congress gave institutional expression to the acceptance by Government of a new responsibility for the economic well-being of the Nation. The act was signed by President Truman on February 20, 1946, as landmark legislation to maintain a stable American economy.

The Truman years were also marked by any number of other crises that required decisions that could be made by no other person than the one on whose office desk there was a plaque with these words:

> The buck stops here.

It took uncommon steadfastness and presence of mind to commit our Nation to choices between paths which were dimly visible and with unforeseen consequences, and with results unpredictable.

As an elder statesman he now has the opportunity to look upon his life in public service, to assess his mark upon history

and to look at the world which he helped to create, and to look upon the problems and the challenges that are resting upon the shoulders of those who have followed him.

For many their impact in history is mainly one of having made the world no worse for their existence. But for President Truman, his was a contribution that led actively and positively to forward the thrust of America's role in world leadership.

Perhaps it is worth a certain sadness today that Mr. Truman now views a world still in turmoil and sees that the peace he so agonizingly sought during his term in office is still the distant goal of man.

But the tragedy and the sacrifices of war and the seeming continued existence of that hatred, mistrust, and lack of understanding all seem to be a part of the human condition.

Therefore, no individual can be measured necessarily by his success in overcoming these evils but rather by his determination, dedication, and commitment to the ever-continuing battle to meet these challenges.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I want to thank the very able gentleman from Independence, Congressman RANDALL, who so well represents the district in which our former President Truman now lives.

I would like to join him in his remarks to pay tribute on his birthday to our great President, Harry S. Truman, a man who was more concerned with the welfare of the American people than with any image that he might have for the moment—a man who spoke a language that all Americans could understand and a language that required no bureaucratic translation.

I want to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] again in wishing Mr. Truman many more years of health and happiness and to thank him for the service that he has rendered to our country.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my colleague, and friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to rise to say now, as one who did not always agree with Mr. Truman when he was President of the United States, that today, looking back in retrospect, I see his light becoming brighter with each passing day. More and more the image of a great President becomes apparent. We could use many more people of the courage of Harry Truman; many more people of his decisiveness and understanding. It is my privilege to wish him well on this particular day, and I am particularly happy to do so in respect to the fact that I can look back over the years with our disagreements and now look upon him as a great individual, a great President.

Mr. RANDALL. We are all grateful for the contribution of our friend from Louisiana. On the occasion of this 83d birthday I think we can say that if only one thing seems more clearly certain than another about Mr. Truman, it is, that as President, he never shrank from a necessary decision. Discussing the Truman years at a Freedom Dinner recently, his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, praised his Chief Executive's foreign policy and his powers of decision, when he said:

> When the Truman Government found its footing in foreign affairs, its policies showed a sweep, a breadth of conception and a boldness of action which were new in his country's history. We had seen it in the early domestic policy of the New Deal and in our vast military effort in World War II, but never before in foreign policy.
>
> The 1947 assumption of responsibility in the Eastern Mediterranean, the 1948 grandeur of the Marshall Plan, the response to the blockade of Berlin and the NATO defense of Europe in 1949, the intervention in Korea in 1950—all these constituted expanded action in a truly heroic mold. All of them were dangerous—all of them required a rare capacity to decide and act. All of them were, we know now, rightly decided and vigorously carried through.

It has been said many times that the rarest gift that God can give a man is the ability to have a capacity for decision, and this, President Truman had in abundance and to a unique degree. The anguish of decision was and still is the duty of every President. If there is a lesson to be learned by any office-holder, it is to copy President Truman's example to be as perceptive and then, most of all, decisive.

Presidents come and go. Each leaves his mark on the course of history. Each contributes in his own distinctive manner toward the contribution of his Nation in the improvement of humanity. A nation can honor its heroes by laying wreaths at the graves or by building memorials to their deeds. But to the Presidents who are still alive it can give only gratitude. To be honored and acclaimed by one's fellow citizens and to be referred to in the Nation's history books is a mark of distinction. But to be held in the hearts of one's countrymen is the greatest tribute that a nation can offer to a man, especially to one of its former Presidents.

Therefore, I say it is from the hearts of your fellow Americans comes the greeting, "Happy birthday, President Truman."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a one-time Missouri farm boy who proved he was big enough to handle the biggest job in the world is 83 years old today and still busily at work setting the record straight. Not as active as he used to be, he nevertheless keeps sharp watch on the events of the day and expresses his views with customary vigor. One of his characteristic opinions is that people should not make a "fuss" over his birthdays, but I think every American who remembers this man's courageous work as President of the United States wants to pay him honor on this day.

We have been blessedly fortunate as a people and as a country to have had Presidents who, in nearly all instances, rose to their responsibilities. Mr. Truman will go down in history as one of our best Presidents, I am sure. To him, and to the gentlewoman, a lady to her fingertips, who has shared his life—Mrs. Bess Truman—and to their wonderful family, every Member of the House would want to send greetings today.

We truly hope that Mr. Truman and his successor in office, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, now at Walter Reed Hospital, enjoy many, many more years of useful life in the service of a country to which both men have devoted their entire lives. Happy birthday, Mr. Truman. Get well quick, Mr. Eisenhower.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation joins in celebration of the birthday of former President Truman, the outstanding leader of our people in times as perilous and trying as any in our country's history. I was privileged to be a freshman Congressman during his administration. My primary hobby is the study of history. I assert, without doubt, that the great stature of this man will grow in the perspective of history. None of our leaders have had more difficult decisions to make; and he made them excellently. My constituents join me in sending our best wishes to him and to his devoted and able wife on this great occasion. We wish them many happy and glorious returns of the day.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, Harry Truman, on his 83d birthday.

I knew Harry Truman when he was Grand Master of Masons in Missouri in the 1930's. He came to Kirksville, Mo., when I was teaching in the high school there. Several of our mutual friends arranged for me to meet there with him. It was at that time I discovered he had an interest in American history and loved to talk about American history.

After that I observed Harry in public life, first as a U.S. Senator—following his noted work on the special committee investigating war contracts and other matters publicly involved with legislation and public policy; later, of course, with all Americans I observed him as Vice President of the United States.

I remember very well the date of President Roosevelt's death and his taking office. I noted his humility and recall his humility and sincere expression of hope to serve well, be a worthy successor, and make a contribution to the American system. Establishment of a better life and a better understanding of Americans worldwide was his constant goal. I shared his concern along with other Americans for a peaceful world and one where the basic freedoms could be extended and serve fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, I never voted for Harry and I disagreed often with many of his policies—both on domestic fronts and foreign fronts—but I do agree with the vast majority of Americans that Harry Truman did his best to serve his country. He had a greatness about him as well as a concern for better Government. He supported the Intergovernmental Organization Committee designed to in-

crease the efficiency and effectiveness of government. When this proposition passed and became law, he named a former President, Herbert Hoover, to the Commission as chairman. It then became known as the Hoover Commission.

On one occasion when I met and visited with him—and I remember the date, January 9, 1959—he told me what he had said to Mr. Hoover. It was "I want to take the political stench out of the Hoover name." It is well known that he and President Hoover were great personal friends. I remember so well the last time he was in West Branch, Iowa. It was on the occasion of the dedication of the library. Herbert Hoover was there. So was Harry Truman. A number of speeches were made honoring Herbert Hoover that day—on his birthday. Among the best, if not the best, was made by Harry Truman. I thought history was made that day, Mr. Speaker, when these two great men got together to renew old friendships, to make all of us see our purpose as Americans, each through their public utterances. Together they made another contribution to the history and heritage of our country. This, also, lent greatness to the American character. It showed the world that men could be antagonists, but when that was over they could be and many would be and all should be friends. It was a fine example of sportsmanship and good will. It was my pleasure that day to visit with both of these great men.

Since that time I have been in personal contact with both President Hoover and President Truman and have had the benefit of assurance from both that there is a great respect that each had for the other. Also, when I saw Mr. Truman he seemed to want to talk about American history and I enjoyed talking to him. After I had a part in organizing the United States Capitol Historical Society, I received many letters of accommodation and good wishes. The very first letter I received was from President Kennedy and very soon after that I received a nice letter of accommodation and good wishes from Harry Truman. Each, in his own way, had a part in encouraging what was a feeble effort at one stage to contribute to a better understanding of American history and later a substantial contribution was made possible because we had men like Harry Truman. He was a great supporter of the historical society and saw to it that "We, the People" was sold in his library at Independence. I saw him next at Mr. Rayburn's funeral in Texas. Again, we had a nice visit. Again, he voiced his interest in history. He said:

Good luck to you in your promotion of American history.

I think this is an exact quote of his:

Every American ought to know more about American history, for when he does, he will understand what America stands for and the result will be better citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I saw Harry was in his library at Independence a year ago last March. Again we had a nice visit. This time, with his great interest, the reaction people were finally evidencing to his work for peace in the world. My colleagues have already spoken of all of them. Again I want to say while there may be mistakes in administration, there were no mistakes in his heart. He desired to do good and to be known for what he said rather than what he had as material possession. There is much we can learn from the example of his life and I commend it to every American and join my colleagues in giving his salute and paying this respect to him today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks upon the occasion of this birthday tribute.

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

There was no objection.

RESPONSIBILITY OF NEWS MEDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hesitated to address you today on this subject, but after an examination of my own thinking, my own conscience, I can do no less.

It may not be understandable to some, but I am sure it is understandable to many that I have—and I have had throughout my life—a fetish for accuracy. Strange as it may seem, in my many years that I spent in the newspaper world—some 23—as an editor, and previously as a reporter, before coming to the Halls of Congress, I insisted upon accuracy in newspapers and among those under me discharging their responsibilities in the freedom of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States—which I hold so dear to myself because of my profession and because of my background.

I stand with those who believe with Voltaire:

I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

The freedom for each American guaranteed by the Constitution for free expression is something sacred to all of us. Perhaps even more sacred than that one amendment, the first of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution, is the Constitution of the United States. I believe it was Gladstone who said:

I have always regarded that Constitution as the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect at a single stroke (so to speak), in its application to political affairs.

It is because of my dedication to that Constitution, because of my belief in the first amendment of the Constitution, that I am compelled to rise today, not in anger, but in sadness, to direct the attention of the Members to the manner in which this freedom of the press and the usage of the first amendment can be prostituted for purposes which I cannot understand.

As I indicated, I do not rise in anger, nor do I rise in a critical manner in an effort to take away from those who want to express an opinion other than mine, their right to do so, but I must insist, I must demand, that the news media of this country—whether it be the newspapers, the radio, or television—confine themselves to the facts in reporting the news. At the moment, I direct attention to a cartoon which appeared May 7 in the Washington Post, by one of America's great and acknowledged cartoonists, Mr. Herblock. Perhaps it is because I recognize his ability and his worth and the tributes which have been paid and the honors given him that I am all the more saddened that this man of great stature has wandered down the path of misrepresentation, inaccuracy, and obviously misleading statements in order to put over a point of view.

I do not disagree with him and his views. He is well qualified and certainly able to express them. I do recognize the force that he has at his command for molding public opinion—not the reporter, not the editorialist, not the news commentator, but that most effective of all media—a picture. It was the Chinese who said that one picture is worth a thousand words. So it becomes more necessary to understand that the cartoonist has within his grasp multiple powers over the voice and the pen.

Of course, the cartoon cannot be printed in the RECORD, so I shall attempt to accurately describe exactly what it says, and then discuss it. I shall not comment upon its inaccuracies until I have described it.

The cartoon is in the usual cartoon form, signed by "Herblock" in the left-hand corner, and over the top is this, in quotes: "We'll Teach You Patriotism and Respect for the Law."

Depicted in the right-hand side of the cartoon are three individuals.

One individual is holding in his hand and burning the U.S. Constitution. Tagged as his identification is "L. MENDEL RIVERS."

The next individual is holding a sign entitled "'Let's Forget the First Amendment'—House Armed Services Committee members." This individual is identified as "E. Hébert, Jr."

The next individual has no name attached to him, but is holding a sign which reads "Hell with the U.S. courts," and over his left shoulder is the Confederate flag.

In the upper left-hand corner are two apparent youngsters, I presume—they look like youngsters. One is holding up a sign which says, "To hell with the draft." The other supposedly is holding up a draft card, or a paper, which says "Draft Act," and is in the act of burning it.

This is the cartoon, described accurately. Now I shall comment on its accuracy and discuss with the Members what might be the intent of the cartoonist. I shall not attempt to probe his intent. I merely read what the cartoonist apparently intends.

Let us begin with the designation of "E. Hebert, Jr.," which obviously refers to me. Well, this is minor, and it is not

important, but it is just an example of the fallacies and inaccuracies. My name is not "E. Hébert, Jr." I have never been called "Junior" in my life. My father's name was Felix Joseph Hébert. My name is FELIX EDWARD HÉBERT, but not "Junior."

Until last Saturday in the report of the New York Times I have never seen myself referred to as "Junior."

Of course, this is inconsequential, but whoever is "E. Hébert, Jr." might take objection to it; I do not know. But at least this is the starting inaccuracy.

Holding up the sign, " 'Let's forget the first amendment'—House Armed Services Committee members," causes me to say that not a single member of the House Armed Services Committee—the entire 40 of them—with one exception, has said "Let's forget the first amendment," and that exception was me. I said it; not the other Members of the House. Yet they are all being held up to ridicule, including myself, as saying, "Let's forget the first amendment."

How did I say it, after discussing my feeling for the first amendment? I hold here in my hand the transcript of the hearing of last Friday before the House Armed Services Committee.

I direct your attention to page 897 at line 24 which is quoting me in reply to a statement by Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr., the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, following a lengthy colloquy and dialog as to why the Department of Justice was not enforcing the law by bringing to the bar of justice the Carmichaels and the Kings and the other individuals of that ilk who are going about the country today making statements which, if they are not treasonable, then I do not know what treason is. They are urging individuals to break the law, urging our people to defy the law, talking at mob demonstrations, telling our boys, "Do not enlist," "Do not be drafted," praising Ho Chi Minh as a great savior of the world, spewing forth the Communist line better than it is spewed from Hanoi or Peking. The American public is asking the $64 question and the $164 question, "Why are not these people prosecuted?" Now keep in mind. In discussing this let me make it crystal clear that I do not want to equate in any way dissent and disloyalty. I recognize and defend the right to dissent, but I condemn and damn disloyalty and the challenge to the fighting men of this country and to their patriotism. There is a strong and clear line of demarcation between dissent and disloyalty. This is to what I address myself here, that is, not to dissent but to disloyalty.

Now, be this as it may, the law is clear on this subject. I shall put into the RECORD the entire colloquy in which it says in no uncertain terms that any individual whosoever in time of war shall frustrate or attempt to incite to mutiny or urge disloyalty or urge nonconformity to the law shall be prosecuted—by whom? By the Justice Department. Every time this questioning turned to that subject and the law, the cloak of immunity of the first amendment was raised—the umbrella of the first amendment. I shall discuss this more in detail tomorrow as far as the Department of Justice is concerned, but I am emphasizing it here in order that you might understand and realize just how this expression was used. It was in this context that the Department of Justice would say, "Well, we cannot prosecute and we will not prosecute them and we do not intend to prosecute them because they come under the umbrella of the first amendment." Now, this is not the function of the Justice Department. The function of the Justice Department is to prosecute and defend the law. It is not the function of the Justice Department to engage in judicial decisions and make decisions before the law is tested. It may very well come under the first amendment, and, knowing the Supreme Court as well as I do, it undoubtedly will come under the first amendment, if I am to judge the future by the past, because the murderers, the rapists, and the Communists run wild because of Supreme Court decisions today. However, I am not engaging in that dispute now and I am not talking about that discussion now. I am talking about what the law says and what is written in the law.

And, Mr. Speaker, strangely enough, the Assistant Attorney General testified and said he had never heard of the statute. But, anyway, he insisted that no matter what it would be, it would come under the coverage of the first amendment.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is in that context and in that direction that I made the statement, "Let us forget the first amendment."

So, Mr. Block, or Herblock, whatever his name may be, lifts out of context "Let's forget the first amendment," and attributes it to every member of the House Armed Services Committee, which is not true and not accurate and indicates that we subscribe to forgetting the first amendment and its full protection of the freedom of speech. That is what its effect has and that is undoubtedly what it was intended to be, while nothing could be further from the truth—nothing could be further from the truth.

There is in the testimony—I have it right here—the first sentence, and here is another page of the discussion and nothing was said about that—of course not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me show you just how far some people go. I detest hate, racism, and bigotry. I come from Louisiana, the Deep South, and I am proud of that fact. I believe that every man has the opportunity, and the equal opportunity, regardless of race, color, or creed, to have that equal opportunity. I believe in privileges for none, whether they be white, black, green, pink, or yellow. I am not a racist. I am not a bigot. I am not intolerant. I recognize your right to disagree with me. I only ask your respect.

At no time during these hearings was anything mentioned about the North or the South, at no time.

At no time was the word "Confederacy" used. At no time was the race question raised and particularly so, because the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and I, coming from that section of the country, would be immediately suspect. So it was not raised. We were not talking about these violators as Negroes or Chinamen or Indians. I do not know what they want on the campuses of this country. True, many white people disgrace the campuses of our country, in my book, and thereby do a disgrace to this country. I do not care about their color or race. The race issue has no place in this.

Mr. Speaker, the cartoon portrayed a third man with a Confederate flag on his shoulder. What does he mean by that? Whether he means to raise it or not, he immediately arouses the race issue; he immediately wants to indicate that the race issue is involved in this consideration. It is not.

What does he mean when he says, "To hell with the courts." No one said that. It was not even uttered.

Perhaps, I would like to say it, but I do not say it, because I respect the courts which have a valid and a legal place in our constitutional form of government, and I will follow any court-ordered decision validly given in the future. However, it is confusing, upon occasion to follow some of the Court's orders. I have decried certain decisions of the Supreme Court. I shudder to think where this country is going, based upon some of the decisions which the Court has rendered, and not in civil rights questions alone.

Mr. Speaker, if I were any one of those nine men I might not be able to sleep at night, based upon some of the decisions which the Court has rendered.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I have a right to criticize this sacrosanct body, or I do not. But, I hope that I am protected by the first amendment; I hope so in the eyes of some people.

Then the other quote: "We will teach you patriotism and respect for the law."

Nobody said that during the hearings. Here are the hearings. You cannot find that quotation in the hearings, but yet it is attributed to the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

I would add the Committee on Armed Services needs no defense from me, but I must defend them with the record.

Then up here, the draft card with two young kids. What do you think youngsters in their formative years—their impressionable years—think when they see a cartoon like this placed before their view? Here is a great newspaper with a large circulation. Here is an outstanding cartoonist, a man of great scope and ability, telling in effect these youngsters: "Do not pay any attention to them. Burn your draft card. To hell with the draft. These are old fuzz-doodles, old racists, old bigots, old, stupid individuals, they do not know what they are talking about. Pay no attention to them."

That is what I object to. I object to the inaccuracy. If the gentleman could have drawn his cartoon and quoted correctly and accurately, he would hear no voice of mine raised against it. I would defend his right to draw it. I will defend the right of every individual to disagree with this country, and the President of the United States, in the conduct of the war, but for my part I stand with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I am not ashamed to be addressed as a "hawk." I want to be a hawk because I want to win, and I want to get those boys back here. But if some people want to be doves, and fly around and flutter their little eyes, then that is their business, or anybody else's business, and they have a right to do it. They have the right to dissent. They have the right to criticism. They have a right to criticize the manner in which this war is being carried on. But they do not have—nobody has the right to arouse to riot and to mutiny, whether this country is at war or not at war. I deny the right of anybody to use the Constitution of the United States to destroy the Constitution of the United States. Under the Constitution we are all supposed to be guaranteed the right of liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But this type of thing as enunciated in this cartoon, and as enunciated by the Department of Justice on the witness stand, that if I want to use LSD or smoke marihuana, and they deny me that, then they have taken my happiness away. That is what it means.

It means this: that there is no law on the books of the Federal Government or of a State that does not violate the first amendment if you want to stretch it that far, ad infinitum, and ad ridiculum, if Latin could be put in that context.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I want to bring to your attention. I do not care if Mr. Herblock wants to embrace Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Minh, or anybody else, or if he wants to take his stand at the side of the Carmichaels and the Kings and the other individuals who are trying to bring disruption to this country—I cannot stop him. He well can do it. That is his right. But, Mr. Speaker, by the same token, I reserve the right and privilege to put my arms around General Westmoreland. I prefer to embrace those kids who are giving everything they can give, and not delay one day their return from Vietnam. General Westmoreland has told us, and I share that opinion, that every day these people contribute to the extension of this war—a war that has claimed 10,000 lives and 50,000 casualties. I want these kids back home as quickly as we can get them home.

Now, Mr. Herblock wants to embrace those who wish to give aid and comfort to the enemy by getting in the headlines of the newspapers in Peking, Moscow, and Hanoi, that this country is divided. As General Westmoreland stated, they are depending on the Achilles heel for their victory.

If Mr. Herblock wants to side with the Communists, that is his business. His business.

But in siding with them, if he so desires, let him at least be a little accurate in his presentation—particularly because of the great force and effect that a cartoon has.

I know the futility of engaging in a contest with a newspaper. I know that. I sat on that throne a long time and I knew the futility of those who would write letters in. I had the upper hand when I was on the paper. I had more ink and more paper than any character could have who could write and send letters in.

I always had the last word. I recognize this. I recognize the unevenness of the contest and of the debate. I recognize the difference in exposure and the audience. But I do recognize and do retain for myself my own conscience and my own belief and what I believe America is and what we should do in America.

Oh, I am old fashioned. I am rather naive. I would rather stand on the gallows with Nathan Hale and say, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," than to stand up on a platform rabble rousing and in denunciation of my Government and telling fellow Americans not to defend that Constitution that guarantees them the right and guarantees me the right to say the things they want to say and that I want to say.

This is my observation today.

Tomorrow during the discussion of the procurement bill to furnish these fighting men with arms, I shall have more to say on the Department of Justice, which I suggest to you is most derelict in its duty. It could easily find reasons to go into other fields which do not concern them but it can find many reasons not to prosecute. Not one single newspaper in this country, not one radio station or one television station carried the affirmative statement that the Department of Justice refused and is refusing and will continue to refuse to prosecute these individuals who have committed what I think are crimes against the law.

To my mind, that would be a good lead—but no, the lead was that members of the House Committee on Armed Services said, "Forget the first amendment."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am ended. I am finished—but I would ask for accuracy and truth in reporting.

Do not take my word—what I have said and uttered here today. Do not accept that as the truth and the fact. Do not accept my conclusions and my observations. These are my opinions. These are my own expressions. I would instead ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to place in the RECORD the entire dialog unexpurgated, unedited, and unchanged—but a raw, accurate report by the reporter of the House Armed Services Committee on last Friday—the colloquy between Mr. Vinson and myself—with nothing changed—and to put this in the RECORD at this point.

Read the record—not the conclusions or the evaluations—but read the raw record and tell me how an individual can come up with this type of misleading, inaccurate, inflammatory cartoon such as Mr. Herblock has presented to his viewers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL). The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana if the material that he desires to put in the RECORD was in a public hearing?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was in a public hearing.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Hébert.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Vinson, I have several questions I desire to explore here.

In the very opening, may I say I want to make a very distinct distinction between the right to speak and the acts of disloyalty or treason or sedition. I will stand in the forefront to defend any man a right to dissent, but in this right to dissent I am afraid we are going into an area of what is certainly treason and sedition as being exhibited on public platforms throughout this country today and on the university campuses of our nation.

I understand that an opinion was asked of a previous Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, as to why some of these individuals who are uttering treasonable and disloyal statements, not statements of dissent or opinion, but treasonable statements and seditious statements, that they could not be prosecuted because we are not in a declared war.

Do you subscribe to that opinion? This is hearsay of Mr. Katzenbach's opinion. Now I am asking you now, is this a reason why certain acts now committed which would be treasonable or seditious if we were in a declared war are not being prosecuted—the individuals who are guilty?

Mr. VINSON. First, Mr. Congressman, I am not aware of the precise opinion that you refer to. We received considerable mail from the House and from the Senate last year in regard to such utterances, but I don't recall any response that drew the line between a declared war and an undeclared war.

However, the case that was previously referred to where the Chief Justice enunciated the clear and present danger test was, I believe, a case under the sedition laws and not under Selective Service. So we are back to the degree and proximity proposition.

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, of course, now, you have indicated by your reply, Mr. Vinson, that these letters in multiple numbers are coming from Members of Congress of the House and the Senate. You will agree with me, I am sure, that these letters reflect the thinking of the American people or else you wouldn't get such letters in such quantity. I think we can be in agreement on that?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, I think so, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. HÉBERT. After all, who is the Constitution of the United States except the American people and what they want? They adopted the Constitution.

Mr. VINSON. The problem with that is that a great deal of the Constitution is to protect minorities and dissenters, and not——

Mr. HÉBERT. We have been made aware of that in the last several years, of the interpretation of that.

What I am trying to get at is this—I may ask your opinion, and may I say I appreciate your position as a lawyer, because undoubtedly you have demonstrated very adequately that you are a good lawyer because you could undoubtedly carry a client far and beyond two years if you were called upon to do so, which in the law is right, that is even under the Constitution.

Now, these utterances—and I am sure you are familiar with them since the general public is well acquainted with them—of individuals standing before crowds arousing those crowds to treasonable heights, to mutiny against the Government, to defiance of the laws, and supposing we were at war on a formal declaration would these utterances and these actions be indictable?

Mr. VINSON. I don't think the existence or nonexistence of a war has any legal relevancy. It obviously might have some psychological relevancy.

Mr. HÉBERT. Wait, never mind, let's don't wander into the field of psychology and all this sort of thing. Let's get down to the facts. I am a country boy like my chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read this, then I will give it back to you. Under Title 18, Sec-

tion 2388 of the Code, among other things, these are the words of that section, quote:

"Whoever, when the United States is at war, wilfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or wilfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment in service of the United States to the injury of the service or to the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined $10,000", and so forth, "20 years."

Then I am finished.

Could we make this applicable to the Selective Service and Training Act? This says "enlistment." The Selective Service and Training Act says "procurement." Why isn't this applicable now?

Mr. VINSON. I would not like to answer that off the top of my head, Mr. Chairman. You definitely and distinctly have First Amendment problems.

Mr. HÉBERT. This is existing law, Mr. Vinson. This is existing law. This thing as Mr. Rivers has pointed out and read and was the section I had in mind when I asked these questions, what does it say, the exact language?

The CHAIRMAN. "When the United States is at war".

Mr. HÉBERT. "At war."

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is the only thing that might proscribe your capacity to enforce the intendment of this statute.

Mr. BATES. There is an amendment to include the present emergency in a later section.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is what I am trying to get at. Of course now the refuge there is when the United States is at war. Technically, and when there is no desire to prosecute these individuals, technically the lawyer and the law can stand behind that technicality, and I am damned sick and tired of technicalities when we have treason in this country and sedition.

What I am trying to find out is this: If that is the prohibition, because it says "at war," and the technicality is we are not at war, wouldn't it suffice to say "are engaged in armed conflict"? Three little words. Or "in armed conflict"? Wouldn't that bring these individuals to the bar of justice?

Mr. VINSON. Well, my previous statement was keyed to the First Amendment.

Mr. HÉBERT. The First Amendment, as Justice Holmes said.

Mr. VINSON. The First Amendment I stated really wasn't relevant, as to the First Amendment, whether you are in war or not in war. I was not referring to this statute.

Mr. HÉBERT. Let's forget the First Amendment. I know that will be the refuge of the Supreme Court, I recognize that. But at least the effort can be made and the demonstration given to the American people certainly that the Department of Justice, and most assuredly the Congress, is determined to eliminate this rat-infested area in this country. But if we are going to stand idly by and merely say we can't do it and all of a sudden go back to the First Amendment, as Justice Holmes so well said you can't cry fire in a theater, free speech ends there.

This begging the question of the First Amendment continuously rather upsets me a little bit, and upsets not only me but millions of American people. They want to know a very simple answer, why can the Carmichaels and why can the Kings, and other individuals of that ilk stand before the American people and institute riot, incite defiance of the law, while the Justice Department stands idly by and the Congress takes no action to strengthen that law?

Now, all we can do is strengthen the law. We can't enforce it. That is not our jurisdiction or our problem. But we can give you the weapons to use.

Now the law says this. It is clear and distinct, "at war." If there is a technicality there, why can't we say "or engaged in armed conflict"? And may I ask you, Mr. Vinson, under that law couldn't you prosecute these individuals?

Mr. VINSON. I am unfamiliar with this particular statute, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. HÉBERT. What is that?

Mr. VINSON. I am unfamiliar with this particular statute. This statute is administered by the Internal Security Division of the Department. However, as the statute was read to me, it related only to those in service.

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir. Read it again. The very opening sentence is very clear. I can even understand it and I am not a lawyer.

Mr. BATES. You have to read both sections there I think really to get an understanding.

Mr. HÉBERT. Read them.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course in the prosecution, the prosecution comes under you, I don't care what division enforces it.

Mr. HÉBERT. You are speaking for the Department of Justice today.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless it has been changed since I was down there, you are the prosecutor.

Mr. VINSON. Not under the Internal Security statute.

Mr. SLATINSHEK. Title 18, Section 2388, reads as follows: "Activities affecting armed forces during war: (a) Whoever when the United States is at war wilfully makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military-naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies, or whoever when the United States is at war wilfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or wilfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States to the injury of the service or the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

And the statute continues, and there is a succeeding section in the statute, Section 2391 of Title 18, which provides a temporary extension of Section 2388 and therefore makes it effective during the current period, despite the fact we are not at war. It simply provides—this portion of Title 18, this section, will be effective during periods of emergency, such as the one we are now in, which was declared December 16, 1950, and has not been terminated.

So the question of war is not really particularly pertinent now. The question is whether or not this statute would apply under the particular situation and whether this statute, when it speaks of recruiting and enlistment service, would cover anyone who interferes with the Selective Service procurement function.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is what I am trying to develop, Mr. Slatinshek. Would my suggestion of adding "armed conflict" strengthen the first section which you read.

However, can you tell us, Mr. Vinson, why there has been no prosecution under the existing law, which certainly is clear enough? We are in an emergency, declared by President Truman. The emergency has never been revoked in the Korean War. We are acting in many areas under the aegis of that so-called emergency. Why hasn't anybody been prosecuted to date?

I admit this, that the Justice Department can't make the decisions that overrule the Supreme Court decisions, which I know that is what they would be, but anyway you can't hit a ball unless you take the bat off your shoulder and find out if it is going to be fair or foul.

Why hasn't the Justice Department proceeded to find out? And remember this too, sir, that twelve men will sit in that jury box and make this decision—twelve men will make the decision after the evidence, and they will decide what the facts are, and of course the Supreme Court will upset it, I know that, but anyway at least it can be shown to the American people that the Justice Department wants to prosecute.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we are more concerned with the rights of these people than we are with the existence of this republic.

I don't want to—you don't form the policy.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hébert, have you finished?

I have promised Mr. King, then we will come to you, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want an answer to the question, Mr. Vinson. You represent the Department of Justice here today.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You are speaking for them and you are head of the Criminal Division. If this isn't criminal, I don't know what criminal is.

Mr. VINSON. Well, that is——

Mr. HÉBERT. Why hasn't this been done?

Mr. VINSON. It is a criminal statute.

Mr. HÉBERT. It is a criminal statute. Are we going to get caught in a place of who handles what division?

Mr. VINSON. No, sir, I can assure you no one has been prosecuted under this statute because the Department felt no one has violated the statute.

Mr. HÉBERT. No one violated the simple and clear language that has just been read to you? These individuals, and there have been hundreds of others besides that, unidentified people, because trouble hasn't been taken to identify the people on these campuses?

Why, a simple man like myself can understand that language, or maybe I wasted years in the business I was in before I came here, understanding words.

I can't understand it, and if you tell me that the Department of Justice can't understand, there is a case for prosecution and presentation, let's test the law. Let's find out whether it is valid or not, whether it is inadequate or not. And if it is inadequate, we want to pass something.

I intend to offer a bill in this committee to strengthen that first section by putting the words in "or armed conflict". What good are the words going to do if the Congress passes the law and the Department of Justice fails to prosecute under the explicit direction of the law and explicit intention of the Congress. And we I think are backed by the American public today. We are not backed by the Department of Justice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Congressman, that goes back to preceding colloquy with the chairman, when I stated that any law that deals with utterances must be read in light of the First Amendment. The First Amendment is not absolute; as you point out, the fire in the theater. But there is a line which must be drawn and which has been drawn.

Mr. HÉBERT. Here, Mr. Vinson, the Department of Justice is performing a judicial function. It is not the Department of Justice's function or authority to make judicial decisions. That is up to the courts.

Of course, the courts go beyond that and legislate—I recognize all these facets—but it is the primary duty of the Department of Justice to prosecute when a prima facie case is made, and certainly I don't think anybody with an average intelligence, except maybe below the average of me, or like me, can't understand and read clearly and distinctly what that statute says. And that is, it is the duty and responsibility of the Department of Justice to prosecute and let the

courts make the determination. This is just merely a lawyer's opinion, that is all it is.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL WINS PULITZER PRIZE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week, one of the great newspapers of America, the Milwaukee Journal, received its fourth Pulitzer Prize.

All Wisconsin citizens are proud of the accomplishments of this newspaper and it is significant that the Pulitzer Prize was awarded to the Journal for its outstanding efforts on behalf of stiffening the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin.

For the information of my colleagues, I include as part of my remarks a series of newspaper articles describing the work done by the Journal and its excellent staff on the subject of water resources and its subsequent receipt of the Pulitzer Prize:

JOURNAL IS AWARDED PULITZER FOR FOURTH TIME

The Milwaukee Journal Monday was awarded a Pulitzer prize for meritorious public service.

The Journal won its prize for "its successful campaign to stiffen the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin."

The Pulitzer award committee described the Journal effort as a "notable advance in the national effort for the conservation of natural resources." The award was announced in New York city.

The Journal shared the prize in the public service category with the Louisville Courier-Journal, which was cited for a successful campaign to control the Kentucky strip mine industry.

It was the fourth time The Milwaukee Journal or members of its staff had won Pulitzer prizes, considered the top award in American journalism.

The first, in 1919, was, like this year's, given to the newspaper for meritorious public service. The other two Journal Pulitzer prizes were for individual achievement. Cartoonist Ross Lewis received a prize in 1935, and Journal reporter Austin C. Wehrwein won in 1953 for international reporting.

The Pulitzer prizes were endowed by Joseph Pulitzer, publisher of the World, New York city, in a bequest to Columbia university. They are awarded annually by the trustees of the university.

A gold medal is given for meritorious public service. Other Pulitzer awards in journalism are $1,000.

The Journal's entry this year was a portfolio centered around a series on water pollution published a year ago in three issues of the Sunday Picture Journal. Also submitted were editorials demanding antipollution action, news stories describing subsequent passage of the state's pollution control program by the legislature and letters to The Journal praising its campaign.

The Picture Journal issues of Apr. 17, Apr. 24 and May 1 last year were devoted entirely to the theme "Pollution: The Spreading Menace."

Journal editor Richard H. Leonard said, "The Milwaukee Journal is deeply gratified by this recognition of its efforts to fight one of the great menaces of our times—the pollution of our lakes and rivers. The Journal has long regarded conservation of our natural resources as one of its most important objectives. We will continue the fight."

The sections were a team effort involving a dozen photographers, writers, artists and editors on The Journal's staff.

The project was planned and supervised by picture editor George J. Lockwood, editor of The Picture Journal. Most of the photos were made by Journal photographer George P. Koshollek, Jr. One of the most dramatic, however, was an aerial color picture by staff photographer Clarence P. Schmidt.

Richard C. Kienitz, The Journal's natural resources writer, did the basic reporting. Journal writer Robert W. Wells assisted Lockwood in editing the text.

Olesen wrote editorials

Editorial writer Don Olesen wrote the editorials.

Other writers contributed to the prize winning sections. Reporter Paul G. Hayes, who specializes in planning, wrote "A Tale of 5 Rivers." Outdoor writer Tom Guyant did an essay, "Wild as the Wolf," on the unspoiled Wolf river.

Photographer Allan Scott produced an eight page color portfolio on the upper Wolf river.

Staff artist Gregg Klees prepared full color maps and Pulitzer cartoonist Lewis turned out a full color cartoon dramatizing the need for action on pollution. Its caption: "Only you, Paul Bunyan, are big enough to do this cleanup job."

Artist Al Berg worked with Lockwood on the page layouts.

Action was demanded

As the series ended, an Olesen editorial demanded state action to provide "more facilities, more enforcement, some new laws, a better co-ordinated antipollution effort, public awareness and indignation—and more dollars."

The editorial agreed with a Green Bay critic of state antipollution efforts that there was slender comfort in knowing that "while other states might be up to their necks in pollution, we're only up to our knees."

The congratulatory letters submitted included letters from Gov. Knowles and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

The Picture Journal series already had been honored in several other nationwide competitions.

Kienitz, Koshollek and Lockwood last month shared second place awards of $500 each in the Edward J. Meeman conservation contest for their work on the sections.

The Meeman awards, named for the late conservation editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, were given by the Scripps-Howard Foundation.

Schmidt's aerial photo, showing wastes pouring into the Fox river waterway at Neenah-Menasha, was ranked second in the National Press Photographers' association competition this year.

Pictures won award

Koshollek's pollution pictures placed first in the Inland Daily Press association competition last fall.

The 27 pages in the three issues were the largest concentration of color photos on a single subject The Journal had ever published.

It is relatively rare, but not unprecedented, for the Pulitzer judges to cite two newspapers in the public service category. It has done so three other times in the half century of Pulitzers.

The Journal's first public service medal, in 1919, was only the second year that this distinction had been awarded.

Americanism cited

That Pulitzer resolution cited The Journal for its "strong and courageous campaign for Americanism in a constituency where foreign elements made such a policy hazardous from a business point of view."

The Journal was one of the first newspapers during World War I to recognize the "uncivilized methods employed by the German government in its war against civilians."

The Pulitzer committee hailed The Journal's exposure of German ruled alliances in this country, its opposition to Wisconsin congressmen who resisted war efforts and its editorials attacking elements that put Germany above America.

Cartoonist honored

Lewis' Pulitzer in 1935 was for the best American newspaper cartoon of the year "in some commendable cause of public importance."

The cartoon, picturing a huge figure of violence looming over strikers and standing next to an industrial plant, bore the caption: "Sure I'll Work for Both Sides."

Lewis, who still is drawing Journal cartoons, is widely regarded as one of the nation's best political cartoonists.

In 1953, Wehrwein won the international reporting award for a series of 25 articles entitled "Canada's New Century." The story told of Canada's economic boom and its relationship to the United States.

The Journal sent Wehrwein thousands of miles, traveling coast to coast, to get the facts.

Wehrwein then was a writer on The Journal's business news staff. He subsequently became a New York Times reporter and now is on the editorial board of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

VETERAN NEWSMEN RESPONSIBLE FOR AWARD WINNING CAMPAIGN

The four men primarily responsible for the stories, photographs and editorials that won a Pulitzer prize Monday all are veteran members of The Journal staff.

George J. Lockwood, picture editor, edited the series in The Picture Journal, George P. Koshollek, jr., Journal staff photographer, took most of the pictures. The reporting was done by Richard C. Kienitz, The Journal's natural resources reporter. Don Olesen, editorial writer, wrote the editorials on water pollution.

Journal man since 1956

Lockwood, 35, was born in Albany, N.Y. He is a graduate of Syracuse university, and received a master of arts degree from the University of Minnesota in 1957. He served in the navy 1953–'55.

Lockwood has been with The Journal since 1956. He was a police reporter and later moved to general assignment, then to the picture desk. He was named editor of The Picture Journal in 1962. In 1966, he was promoted to picture editor.

Koshollek, 41, grew up in Stevens Point. During World War II, he served with the navy on Guam. He returned home to attend Stevens Point State college, and joined The Journal staff in 1949. His assignments for the Journal have been varied, including a trip to Castro's Cuba. He also photographed President Kennedy's funeral. He has won dozens of major photo prizes.

Wisconsin native

Kienitz, 48, is a native of Neenah. He has been with The Journal since 1953. Before that he was news editor of the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald. Kienitz was a member of The Journal's state news desk before becoming natural resources writer. Kienitz studied at the University of Wisconsin, and served with the air force in Italy during World War II.

Olesen, 45, was born in Madison. He is a graduate of Swarthmore (Pa.) college. In

World War II, he served with the army in the China-Burma-India theater.

He began his journalistic career reporting for the Washington (D.C.) Daily News. He later worked as a reporter for the Washington Post. He also was a staff member of the Lakeland Boating magazine before joining The Journal staff in 1957. Olesen wrote boating and skiing news before he became an editorial writer.

PULITZER STARTED IN MUDDY TRIPS

This is how a Pulitzer prize winner is born.

The Milwaukee Journal's series on water pollution, which won American journalism's top award Monday, had its beginnings in August, 1965.

Richard H. Leonard, then managing editor and now editor, and Arville Schaleben, an associate editor, were discussing the fall plans for news and picture projects with other editors.

The conversation went into such things as "a series on education . . . The Journal's Drive Alive campaign . . . and something on water pollution."

George J. Lockwood, editor of The Picture Journal, volunteered that the pollution story would best be told with color photography in The Picture Journal. As he puts it, "In about 10 seconds I had the toughest assignment of my career."

Many gave leads

Lockwood, now also picture editor of The Journal, began to research the story in Milwaukee, Waukesha and Madison. Game wardens, regional planning officials, public health inspectors and others concerned provided all sorts of leads, such as:

Chicken entrails turn the Root river blood red in summer; South Milwaukee pours its sewage—about 65% untreated—into Lake Michigan, and a knitting mill in the Appleton area dyes effluent a rainbow of colors in a huge settling pond.

By mid-October, Lockwood had enough information to provide a shooting schedule for a photographer.

Photographer George P. Koshollek, jr., many times a prize winner, was assigned to the job for three weeks. Before he was through, Koshollek would cover 3,000 miles of the state in waders and hunting boots, in boats and planes.

Writer joins him

Richard C. Kienitz, conservation writer who is based in Madison, was assigned to join forces with Koshollek.

They found pollution everywhere, in every county, in creeks, lakes and rivers.

After Koshollek's trip, Leonard and Schaleben spent an afternoon examining the color pictures. The editors insisted on complete documentation of each picture and also insisted that the paper mills—the biggest single polluters in the state—be allowed to show their side of the campaign to clean up the waterways.

Kienitz, Koshollek and Lockwood spent two days in the Fox River valley in talks and tours with officers of the state's paper industry.

Goes to Madison

Lockwood took all the pictures to Madison, where he and Kienitz met with Theodore Wisniewski, director of the state committee on water pollution, who detailed the polluting elements shown in the pictures.

By this time, it was 1966. The word was out that the legislature would meet in May for a special session to develop antipollution laws. Timing for publication of the series became critical.

Apr. 17 was selected for the opening installment. The third and final story would appear May 1, a day before the special session was convened.

Results approved

Half a dozen other Journal staffers contributed to the team effort. They included photographer Clarence P. Schmidt, writers Tom Guyant, Paul G. Hayes and Robert W. Wells, artist Gregg Klees and cartoonist Ross A. Lewis, himself a Pulitzer winner.

Lockwood took four weeks to complete the editing and layouts. The other editors approved the result with minor changes.

Lockwood and Al Berg, a Journal artist, went to Chicago to the Cuneo Press, where The Picture Journal is printed. They looked over the engraver's shoulders as he prepared plates. Color can be spoiled if photographs do not have expert reproduction.

On Apr. 17, Wisconsin citizens picked up The Picture Journal and "Pollution: The Spreading Menace" hit them between the eyes. This was the first of three Picture Journals devoted to pollution.

The Journal's editorial columns took up the cause. For Journal editorial writers, who have been defenders of natural resources for decades, this was no new crusade.

The editorials, written by conservation specialist Don Olesen of the editorial writing staff, demanded state action.

Reactions pour in

Reaction was swift. Of the pollution series, Gov. Knowles wrote: "In spite of the hard work done by pollution committees, meeting for the last eight months, it is most difficult to present the problem adequately to the public without your help."

Stewart L. Udall, United States secretary of the interior, said the series was "one of the most effective and constructive pieces on water pollution I have ever seen."

At the bottom of his letter he wrote: "Keep slugging."

The series reached many desks. The federal department of agriculture wanted to reproduce the color photo. So did Audubon magazine.

On June 10, the state legislature wrote the end of the series. It passed and sent to the governor for his signature a bill that Udall has since called "the finest piece of legislation yet enacted in the national fight to preserve clean water."

SERIES ON FOUL WATER ACCLAIMED BY MANY

The Milwaukee Journal's 1966 campaign against water pollution, honored Monday with a Pulitzer prize, won acclaim from high officials and ordinary citizens soon after it was printed.

Praise came from Gov. Knowles, congressmen and cabinet members.

The Journal's efforts were credited with a major role in getting passage of Wisconsin's 300 million dollar pollution control law.

Patrick Lucey, then lieutenant governor, said The Journal's photography "portrayed the pollution problem as no amount of words could have done."

Gov. Knowles, applauding "the efforts of The Milwaukee Journal and its staff for its accomplishment," said the paper was to be congratulated for bringing the pollution story to the attention of the state.

"Most effective"

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall wrote that The Picture Journal series was "one of the most effective and constructive pieces on water pollution that I have seen."

"The pictures are superlative and the text shows both the in depth research and the deft word handling of a truly excellent reporter," the secretary wrote.

Udall later praised the new Wisconsin control bill.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), introducing a "clean waters act of 1966" in congress, made a senate speech recommending that his fellow senators read The Journal's series. It would, he said, shock every citizen and every public official into action.

"Finest combination"

H. W. Poston, regional program director in Chicago for the federal water pollution control administration, called the project the "finest combination pictorial and narrative job of water pollution reporting I have ever seen." He said he had distributed copies to key people in the field.

William A. Riaski, Glenview, Ill., executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America, wrote: "Your paper has a long history of being in the forefront in publicizing the urgent conservation issues. The present series on 'The Spreading Menace' will add another star to your crown."

Some demur

Reader Frank Cetin, 5246 N. 44th st., wrote that he had "never heard or read anything on the subject that impressed me as much."

W. J. MacNeill, secretary of the Green Lake (Wis.) Lake Property Owners association, reported that his board of directors had voted unanimously to express appreciation to The Journal "for this public spirited and powerful assist to the fighters for 'clean water.'"

Not all the reaction was laudatory. In South Milwaukee, Mayor Chester Grobschmidt objected strenuously because some pictures in the series showed South Milwaukee's cataract of municipal sewage—65% untreated—pouring into Lake Michigan.

Village Trustee James Ackley of Pewaukee complained about a picture of the debris clogged Pewaukee river. "We have done our level best to keep pollution down," he said.

But in the Madison suburb of Shorewood Hills, the village board officially commended The Journal's series and trustee Victor Johnson said it should be "required reading."

THE PULITZER AWARD

It is significant that the two newspapers that share the Pulitzer prize award for meritorious public service were honored for achievements in a common cause—the mounting struggle to restore and protect the nation's natural resources.

The Milwaukee Journal was cited for "its successful campaign to stiffen the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin" and the Louisville Courier-Journal for its fruitful efforts to control the ravages of strip mining in Kentucky.

Both efforts simply are different phases of the new national wave of conservation awareness which concerns itself with the natural world around us—air, water, land—and the worsening of much of it. It is the crisis of man's marvelous and sometimes mindless technology and its impact on natural resources. It is the problem caused by perhaps 70% of our population crowded into 1% of our total land area.

The Journal's campaign undoubtedly was a significant factor in passage of Wisconsin's landmark 1966 water quality law, designed to provide some of the money, manpower and enforcement teeth needed to begin cleaning up our waterways. The Courier-Journal's long struggle against unchecked surface or strip mining of coal resulted in a tough new law to control the practice in Kentucky. Both campaigns have had an impact in other states.

Wisconsin, however, may have a tough new law to curb pollution, yet the Milwaukee river is murky and sometimes foul as it flows through the state's largest city. Many of our inland lakes are sickened in season with a carpet of green algae. Even portions of our inland oceans, the Great Lakes, are blighted.

Both efforts, in Wisconsin and in Kentucky, are beginnings only. Now must come the essential, the tedious and never ending business of translating law into effective action. It will require patience, determination

and, most of all, the wisdom to use with intelligence and restraint the technology which is our triumph.

LEGISLATION LONG OVERDUE

Mr. KLEPPE. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of us saw the photos of the burning of the American flag in Central Park in New York on April 15 which were carried by many newspapers across the Nation. This was the latest and most spectacular of a number of cases in which the flag was mutilated and held up to derision.

I am also sure that most of those who read about the New York case boiled with indignation that those so-called Americans responsible for the burning were not apprehended, expeditiously tried, and socked with a stiff fine and jail sentence. The truth of the matter is, of course, that there is no Federal statute to cover this abuse, and some of the local and State statutes are mere wrist slaps as penalties go.

I can well imagine the exasperation of organizations like the veteran groups, many of whose members saw American soldiers die in defense of causes exemplified by the flag. One need only remember the scene of the four marines on Mount Suribachi straining to erect the American flag while the battle raged around them.

There is no excuse why legislation now before Congress cannot be evaluated, amended if necessary, and enacted into law promptly. Hearings are now in progress on the House side, and it is hoped that resulting legislation will be presented to the full body as soon as possible.

Legislation was first introduced in the House to correct abuses of the flag by Congressman RICHARD ROUDEBUSH during the 89th Congress. Similar legislation, which I also introduced last year, was again submitted this year by Congressman ROUDEBUSH and other interested Members, reflecting the concern of many citizens for corrective action. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, for instance, adopted a resolution last year calling for a Federal statute to cover flag abuses. Indicative of the feeling that many citizens have experienced on this issue is the VFW press release of May 8, 1967, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

VFW BACKS FLAG DESECRATION LEGISLATION BEFORE HOUSE PANEL

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 8.—The Senior Vice Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Joseph A. Scerra, Gardner, Mass., today told a Subcommittee of the House of Representatives that "it is the position of the VFW that the Congress must make desecration of the Flag a crime. Present laws concerning disrespect for the Flag are inadequate to meet the times."

Testifying before the House Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, headed by Rep. Byron Rogers (Colo.), Scerra said in part: "Our organization has long been intensely concerned over the public defilement and desecration of our National Flag. During the past several years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been the leader in bringing this development to the attention of the Congress. Unfortunately, these incidents which have been accelerating of late have received nationwide and international publicity."

The Senior Vice Commander-in-Chief told the House panel that the VFW lends its "support to a bill presented by Rep. Richard L. Roudebush (Ind.), a former VFW Commander-in-Chief, and to similar bills which propose to make it a crime to desecrate our Flag. Roudebush's bill is H.R. 1207."

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars at its 67th National Convention in New York City last August adopted a resolution which resolves that 'we strongly support legislation providing punishment of one year in prison and a $1,000 fine for any person who publicly and willfully destroys, mutilates or desecrates the American Flag.'

"It is incredible to the VFW that legislation of this kind should be necessary," Scerra said. "It is becoming almost commonplace throughout this great Nation to read that certain fringe elements of our society have in some way or other publicly desecrated our Flag. It is believed that because this is our National Flag, a national law should be enacted by the Congress so that there will be uniformity both in the administration of the law and the attachment of penalties for conviction of crimes under the act."

"What is most regrettable," the VFW leader said, "is that defilement of our Flag has been interpreted by other nations and particularly by North Vietnam as a substantial resentment of the American people to the Vietnam war effort in that country. The Flag of the United States is a Federal banner and a Federal concern. Let us guard that concern. We believe that the Congress should act expeditiously to establish penalties as provided in the legislation pending before this committee in order that debasement of the Flag of the United States in the areas of contempt and sedition can no longer be accomplished with impunity."

"VIETNAM AND THE UNITED NATIONS"—AN ADDRESS BY HAROLD E. STASSEN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday night, April 20, the Honorable Harold E. Stassen addressed the Honors Convocation of the University of Maryland. Drawing on his experience at the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 and during the Eisenhower administration, Governor Stassen proposed a course toward peace in Vietnam which emphasizes a comprehensive expansion and strengthening of the United Nations. So that his proposals may be widely read and discussed, I would like to include his speech in the RECORD at this point:

VIETNAM AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Address of Harold E. Stassen to the Honors Convocation at the University of Maryland, Apr. 20, 1967)

Honors Awards Winners, Students, Faculty and friends of the University of Maryland:

As we meet in this Honors Award Convocation, our country is deadlocked in a bitter bloody unending war in Vietnam. The other side in that war is supported by the Communist Governments of Mainland China and of the Soviet Union. General William Westmoreland, the Commanding General of the United States and Allied Forces in Vietnam, stated a week ago that in the way in which he was engaged in fighting it, there was no end in sight to that War.

Nothing will have a more profound effect upon the future lives of the young men and young women who are awarded honors at the University of Maryland tonight than the future course of that Vietnam War and its worldwide implications.

Therefore, in addition to directly joining in the acclaim to each and every student who on this night is honored for special attainment at this great University, it seems to me that I would honor you most if I spoke out earnestly and emphatically of the path of peace in Vietnam and in the world.

In doing so, I speak with respect for those who have different views. I speak with recognition of the sincerity of those who have divergent opinions.

I do not speak as either a dove or a hawk. I do not speak in a partisan sense, as I am mindful thoroughly that the divergence of views cuts across party lines.

Nor do I consider that in speaking I am exercising merely the right of dissent. I consider that I am exercising the right of a free people to endeavor to change the course of their government when they are convinced that it is mistaken!

And I am convinced that the present course of our government in Vietnam is tragically mistaken and must be changed!

In speaking in positive and definite terms about an issue as far-reaching as that in which we are engaged this evening, I know full well the danger of appearing to be arbitrary or seeming to be categorical. Let me simply say with humility that I do not wish to be any of these. I do continue to listen to and read of all other views on Vietnam. I do continue to be willing to meet and discuss or debate the views on Vietnam of any one with different views, whether they be in the Administration or out of it; in my political party or in the other political party.

The correction of this tragic mistake, the turning toward what I feel certain is the path of peace, is so important that the task cannot be approached in superficial terms or with personal preferences.

Permit me also to preface my remarks with a brief reference to the experience of which I speak. In my student days at the University of Minnesota, in my junior year, as I participated in a Convocation such as you are engaged in tonight, I decided that the top priority in my life would be to make a contribution to peace with justice for humanity.

This decision led to many steps through the years, some understood and some not understood.

Out of my continuing study and my experiences, I am certain that the path of peace in Vietnam is marked by three major inseparable parallel courses of action.

First of all, the United States must take an open, creative initiative to modernize and strengthen the United Nations through a rewriting of the Charter, a rewriting which would declare all peoples eligible for membership, whatsoever may be their current

form of government and thereby encompass within the eligibility both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, both Nationalist China on Formosa and the Republic of China on the Mainland, both the Federal Republic of Germany in the West and the Communist Government of East Germany, both North Korea and South Korea.

Your first reaction may be that they are too complex. May I emphasize that there are no simple answers to the whole inter-related matters of the emergence of peoples from Colonialism, at a time when there is a world-wide competition between the systems of modern Russia and Chinese Communism and modern American peoples' capitalism, and in an age of nuclear weapons on both sides that would make a world war a holocaust for all humanity.

Let us take up these three inseparable parallel courses of action of the path of peace in Vietnam in detail.

Let us do so in the form of some of the questions and answers which have arisen in the process of my current advocacy of this path of peace to the Administration and to Senators and Congressmen. I have been asked these questions and have given these responses.

1. Why do you state that you do not believe there can be an American War solution in Vietnam?

Because extensive American War action is self-defeating in that it creates new guerillas and new opposition among the young men of the nation faster than it can possibly lead to the killing of guerrillas and the killing of young soldiers of the opposition.

Vietnam is a territory of approximately the size of the State of New Jersey with 24,000,000 people living within it. Approximately one-half of these are North and approximately one-half are South. This division of the country was established by the French as they ended in 1954 their postwar nine-year endeavor to reassert Colonial administration. The feeling against Colonialism, and the feeling that centers on the color differences, are so deep, and the feeling against bombing on the part of all people is so intense, that our American direct military action in the past two years has built up greater opposition rather than lessened it.

In that modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, a new sound financial base must be established; a new Central Council or Regional Council with weighted voting must be added; improved methods for peaceful solutions need to be brought forward, such as a World Court of Equity, a Board of Arbitration and a Panel of Mediators. The beginnings of a small elite United Nations Police Force must be organized.

Parallel to the initiation of this first course of action, implemented immediately, there must be a change in the United States policies in Vietnam with new orders to quiet down the War; to stop hunter-killer drives through the jungles and over the mountains, to stop the bombing except in direct defense against attack or the imminent threat of attack; to maintain a very powerful military presence in Vietnam, but to do so deliberately with the minimum of casualties for Americans and for the Vietnamese.

The third of the courses of action likewise to be started contemporaneously is an extensive program with highest priority to advance the educational, economic, social and political well-being of the peoples of Vietnam and particularly of the youth of Vietnam, and generally of the less fortunate peoples of the world. The major resources and the great productive potential of our country which will be released by the quieting down of the War in Vietnam would be utilized for these purposes.

I realize full well that these three inseparable parallel courses of action may well at first sound unrealistic to you. Let me assure you that I believe they are realistic and practical and essential.

Our American men in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines have carried on an outstanding courageous performance of duty. They are heroes, and they deserve to be so regarded. They are endeavoring valiantly to carry out the orders to bomb and to seek out and kill the opposing forces.

Furthermore, I recognize the sincerity of purpose of President Johnson and his Administration in changing from the patient advisory, educational and supply role which the United States had from 1954 to 1965, over into direct extensive American military combat. But I point out the difference of results. In ten years under Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower from 1954 to 1964 only one hundred Americans were killed in the entire ten-year period. Vietnamese casualties were also relatively limited. The young men were gradually getting educated and prepared for goverment, a process which the French under Colonialism had not permitted.

When President Johnson changed the orders and moved into direct American military combat and extensive bombing that unfortunate weekend in February 1965, the result was to accelerate the guerilla movement. The further result was to solidify the people of North Vietnam in the supply of their armed forces. Now after more than 8,000 American deaths and many times this number of American casualties and many, many times this number of Vietnamese casualties, South and North, the opposing military forces in South Vietnam are more numerous today than they were in February 1965. More young Vietnamese reach military age each month than the highest claims of enemy killed! This is one indication of the futility of the present course of action.

American military forces have a very important role to play in standing in a defensive posture in South Vietnam to safeguard against any military takeover and to safeguard against any Chinese intervention in Vietnam. But American military might cannot force negotiations. The long resistance to Colonialism, the feeling of color, the cultural background, all combine in a result that every time President Johnson says to the North Vietnamese "you come to the negotiating table or I will bomb you more intensively," he makes it more difficult, if not impossible, for them to come to the negotiating table. In my judgment they will die before they knuckle under to these actions and threats. The American military forces cannot obtain a decisive military victory. The extensive jungles cannot be permanently occupied. The Cambodia haven for the opposition cannot be obliterated. The Communist support cannot be threatened away. The other side can escalate with more missiles and longer range missiles and more guerillas for each escalation of the United States. Even if the United States took the extreme action of completely devastating North Vietnam, a vacuum would be created which in the long term future the Chinese Communists would fill. Certainly this is not a solution of Vietnam!

Our priority aim should be changed! Our priority aim should be to *win the people of Vietnam*, rather than to *win the war in Vietnam!*

2. What is the basis for your feeling that if both Vietnams were to be proposed for membership in the United Nations at this period of history as a part of the modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, and if the United States unilaterally quieted down the War, this could lead to a solution?

My conviction on this is based on my lifelong experiences and studies. As you may know, on behalf of President Eisenhower, I was in charge of the mutual security and foreign operations programs in all countries. Before that, during World War II, as Assistant Chief of Staff for Administration for Admiral William Halsey, I had the responsibility for bringing together all of the various Intelligence Information from the American Commands, including General MacArthur's and from Lord Mountbatten's British Command. It was my duty to see to it that this Intelligence Information in turn reached the Commanders who needed to know within Admiral Halsey's combined fighting forces. At the end of World War II, in the Drafting of the United Nations Charter under appointment by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, I was in direct charge of drafting and negotiating the provisions for trusteeship which related to dependent peoples and mandated territories and Colonial changes. Long before that, in college days, one of my specialties was the study of the Far East. I know something of the peoples, the jungles, the rice paddies, and most of the leaders.

I am convinced that the opportunity to have full status within the United Nations for the peoples of both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and their governments; the parallel quieting down of the War by unconditional decision of the United States; the opportunity for the young men to turn to education and to the development of their country in an economic sense; repeated amnesty offers to the opposing forces; genuine social, economic, and political reforms; will together cause the guerilla forces and the war actions to wither away. This will be the effect whether the leaders of the guerillas and the officials of the government of North Vietnam agree or not. These actions will also cause new leaders to arise who fit these new circumstances, even as President Magsaysay rose in the Philippines during similar policies which we instituted in the Philippines during Presdent Eisenhower's Adminstration.

So long as we continue currently the concept of the 1954 French Agreement that one or the other of the Vietnam governments will take over a United Vietnam, we rivet into the situation an unending bitter bloody struggle.

3. Do you believe in peace at any price?

Certainly not! The United States must continue to be prepared to fight a modern war with all of its devastation, if it becomes necessary to defend freedom, or to defend our national security, or to defend against aggressive war. I served in World War II in active and extensive combat with Admiral Halsey in a number of the major battles and campaigns of the Pacific. My philosophy has not changed. But I do believe that we should be prepared to pay a very large price of patience for peace. We should be prepared to pay a substantial price of economic and educational assistance for peace. We should be prepared to pay an extraordinary price of diplomatic endeavor, of pioneering, of leadership efforts in the United Nations, and of thoughtfulness for the differences of cultures, aspirations, and circumstances of other peoples, all for peace!

We should exercise exceptional moral restraint upon the use of American combat forces in direct military action.

We should recognize the change of the nuclear age in that it is no longer sane to try to solve an international problem by the means of direct combat force. We must continue to be very powerful and very alert but recognize the profound change that since the ultimate use of military force is a nuclear holocaust of mutual devastation, there should be an extraordinary moral restraint upon the first use of military force.

4. Do you consider Communism to be a threat?

Definitely. We must ever be very alert to the threat of Communism, particularly through the dictatorships of states under Communism. Very powerful military force on our part must not only be prepared for the ultimate tragedy which a Third World War

would mean, but we must also be so powerful and alert as to discourage any miscalculation on the part of any Communist dictatorship. Thus our military position should minimize the danger that any opposing force would ever think it could get by with an attack upon the United States.

But the actual change from Communism toward freedom, I am convinced, will not come about through war action. It can only come about through the inherent internal pressure for more freedom on the part of the peoples within the Communist States. I have long held and expressed this view. I suggest that there is increasing evidence in support of it within all of the Eastern European States and within Russia itself.

A sharp confrontation with the Communist dictatorship States leads to the tragedy of war, war with mutual devastation. But patient and powerful defensive resistance, designed to provide the time for the internal evolution of the peoples' desire for freedom; programs aimed at improving the conditions of such peoples' evolution toward freedom; and actual progress in the United States in the true wellbeing of all of our citizens without discrimination; these three combined constitute the foundation for a successful American world policy for the decades ahead.

Time for such peoples' evolution is particularly important now in the instance of China, which relatively is in the early stage of Communist dictatorship. Even now the internal ferment in China, which I had predicted, is becoming evident. Out of this ferment, I am convinced will arise, gradually and powerfully, a reassertion of the individual Chinese desire for freedom, and a persistent demand for the rights of the Chinese family. This process will be facilitated if we open up the windows of communication with China, and if we avoid, skillfully and without appeasement, the sharp aggressive confrontation which would trigger a world war.

I was in the center of the studies and discussions in President Eisenhower's Administration which gave rise to the President's "opening up" proposals at the Summit Meeting in 1955. This "opening up" has been followed through ever since with the extensive reciprocal visits of delegations and exchanges of exhibitions in the years since then. I believe all objective students are now quite well agreed that this "opening up" has been a part of the process by which the evolution toward the individual freedom of the Russian people, and toward a better prospect for peace, has occurred. The strong defensive position of NATO and of the United States; the favorable development of the Marshall Plan and of the European Common Market; the successful Austrian negotiation for sovereignty and independence; the Berlin Food Program for East Germans; and many other steps; were and are a part of the process. But the "opening up" was and is a crucial and indispensable element in the favorable result. May I emphasize that it is a favorable result for the people of Russia as well as for the people of the United States. It is also a favorable result for the people of the other nations of the world. One of the basic facts of the modern space-atomic age is the high degree of true mutual interests of all peoples of all nations.

5. Why do you now advocate universal eligibility for membership in the United Nations?

The developments in the space atomic age seem to me to make it so clear that this is now truly one world. Its problems cannot be resolved without recognizing it as one world. The most intense dangers and difficulties today are those which were left outside of the United Nations; that is to say the divided Germany, the Vietnam situation, and Mainland China.

At the time the original Charter was drafted, it was basically a matter of the nations that had been working together and standing together in World War II forming an organization to continue their quest for peace. As time moved on, former enemy states such as Italy and Japan were taken into membership. But in the most crucial area of the divided states emerging from World War II to wit: Germany, China, Vietnam, and Korea, all these were left outside of the United Nations. I believe that any objective study, any thorough fresh review of the situation and of the best prospects for moving into the next decade without war, will conclude that all of these problems areas should be within the framework of the United Nations. Therefore, all of the peoples should be included within the universal eligibility for membership, whatever may be their current form of government.

6. Explain what you mean by amending the United Nations Charter without a veto; could not, for example, the Nationalist Government of China on Taiwan veto any change in the Charter?

Neither the Nationalist Government of China nor any other one government can arbitrarily veto any amendment in the Charter if that amendment is brought about through the Charter amending convention process as provided in Article 109.

First of all the amending convention can be called without a veto. This requires any seven votes of the Security Council and two-thirds of the Assembly.

Once such a convention is called and convened, it has complete authority in and of itself to amend any portion of the Charter. It can amend Article 109 and Article 23. Such a convention can decide, for example, that for the contemporary period of history both Chinas should be eligible for membership, and neither one should have a permanent seat in the Security Council, and neither one should have the right of vetoing amendments or of any other kind of veto.

In other words, each state in the world in such a convention would have the sanction of its own true position in the world and would not have any arbitrary or legalistic absolute power.

It is quite evident that it would not make much sense to go forward with a revised United Nations Charter unless both the United States and the U.S.S.R. would become members and ratify the revised Charter. But even these great powers would not be entirely immune from the thorough consideration of the views of others. Under extreme circumstances, the rest of the world could move forward without any one major power. The aim, of course, would be, as I have emphasized, to follow the concept that this is one world in the space age and that all peoples should be eligible for membership whatsoever may be their contemporary form of government, and whether or not we approve of that form of government.

The aim would be to establish the improved structure of the organization of the United Nations so that there was a better prospect for the working out of peaceful change, the evolution of increasing freedom, progress in true well being of all peoples, and the growth of improved methods of settling differences between nations without war.

I emphasize that at the time the original United Nations Charter was drafted in 1945, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Senator Tom Connally, and I and others foresaw this need of updating the Charter and specifically provided this means of the amending convention which had not been included in the original Dumbarton Oaks draft. We specifically did not want to permanently freeze the organization. We did not want to stagnate the United Nations for all time with the permanent members that were then emerging from World War II.

7. What other changes would you want to see brought about within the United Nations Charter in such an amending convention, to, as you put it, "modernize and strengthen the organization"?

A. A new method of financing;
B. A new Council of Regional Secretaries;
C. A World Court of Equity;
D. A United Nations Board of Arbitration;
E. A United Nations Panel of Mediators;
F. A United Nations Police Force.

8. What do you mean by a Council of Regional Secretaries?

This would be a new Council which would function between the large Assembly, with its one-vote one-State, and the Security Council, with its veto votes. It would function with weighted voting and its members would be elected through weighted voting within the respective Regions of the World. It would have a number of approximately 11. These Regional Secretaries would meet regularly with the Secretary General. They should be empowered to make recommendations on any matter within the scope of the Charter.

The town hall effect of the Assembly has value and would be continued. But the Assembly cannot be the sole functioning body for the future. Likewise, the Security Council, perhaps with a reduced number of permanent seats, would still function and still have a restraint upon the actual major combat military moves of the United Nations.

But a Council of Regional Secretaries could be an important part of the gradually developing effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and in furthering progress in a comprehensive sense for all humanity.

9. Why do you propose a World Court of Equity, when there already is a World Court?

The present World Court has many limitations in its origin, its emphasis, and in the United States' reservations to it. The greatest need is for the approach to world problems that is comparable to what we know as "equity", and comparable to the original development of the English Equity Courts. It is a procedure that can take into account the totality of facts. It can lead to an amendment of agreements, as well as their interpretation; to a recommended modification of boundaries; as well as the study of old shifting boundaries; to the comprehensive inter-related conditions and requirements for reality and fairness and justice, as well as one specific treaty or documentary interpretation. Equity provides a key to lifting away from past outmoded conditions or injustices without chaos.

With a limited power of enforcement, and a basic procedure of referring its decisions, if necessary, to the United Nations itself, I believe the United States Senate could be convinced to approve membership in such a new World Court of Equity without reservation. Other members of the United Nations would likewise ratify without reservation. This World Court of Equity would then be available as one of the alternative means of reaching peaceful answers to difficult problems in the world such as Kashmir, between India and Pakistan; the Jordan River, between Israel and the Arabian States; and other similar intense problems. It would also be available to lead into the very important new areas of the equities and orderliness of the use of outer space, and the equities and orderliness of the use of the resources under the sea.

10. What type of amended financial support for the United Nations do you suggest?

The best method of strengthening the financial arrangements within the United Nations would be to provide for a small United Nations charge or fee upon all international movements of goods, materials and machinery. A one-percent charge would provide quite an adequate financial base. This provision could be included within the revisions of the Charter, arising out of a Charter-amending session. Since there is a direct relationship between the stability of international relations and the large volume flow of

export and import, there is a certain amount of logic in placing the cost of the maintenance of the United Nations upon this flow of goods, materials and machinery. It is a bit like charging a gas tax for the funds to maintain the highways upon which the automobiles may then operate in increasing numbers and with greater facility.

There is a small but significant precedent for this kind of approach to the financing of the United Nations. In the Suez Canal crisis ten years ago, when the Canal was closed through the sunken ships, the United Nations borrowed the money and issued the contracts to salvage companies to clear out the Canal. Then a United Nations surcharge of five percent was placed upon all ships going through the Canal, and this surcharge was used to pay off the United Nations debt. Complete payment was concluded within a few years time.

Some automatic regular source of revenue paid in by all peoples is an essential part of the modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, and I have not heard of any better proposal than the foregoing.

11. What about your recommendation for a United Nations Police Force?

If strong financing is arranged, a small standing United Nations Police Force in United Nations uniforms, ready to move in promptly in situations of border disputes or instability, could help nip trouble in the bud before it becomes a major matter. Such a United Nations Police Force can fit in with the moving of these differences toward the United Nations Board of Arbitration and the World Court of Equity, rather than toward an intense struggle between military forces in War.

It would be best to recruit the members of this elite Police Force from among the nationals of the smaller states, and limit the percentage of men in the force from any one member state. Through various provisions of this kind, it could be made a truly United Nations Force to psychologically as well as physically advance the potential for peace.

12. What would be the nature of a United Nations Board of Arbitration?

There could be many variations. But the probable makeup would be three individuals from three different member states, none of which had any major direct interest in the contending states in any particular dispute.

Such a United Nations Board of Arbitration would be an additional and important alternative for settling differences without War.

13. How would the United Nations Panel of Mediators function?

This would be another alternative method available for the solution of differences between nations without resort to military force. Through a standing Panel of such mediators there could be more rapid action in moving one of them into a difficult problem, and a more sustained long term attention until solutions are reached.

There would be many parallels to the diverse methods and successful functioning of mediators in labor-management disputes in the United States.

14. Do you agree that you cannot trust the Communist dictators?

Yes, I agree. But I also emphasize that we should always keep in mind both the people and the government in a Communist dictatorship or any other dictatorship state. The people within a dictatorship are members of the same human race as the people in a free and democratic state. They have in large measure the same aspirations and the same human nature. They will develop internal pressures for more individual freedom, for more dignity, and for more economic and educational progress. This pressure from the people has been the basic, modifying force against dictatorships from the earliest beginnings of history. It is very evident that it operates now within the Communist dicatorships. The United States should ever think through its policies in terms of advancing the future wellbeing of all humanity on this earth under God. Within that context it can and will also advance the wellbeing of the people of the United States. But a narrow nationalism, or offensive military moves, or oppressive economic actions, against an entire people caught currently under a Communist dictatorship are, and will continue to be, shortsighted and in error.

15. What do you consider to be the greatest policy problem for the United States?

The tendency to polarize our viewpoint or think only in the two extremes. The most desirable course is usually in between these extremes. Thus in Vietnam, the greatest emphasis has been upon either greater United States military action and escalation, or withdrawal. Both of these in my view are a grave mistake. The maintenance of a presence in Vietnam, but the quieting down of the War, and the bringing forward of the diplomatic alternatives and of the economic, educational and cultural advances is the course that should be followed. I sometimes refer to it as "The Fourth Alternative." It is the path of peace in Vietnam.

These in-between solutions have in the past proved to be right in instance after instance. But to reach such solutions we must resist either one of the polarized extremes with all of their seeming attraction of simplicity, and the emotional advocacy of their sincere partisans. These in-between solutions need to be arrived at with the best available information, plus a sensitivity to the basic moral principles which should guide our nation.

May I close with a call to action. If upon reflection you become convinced that the creative path of peace which I advocate is right; if you conclude that you prefer it over either of the extremes of continued or escalated American war action on the one hand, or withdrawal on the other hand, then I suggest you take one or more of the following steps:

1. Write to the President.
2. Write to your Senators and Congressmen, or better yet, get together a delegation to go to Washington to call on them.
3. Propose resolutions in organizations of which you are a member.

Above all, do not underestimate the impact which you and the members of your generation can have upon the policy of our nation and of the world.

May I express the hope that all of you will decide that during your lifetimes, whatever may be your occupation, you will give some of your time and your energy and your intelligence to this cause of peace.

May I further express the hope that some one or more of the honor students of this night at the University of Maryland will decide to give top priority throughout his or her lifetime to this cause of peace, peace with justice for all humanity on this earth under God.

CONGRESSMAN McCLURE TO CO-SPONSOR WIDNALL-PERCY HOME-OWNERSHIP PLAN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, individual homeownership is a goal sought by most Americans, but one that has eluded a sizable segment of the populace.

The role of Government in this matter has always been under dispute. The late Senator Robert A. Taft, author of one of the first Federal housing bills, justified it this way:

> The object of a housing policy should be to see that there is a housing plan which provides decent shelter and decent housing for all those [American] families . . . It is claimed that private enterprise without any aid from the government can solve the problem. I think that's contradicted by the facts and figures.

Today, however, prosperity is very nearly universal, and one would think that all the Government need do would be to establish an economy in which all who so desire could work and flourish.

But today's economy is "managed." And the housing proposals of the Federal planners range from Government-owned projects that will be tomorrow's slums to the rent supplement program.

Congressman WIDNALL and Senator PERCY have devised an alternative program in which the Federal Government works in partnership with private enterprise and slum residents themselves. Financing of the program comes from the sale of bonds guaranteed for a fee by the Government. Local nonprofit housing associations would be supported in their efforts to rehabilitate or construct housing for sale to families unable to obtain ordinary financing. The Government would pay the difference between the market rate of interest and a lower rate charged to the homebuyer. When a homeowner increases his income to a higher level, he will make repayments into a revolving fund to help other low-income buyers. Prospective buyers are able to reduce the cost of their home by contributing their own labor to its construction.

From a humanitarian standpoint, I regret there is a need for a housing program. From a philosophical standpoint, I regret that we turn once again, hat in hand, to the Federal Treasury. But from a realistic standpoint, I know that the choice narrows down to a rehash of welfare-state failures or the hope of a permanent cure that lies in the Widnall-Percy plan. For this reason, I have decided to cosponsor the Republican proposal.

Recently, a newspaper columnist wrote that this measure was being offered in an attempt to deter the presidential hopes of our former Vice President, and to boost similar ambitions on the part of the bill's chief sponsor. Had I felt the motivation for the bill was anything but a humanitarian one, I would not be endorsing it today, and I would vehemently object to anyone construing my cosponsorship as either a repudiation or an endorsement of any potential candidate.

MUTUAL FUND PROPOSALS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the New York Times editorialized on the currently pending SEC mutual fund industry proposals. One comment from the Times deserves particular attention:

Congressional hearings ought to make clear that mutual funds are not on trial.

How very true that is.

I commend to my colleagues the editorial which follows:

MUTUAL FUND RESPONSIBILITY

After failing to win agreement in direct negotiations with the mutual fund industry, the Securities and Exchange Commission has reluctantly taken its case to Congress. It is asking for approval of reforms designed to give a fairer deal to mutual fund investors.

The industry's refusal to strike a compromise with the S.E.C. is based in part on its belief that there is no real need for reform. It points to its extraordinary growth over the past twenty years as proof that investors are being well served. And it takes the position that the S.E.C.'s proposals to reduce sales charges and management fees and to abolish the "front-end load"—the practice of deducting up to half of initial payments on long-term installment agreements—will cripple the industry and hurt investors.

It is true that the S.E.C. has not established an ironclad economic case for some of its reforms. Yet investors are subject to excessive sales charges; they do not benefit from economies of scale or from price or performance competition, and the industry's high commissions are conducive to high-pressure sales practices. In asking for new safeguards the S.E.C. is not seeking to put efficient mutual funds out of business. Indeed, its recommendations are designed to see to it that mutual funds continue to operate at a profit.

Clearly the future of mutual funds is not at stake. The S.E.C. has in fact testified to their value as a medium for diversifying risk for small investors. But the mutual fund industry has not undertaken to reform itself, nor has it shown the responsibility and maturity that should accompany control over nearly $40 billion in shareholder assets.

The industry hopes that its size and its influence in Congress will serve to maintain the *status quo*. But the needs of the nation's investors and potential investors in mutual funds must also be taken into account. They should not be compelled to pay excessive sales charges or exorbitant management fees. And people who have no reason to buy mutual funds should not be pressured into signing up for them by fast-talking salesmen earning fat commissions.

Congressional hearings ought to make clear that mutual funds are not on trial. But their practices are. It is up to Congress to see that the industry takes a more responsible attitude in dealing with the public.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LIX

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, two former standard bearers of the two great political parties have advocated the elimination of the draft. In 1956, the Democratic candidate, the late Adlai E. Stevenson, spoke out against conscription. Although severely criticized by his opponents, Stevenson said:

I don't see how we can ever get anywhere against the rigid, negative position that we cannot even discuss the matter or even look forward to the time when we can do away with compulsory military service.

In 1964, the Republican Party nominee for President, Senator Barry Goldwater pledged that if elected:

I would do everything in my power to end the draft system altogether in favor of a fully professional military force.

Mr. Speaker, although supporters of abolition of compulsory military service may represent different political parties and opposing philosophies, they are, however, united in their concern for the freedom of the individual in a democratic society. Conscription is an alien institution in American life, and because it is compulsory, it is in direct conflict with our notion of liberty and it should be abolished.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have heard over the last 10 days a number of statements from both sides of the aisle about the possible effect the Republican substitute to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would have on the participation of children from parochial schools. Most of the statements were very general in nature. As a lawyer, I have grave reservations about Mr. QUIE's substitute bill and would like to outline my specific concerns.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

First, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been a success. It has involved children attending parochial schools in many ways: dual enrollment, special evening and weekend classes, and special public school services in parochial schools to name a few. This progress did not come about by chance. The law was carefully designed to meet the church-state problems. We realized that for many years Federal aid to education was thwarted by this issue and a solution was painstakingly devised. Funds are provided to public schools with the specific proviso that public school programs should be extended to all children whether they are in school or are dropouts, or whether they attend public schools or parochial schools.

We thus laid down several guidelines to assure participation of children in parochial schools while at the same time set up restrictions to prevent any unconstitutional practices.

Basically, the law provides:

First. State administration must be consistent with State law.

Second. Funds must not enrich or directly benefit any private schools.

Third. Title and control of all material must remain with the public authority.

Fourth. Materials used by children in private schools must be in use or approved for use in the public schools.

Fifth. Grants are to be made to the local school district. The flexibility built into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was to permit all States to participate even though State laws governing its operation vary greatly over the United States.

STATE CONSTITUTIONS

As we all know, State constitutions and laws vary greatly and in many respects impose stricter limitations in the area of church-state relations than does the U.S. Constitution. Many State constitutions prohibit any aid "direct or indirect" to church-related institutions. All State constitutions go into greater detail than the U.S. Constitution to spell out the line of separation between church and state. The difference is best illustrated by various rulings on providing public transportation for children attending private schools. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), held that such transportation did not violate the first amendment. Since that decision, the highest courts in four States have ruled that public transportation of parochial school children violated their State constitution.

In spite of these greater State constitutional restrictions, the administration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has continued virtually unaffected. Time and again, State attorneys general have ruled that the State constitution does not apply to Federal programs, the entire cost of which is paid for with Federal moneys kept separate from State and local funds.

Two examples of these rulings are as follows:

First. In Nevada where dual enrollment has been ruled to be unconstitutional, the attorney general said that although Nevada law forbids the use of State, county, or municipal funds to benefit any sectarian society, the State may accept and use funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 "providing the moneys are designated as Federal moneys and kept in separate funds."

Second. In New York the attorney general ruled that the constitutional provision which forbids direct or indirect aid forbids dual enrollment even where the program is entirely paid out of Federal funds. He added, however, that no violation would occur "if the entire cost of the program in this State—including administration thereof—is paid out of Federal grants without the use of any State or local property or credit or public money at any stage of the program."

PROBLEMS UNDER H.R. 8983

While I cannot be completely sure States will be unable to participate fully

in the Republican substitute, I am not convinced some of the statutory gloss added to the bill, such as anticommingling provisions, resolves all the issues. The basic concept behind a block grant is contrary to the legal philosophy seen in these State rulings. A block grant is designed to provide general aid to States to operate State, not Federal, programs. Even if this block grant proposal does not reach this end result, it does involve the State to a much greater degree.

There are basic differences between the administrative mechanisms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and those contained in H.R. 8983. Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a school district prepares a proposal based on its allocation of funds provided for in the law. All funds are distributed by the Federal Government and are identifiable as Federal funds. Under the proposed substitute a State department of education has almost total discretion concerning reallocation of funds within a State and would be charged with the responsibility for general administration. Such a program obviously requires substantial State participation. Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is administratively similar to H.R. 8983 but the State law problem was recognized and a provision was made in the law to bypass these State restrictions. The substitute bill has retained this bypass, but only as it relates to provisions for books and equipment.

Other portions of H.R. 8983 raise similar State law problems. For just one example, section 703(1) authorizes grants for programs and projects designed to meet the needs of educationally deprived children, yet there appears no statement that these grants must be limited to *local school* districts. In fact, a contrary implication exists in section 704(a)(6) which gives a local education agency or other applicant denied assistance a right of a hearing before the State educational agency. Does a reading of these sections together mean that a parochial school can request constructional assistance? If this be true, then severe State law questions exist.

In closing, while it may be true, as has been said by many, that there are no church-state impediments in H.R. 8983, I have not been convinced that all these problems have been carefully reviewed and solved. With so much at stake—a multibillion-dollar program that is working well—I cannot support a bill that seemingly has internal inconsistencies and has not been considered and refined by our committee process.

For my colleagues, I am introducing into the RECORD those State constitutional provisions which relate to the church-state issue:

STATE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Article I

Sec. 3. That no religion shall be established by law; that no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect, society, denomination or mode of worship; that no one shall be compelled by law to attend any place of worship; nor to pay any tithes, taxes or other rates for building or repairing any place of worship, or for maintaining any minister or ministry; that no religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this State; and that the civil rights privileges and capacities of any citizen shall not be in any manner affected by his religious principles.

Article IV

Sec. 263. No money raised for the support of public schools shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

Article I

Sec. 4. No law shall be made respectig an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Article VII

Sec. 1. The legislature shall by general law establish and maintain a system of public schools open to all children of the State, and may provide for other public educational institutions. Schools and institutions so established shall be free from sectarian control. No money shall be paid from public funds for the direct benefit of any religious or other private educational institution.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Article II

Sec. 7. The mode of administering an oath, or affirmation, shall be such as shall be most consistent with and binding upon the conscience of the person to whom such oath, or affirmation, may be administered.

SEC. 12. The liberty of conscience secured by the provisions of this Constitution shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise, or instruction, or to the support of any religious establishment. No religious qualification shall be required for any public office or employment, nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror in consequence of his opinion on matters of religion, nor be questioned touching his religious belief in any court of justice to affect the weight of his testimony.

Article IX

Sec. 10. No tax shall be laid or appropriation of public money made in aid of any church, or private or sectarian school, or any public service corporation.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Article II

Sec. 24. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship; or to maintain any ministry against his consent. No human authority can, in any case or manner whatsoever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment, denomination or mode of worship above any other.

Sec. 25. Religion, morality and knowledge being essential to good government, the General Assembly shall enact suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceful enjoyment of its own mode of public workship.

Sec. 26. No religious test shall ever be required of any person as a qualification to vote or hold office, nor shall any person be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious belief; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be guaranteed in this State; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness or juror on account of his opinions on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this State.

Article IV

Sec. 30. Neither the Legislature, nor any county, city and county, township, school district, or other municipal corporation, shall ever make an appropriation, or pay from any public fund whatever, or grant anything to or in aid of any religious sect, church, creed, or sectarian purpose, or help to support or sustain any school, college, university, hospital, or other institution controlled by any religious creed, church, or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of personal property or real estate ever be made by the State, or any city, city and county, town, or other municipal corporation for any religious creed, church, or sectarian purpose whatever; provided, that nothing in this section shall prevent the Legislature granting aid pursuant to Section 22 of this article.

Article IX

Sec. 8. No public money shall ever be appropriated for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools; nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught, or instruction thereon be permitted, directly or indirectly, in any of the common schools of the State.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Article II

Sec. 4. Religious freedom.—That the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever hereafter be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege or capacity, on account of his opinions concerning religion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of the state. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship, religious sect or denomination against his consent. Nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article IX

Sec. 7. Aid to private schools, churches, etc., forbidden.—Neither the general assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian society, or for any sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatsoever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property, ever be made by the state, or any such public corporation, to any church, or for any sectarian purpose.

Sec. 8. Religious test and race discrimination forbidden—Sectarian tenets.—No religious test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as a teacher or

student; and no teacher or student of any such institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatever. No sectarian tenets or doctrines shall ever be taught in the public schools, nor shall any distinction or classification of pupils be made on account of race or color.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Article I

Sec. 3. The exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever be free to all persons in this state; provided, that the right hereby declared and established, shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state.

Sec. 4. No preference shall be given by law to any Christian sect or mode of worship.

Article VII

Sec. 1. It being the duty of all men to worship the Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the Universe, and their right to render that worship, in the mode most consistent with the dictates of their consciences; no person shall by law be compelled to join or support, nor be classed with, or associated to, any congregation, church, or religious association. But every person now belonging to such congregation, church or religious association shall remain a member thereof until he shall have separated himself therefrom, in the manner hereinafter provided. And each and every society or denomination of Christians in this state, shall have and enjoy the same and equal powers, rights and privileges; and shall have power and authority to support and maintain the ministers or teachers of their respective denominations, and to build and repair houses for public worship, by a tax on the members of any such society only, to be laid by a major vote of the legal voters assembled at any society meeting, warned and held according to law, or in any other manner.

Sec. 2. If any person shall choose to separate himself from the society or denomination of Christians to which he may belong, and shall leave a written notice thereof with the clerk of such society, he shall thereupon be no longer liable for any future expenses which may be incurred by said society.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Article I

Sec. 1. Although it is the duty of all men frequently to assemble together for the public worship of Almighty God; and piety and morality, on which the prosperity of communities depends are hereby promoted; yet no man shall or ought to be compelled to attend any religious worship, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of worship, or to the maintenance of any ministry, against his own free will and consent; and no power shall or ought to be vested in or assumed by any magistrate that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control the rights of conscience, in the free exercise of religious worship, nor a preference given by law to any religious societies, denominations, or modes of worship.

Sec. 2. No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office, or public trust, under this State.

Article X

Sec. 3. No portion of any fund existing, or which may hereafter be appropriated, or raised by tax, for educational purposes, shall be appropriated to, or used by, or in aid of any sectarian, church or denominational school; provided, that all real or personal property used for school purposes, where the tuition is free, shall be exempt from taxation and assessment for public purposes.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Declaration of Rights

Sec. 5. Religious freedom; liberty of conscience, etc.—The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall forever be allowed in this State, and no person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of consicence (sic) hereby secured shall not be so constrewed (sic) as to justify licentiousness or practices subversive of, or inconsistent with, the peace or moral safety of the State or society.

Sec. 6. Religious preferences; public aid, etc.—No preference shall be given by law to any church, sect or mode of worship and no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly in aid of any church, sect or religious denomination or in aid of any sectarian institution.

Article XII

Sec. 13. Restriction on use of county or district school funds.—No law shall be enacted authorizing the diversion or the lending of any County or District School Funds, or the appropriation of any part of the permanent or available school Fund to any other than school purposes; nor shall the same, or any part thereof, be appropriated to or used the support of any sectarian school.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Article I

Section I

Paragraph XII. Freedom of conscience. All men have the natural and inalienable right to worship God, each according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no human authority should, in any case, control or interfere with such right of conscience.

Paragraph XIII. Religious opinions; liberty of conscience. No inhabitant of this State shall be molested in person or property, or prohibited from holding any public office or trust, on account of his religious opinions; but the right of liberty of conscience shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State.

Paragraph XIV. Appropriations to churches, sects, etc., forbidden. No money shall ever be taken from the public Treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect, or denomination of religionists, or of any sectarian institution.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

Article I

Sec. 3. No law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peacably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Article IX

Sec. 1. The State shall provide for the establishment, support and control of a statewide system of public schools free from sectarian control, a state university, public libraries and such other educational institutions as may be deemed desirable, including physical facilities therefor. There shall be no segregation in public educational institutions because of race, religion or ancestry; nor shall public funds be appropriated for the support or benefit of any sectarian or private educational institution.

IDAHO STATE CONSTITUTION

Article I

Sec. 4. Guaranty of religious liberty.—The exercise and enjoyment of religious faith and worship shall forever be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege, or capacity on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, or excuse acts of licentiousness or justify polygamous or other pernicious practices, inconsistent with morality or the peace or safety of the state; nor to permit any person, organization, or association to directly or indirectly aid or abet, counsel or advise any person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, or any other crime. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship, religious sect or denomination, or pay tithes against his consent; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship. Bigamy and polygamy are forever prohibited in the state, and the legislature shall provide by law for the punishment of such crimes.

Article IX

Sec. 5. Sectarian appropriations prohibited.—Neither the legislature nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian or religious society, or for any sectarian or religious purpose, or to help support or sustain any school academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church, sectarian or religious denomination whatsoever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property ever be made by the state, or any such public corporation, to any church or for any sectarian or religious purpose.

Sec. 6. Religious test and teaching in school prohibited.—No religious test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as teacher or student; and no teacher or student of any such institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatever. No sectarian or religious tenets or doctrines shall ever be taught in the public schools, nor shall any distinction or classification of pupils be made on account of race or color. No books, papers, tracts or documents of a political, sectarian or denominational character shall be used or introduced in any schools established under the provisions of this article, nor shall any teacher or any district receive any of the public school moneys in which the schools have not been taught in accordance with the provisions of this article.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Article II

Sec. 3. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege or capacity, on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, or justfy practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship against his consent, nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of [religion].

Article VIII

Sec. 3. Neither the General Assembly nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money, or other personal property ever be

made by the State, or any such public corporation, to any church, or for any sectarian purpose.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF INDIANA

Article I

Ses. 2. Right to worship.—All men shall be secured in the natural right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences.

Sec. 3. Freedom of thought.—No law shall, in any case whatever, control the free exercise and enjoyment of religious opinions, or interfere with the rights of conscience.

Sec. 4. No preference to any creed.—No preference shall be given, by law, to any creed, religious society, or mode of worship; and no man shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support, any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent.

Sec. 5. No religious test for office.—No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of trust or profit.

Sec. 6. No money for religious institutions.—No money shall be drawn from the treasury, for the benefit of any religious or theological institution.

Sec. 7. Competency of witness.—No person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness, in consequence of his opinions on matters of religion.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF IOWA

Article I

Sec. 3. The General Assembly shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building or repairing places of worship or the maintenance of any minister, or ministry.

Sec. 4. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office, or public trust, and no person shall be deprived of any of his rights, privileges, or capacities, or disqualified from the performance of any of his public or private duties, or rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity, in consequence of his opinions on the subject of religion; and any part of any judicial proceedings shall have the right to use as a witness, or take the testimony of, any other person not disqualified on account of interest, who may be cognizant of any fact material to the case; and parties to suits may be witnesses, as provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

Bill of Rights

Sec. 7. Religious liberty. The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience shall never be infringed; nor shall any person be compelled to attend or support any form of worship; nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted, nor any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. No religious test or property qualification shall be required for any office of public trust, nor for any vote at any election, nor shall any person be incompetent to testify on account of religious belief.

Article 6

Sec. 8. Nonsectarianism. No religious sect or sects shall ever control any part of the common-school or university fund of the state.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Bill of Rights

That the great and essential principles of liberty and free government may be recognized and established, we declare that:

Sec. 1. Rights of life, liberty, worship, pursuit of safety and happiness, free speech, acquiring and protecting property, peaceable assembly, redress of grievances, bearing arms.

* * * * *

Second: The right of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of their consciences.

* * * * *

Sec. 5. Right of religious freedom. No preference shall ever be given by law to any religious sect, society or denomination; nor to any particular creed, mode of worship or system of ecclesiastical polity; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, to contribute to the erection or maintenance of any such place, or to the salary or support of any minister of religion; nor shall any man be compelled to send his child to any school to which he may be conscientiously opposed; and the civil rights, privileges or capacities of no person shall be taken away, or in anywise diminished or enlarged, on account of his belief or disbelief of any religious tenet, dogma or teaching. No human authority shall, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience.

Sec. 189. School money not to be used for church, sectarian or denominational school. No portion of any fund or tax now existing, or that may hereafter be raised or levied for educational purposes, shall be appropriated to, or used by, or in aid of, any church, sectarian or denominational school.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Article I

Sec. 4. Every person has the natural right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No law shall be passed respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall any preference ever be given to, nor any discrimination made against, any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship.

Article IV

Sec. 8. No money shall ever be taken from the public treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister or teacher thereof, as such, and no preference shall ever be given to, nor any discrimination made against, any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship. No appropriation from the State treasury shall be made for private, charitable or benevolent purposes to any person or community; provided, this shall not apply to the State Asylums for the Insane, and the State Schools for the Deaf and Dumb, and the Blind, and the Charity Hospitals, and public charitable institutions conducted under State authority.

Article XII

Sec. 13. No appropriation of public funds shall be made to any private or sectarian school. The Legislature may enact appropriate legislation to permit institutions of higher learning which receive all or part of their support from the State of Louisiana to engage in interstate and intrastate education agreements with other state governments, agencies of other state governments, institutions of higher learning of other state governments and private institutions of higher learning within or outside state boundaries.

Article XIV

Sec. 15(A)(L). Appointments and promotions, examinations; discrimination. Permanent appointments and promotions in the Classified Civil Service of the State and of cities having a population exceeding two hundred fifty thousand, according to the last preceding decennial census of the United States for which the final report of population returns have been printed, published and distributed by the Director of Census, shall be made only after certification by the appropriate Civil Service Departments pursuant to a general system based upon merit, efficiency, and fitness, under which certificates shall be based on examinations which, so far as practical, shall be competitive, and all employees in the Classified Service shall be competitive, and all employees in the Classified Service shall be employed from those eligible under such certification. No person in the "State" or "City Classified Service," having gained civil service status shall be discriminated against or subjected to any disciplinary action except for cause, and no person in the State or City Classified Service shall be discriminated against or subjected to any disciplinary action for political or religious reasons, and all such persons shall have the right to appeal from such actions.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MAINE AND AMENDMENTS

Article I

Sec. 3. All men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no one shall be hurt, molested or restrained in his person, liberty or estate for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, nor for his religious professions or sentiments, provided he does not disturb the public peace, nor obstruct others in their religious worship;—and all persons demeaning themselves peaceably, as good members of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the laws, and no subordination or preference of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law, nor shall any religious test be required as a qualification for any office or trust, under this state; and all religious societies in this state, whether incorporate or unincorporate, shall at all times have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and contracting with them for their support and maintenance.

THE CONSTITUTION OF MARYLAND DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

Art. 36. That as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to Him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no person ought by any law to be molested in his person or estate, on account of his religious persuasion, or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil or religious rights; nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent, or maintain, or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain, any place of worship, or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness, or juror, on account of his religious belief; provided, he believes in the existence of God, and that under His dispensation such person will be held morally accountable for his acts, and be rewarded or punished therefor either in this world or in the world to come.

Art. 37. That no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this State, other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God; nor shall the Legislature prescribe any other oath of office than the oath prescribed by this Constitution.

Art. 38. That every gift, sale or devise of land to any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or to any Religious Sect, Order or Denomination, or to, or for the support, use or benefit of, or in trust for, any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or any Religious Sect, Order or Denomination; and every gift or sale of goods, or chattels to go in succession, or to take place after the death of the Sellor or Donor, to or for such support, use or benefit of any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or any Religious Sect, Order or De-

nomination, without the prior or subsequent sanction of the Legislature, shall be void; except always, any sale, gift, lease or devise of any quantity of land, not exceeding five acres, for a church, meeting-house, or other house of worship, or parsonage, or for a burying ground, which shall be improved, enjoyed or used only for such purpose; or such sale, gift, lease or devise shall be void. Provided, however, that except insofar as the General Assembly shall hereafter by law otherwise enact, the consent of the Legislature shall not be required to any gift, grant, deed or conveyance executed after the 2nd day of November 1948, or to any devise or bequest contained in the will of any person dying after said 2nd day of November 1948, for any of the purposes hereinabove in this Article mentioned.

Art. VIII, sec. 3. School Fund

The School Fund of the State shall be kept inviolate and appropriated only to the purposes of education.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Declaration of rights

Art. II. It is the right as well as the Duty of all men in society, publickly, (sic) and at stated seasons to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and the preserver of the Universe. And no Subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, Liberty, or Estate, for worshipping GOD in the manner and season most agreeable to the Dictates of his own conscience, or for his religious profession or sentiments; provided he doth not Disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious Worship.—

Art. III. (As amended by Art. XI of the Articles of Amendments) [As the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality; and as these cannot be generally diffused through a Community, but by the institution of the public Worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the Legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several Towns, Parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, to make suitable provision, at their own Expence (sic), for the institution of the Public worship of GOD, and for the support and maintenance of public protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made Voluntarily—And the people of this Commonwealth have also a right to, and do, invest their legislature with authority to enjoin upon all the Subjects an attendance upon the instructions of the public teachers aforesaid, at stated times and seasons, if there be any on whose instructions they can Conscientiously and conveniently attend—provided notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public Teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance.—And all monies, paid by the Subject to the Support of public worship, and of the public teachers aforesaid, shall, if he require it, be uniformly applied to the support of the public teacher or teachers of his own religious sect or denomination, provided there be any on whose instructions he attends; otherwise it may be paid towards the support of the teacher or teachers of the parish or precinct in which the said monies are raised—And every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good Subjects of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the Law: And no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.]

Articles of amendment

Art. XI. "Instead of the Third Article of the Bill of Rights, the following Modification and Amendment thereof is substituted.

As the public workship of GOD and instructions in piety, religion and morality, promote the happiness and prosperity of a people and the security of a Republican Government;—Therefore, the several religious societies of this Commonwealth, whether corporate or unincorporate, at any meeting legally warned and holden for that purpose, shall ever have the right to elect their pastors or religious teachers, to contract with them for their support, to raise money for erecting and repairing houses for public worship, for the maintenance of religious instruction, and for the payment of necessary expenses: And all persons belonging to any religious society shall be taken and held to be members, until they shall file with the Clerk of such Society, a written notice, declaring the dissolution of their membership, and thenceforth shall not be liable for any grant or contract, which may be thereafter made, or entered into by such society:—And all religious sects and denominations demeaning themselves peaceably and as good citizens of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

Art. XLVI. (In place of Article XVIII of the Articles of Amendment of the constitution ratified and adopted May 23, 1855, the following article of amendment, submitted by the constitutional convention was ratified and adopted November 6, 1917.) Article XVIII. Section 1. No law shall be passed prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

Sec. 2. All moneys raised by taxation in the towns and cities for the support of public schools, and all moneys which may be appropriated by the commonwealth for the support of common schools shall be applied to, and expended in, no other schools than those which are conducted according to law, under the order and superintendence of the authorities of the town or city in which the money is expended; and no grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized by the commonwealth or any political division thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any school or institution of learning, whether under public control or otherwise, wherein any denominational doctrine is inculcated, or any other school, or any college, infirmary, hospital, institution, or educational, charitable or religious undertaking which is not publicly owned and under the exclusive control, order and superintendence of public officers or public agents authorized by the commonwealth or federal authority or both, except that appropriations may be made for the maintenance and support of the Soldier's Home in Massachusetts and for free public libraries in any city or town, and to carry out legal obligations, if any, already entered into; and no such grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or society.

Sec. 3. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the commonwealth, or any political division thereof, from paying to privately controlled hospitals, infirmaries, or institutions for the deaf, dumb or blind not more than the ordinary and reasonable compensation for care or support actually rendered or furnished by such hospitals, infirmaries or institutions to such persons as may be in whole or in part unable to support or care for themselves.

Sec. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive any inmate of a publicly controlled reformatory, penal or charitable institution of the opportunity of religious exercises therein of his own faith; but no inmate of such institution shall be compelled to attend religious services or receive religious instruction against his will, or, if a minor, without the consent of his parent or guardian.

Sec. 5. This amendment will not take effect until the October first next succeeding its ratification and adoption by the people.

Article XLVIII

Sec. 2. Excluded Matters.—No measure that relates to religion, religious practices or religious institutions; or to the appointment, qualification, tenure, removal, recall or compensation of judges; or to the reversal of a judicial decision; or to the powers, creation or abolition of courts; or the operation of which is restricted to a particular town, city or other political division or to particular districts or localities of the commonwealth; or that makes a specific appropriation of money from the treasury of the commonwealth, shall be proposed by an initiative petition; but if a law approved by the people is not repealed, the general court shall raise by taxation or otherwise and shall appropriate such money as may be necessary to carry such law into effect.

Neither the eighteenth amendment of the constitution, as approved and ratified to take effect on the first day of October in the year nineteen hundred and eighteen, nor this provision for its protection, shall be the subject of an initiative amendment.

No proposition inconsistent with any one of the following rights of the individual, as at present declared in the declaration of rights, shall be the subject of an initiative or referendum petition: The right to receive compensation for private property appropriated to public use; the right of access to and protection in courts of justice; the right of trial by jury; protection from unreasonable search, unreasonable bail and the law martial; freedom of the press; freedom of speech; freedom of elections; and the right of peaceable assembly.

No part of the constitution specifically excluding any matter from the operation of the popular initiative and referendum shall be the subject of an initiative petition; nor shall this section be the subject of such a petition.

The limitations on the legislative power of the general court in the constitution shall extend to the legislative power of the people as exercised hereunder.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Article I

SEC. 2. No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws; nor shall any person be denied the enjoyment of his civil or political rights or be discriminated against in the exercise thereof because of religion, race, color or national origin. The legislature shall implement this section by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 4. Every person shall be at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, or, against his consent, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teacher of religion. No money shall be appropriated or drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious sect or society, theological or religious seminary; nor shall property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purpose. The civil and political rights, privileges and capacities of no person shall be diminished or enlarged on account of his religious belief.

Article IX

SEC. 11. There shall be established a state school aid fund which shall be used exclusively for aid to school districts, higher edu-

cation and school employees' retirement systems, as provided by law. One-half of all taxes imposed on retailers on taxable sales at retail tangible personal property, and other tax revenues provided by law, shall be dedicated to this fund. Payments from this fund shall be made in full on a scheduled basis, as provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Article I

SEC. 16. The enumeration of rights in this constitution shall not be construed to deny or impair others retained by and inherent in the people. The right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed, nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any religious or ecclesiastical ministry, against his consent; nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State, nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious societies, or religious or theological seminaries.

Sec. 17. No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the State. No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification of any voter at any election in this State; nor shall any person be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequency of his opinion upon the subject of religion.

Article VIII

Sec. 3. The legislature shall make such provisions, by taxation or otherwise, as, with the income arising from the school fund, will secure a thorough and efficient system of public schools in each township in the State.

But in no case shall the moneys derived as aforesaid, or any portion thereof, or any public moneys or property, be appropriated or used for the support of schools, wherein the distinctive doctrines, creeds or tenets of any particular Christian or other religious sect are promulgated or taught.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Article 3

Sec. 18. No religious tests as a qualification for office shall be required; and no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect or mode of worship; but the free enjoyment of all religious sentiments and the different modes of worship shall be held sacred. The rights hereby secured shall not be construed to justify acts of licentiousness injurious to morals or dangerous to the peace and safety of the state, or to exclude the Holy Bible from use in any public school of this state.

Article 8

Sec. 208. No religious or other sect or sects shall ever control any part of the school or other educational funds of this state; nor shall any funds be appropriated toward the support of any sectarian school, or to any school that at the time of receiving such appropriations is not conducted as a free school.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Article I

Sec. 5. Religious freedom—liberty of conscience and belief—limitations.—That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worshop Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no person shall, on account of his religious persuasion or belief, be rendered ineligible to any public office of trust or profit in this state, be disqualified from testifying or serving as a juror, or be molested in his person or estate; but this section shall not be construed to excuse acts of licentiousness, nor to justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of the state, or with the rights of others.

Sec. 6. Practice and support of religion not compulsory—contracts therefor enforcible.—That no person can be compelled to erect, support or attend any place or system of worship, or to maintain or support any priest, minister, preacher or teacher of any sect, church, creed or denomination of religion; but if any person shall voluntarily make a contract for any such object, he shall be held to the performance of the same.

Sec. 7. Public aid for religious purposes—preference and discriminations on religious grounds.—That no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister or teacher thereof, as such; and that no preference shall be given to nor any discrimination made against any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship.

Article IX

Sec. 8. Prohibition of public aid for religious purposes and institutions.—Neither the general assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other municipal corporation, shall ever make an appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any religious creed, church or sectarian purpose, or to help to support or sustain any private or public school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other institution of learning controlled by any religious creed, church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation or personal property or real estate ever be made by the state, or any county, city, town, or other municipal corporation, for any religious creed, church, or sectarian purpose whatever.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

Article III

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever hereafter be guaranteed, and no person shall be denied any civil or political right or privilege on account of his opinions concerning religion, but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, by bigamous or polygamous marriage, or otherwise, or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace, or safety of the state, or opposed to the civil authority thereof, or of the United States. No person shall be required to attend any place of worship or support any ministry, religious sect, or denomination, against his consent; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article V

Sec. 35. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, nor to any denomination or sectarian institution or association.

Article XI

Sec. 8. Neither the legislative assembly, nor any county, city, town, or school district, or other public corporations, shall ever make directly or indirectly any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, or make any grant of lands or other property in aid of any chuch, or for any sectarian purpose, or to aid in the support of any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other literary, scientific institution, controlled in whole or in part by any church, sect or denomination whatever.

Sec. 9. No religious or partisan test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as teacher or student; nor shall attendance be required at any religious service whatever, nor shall any sectarian tenets be taught in any public educational institution of the state; nor shall any person be debarred admission to any of the collegiate departments of the university on account of sex.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Article I

Sec. 4. All persons have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. No person shall be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship against his consent, and no preference shall be given by law to any religious society, nor shall any interference with the rights of conscience be permitted. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for office, nor shall any person be incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious beliefs; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths and affirmations. Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction.

Article VII

Sec. 11. No sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public funds set apart for educational purposes, nor shall the state accept any grant, conveyance, or bequest of money, lands or other property to be used for sectarian purposes. Neither the State Legislature nor any county, city or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation from any public fund, or grant any public land in aid of any sectarian or denominational school or college, or any educational institution which is not exclusively owned and controlled by the state or a governmental subdivision thereof. No religious test or qualification shall be required of teacher or student, for admission to or continuance in any public school or educational institution supported in whole or in part by public taxation.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this state; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his opinions on matters of his religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article XI

Sec. 2. The legislature shall provide for a uniform system of common schools, by which a school shall be established and maintained in each school district at least six months in every year, and any school district at least six months in every year, and any school district which shall allow instruction of a sectarian character therein may be deprived of its proportion of the interest of the public school fund during such neglect or infraction, and the legislature may pass such laws as will tend to secure a general attendance of the children in each school district upon said public schools.

Sec. 9. No sectarian instruction shall be imparted or tolerated in any school or university that may be established under the constitution.

Sec. 10. No public funds of any kind or

character whatever, state, county, or municipal, shall be used for sectarian purposes.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Part first

Art. 5th. Every individual has a natural and unalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and reason; and no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession, sentiments, or persuasion; provided he doth not disturb the public peace or disturb others in their religous worship.

Art. 6th. As morality and piety, rightly grounded on evangelical principles, will give the best and greatest security to government, and will lay, in the hearts of men, the strongest obligation to due subjection; and as the knowledge of these is most likely to be propagated through a society, by the institution of the public worship of the Deity, and of public instruction in morality and religion; therefore, to promote these important purposes, the people of this state have a right to empower, and do hereby fully empower, the legislature, to authorize, from time to time, the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies, within this state, to make adequate provision, at their own expense, for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality:

Provided notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their own public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance. And no person, of any one particular religious sect or denomination, shall ever be compelled to pay towards the support of the teacher or teachers of another persuasion, sect, or denomination.

And every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves quietly, and as good subjects of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another, shall ever be established by law.

Art. 6th. And nothing herein shall be understood to affect any former contracts made for the support of the ministry; but all such contracts shall remain, and be in the same states as if this constitution had not been made.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Article I

Sec. 3. No person shall be deprived of the inestimable privilege of worshiping Almighty God in a manner agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; nor under any pretence whatever be compelled to attend any place of worship contrary to his faith and judgment; nor shall any person be obliged to pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building or repairing any church or churches, place or places of worship, or for the maintenance of any minister or ministry, contrary to what he believes to be right or has deliberately and voluntarily engaged to perform.

Sec. 4. There shall be no establishment of one religious sect in preference to another; no religious or racial test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust.

Sec. 5. No person shall be denied the enjoyment of any civil or military right, nor be discriminated against in the exercise of any civil or military right, nor be segregated in the militia or in the public schools, because of religious principles, race, color, ancestry or national origin.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Article II

Sec. 11. Every man shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no person shall ever be molested or denied any civil or political right or privilege on account of his religious opinion or mode of religious worship. No person shall be required to attend any place of worship or support any religious sect or denomination; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article IV

Sec. 31. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, educational or other benevolent purposes to any person, corporation, association, institution or community, not under the absolute control of the state, but the legislature may, in its discretion, make appropriations for the charitable institutions and hospitals, for the maintenance of which annual appropriations were made by legislative assembly of nineteen hundred and nine.

Article XII

Sec. 3. The schools, colleges, universities and other educational institutions provided for by this Constitution shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted to the State by Congress, or any other funds appropriated, levied or collected for educational purposes, shall be used for the support of any sectarian, denominational or private school, college or university.

Sec. 9. No religious test shall ever be required as a condition of admission into the public schools or any educational institution of this State, either as a teacher or student and no teacher or students of such school or institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatsoever.

NEW YORK STATE CONSTITUTION

Article I

Sec. 3. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this state to all mankind; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his opinions on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article XI

Sec. 4. Neither the state nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used; directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection, of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught, but the legislature may provide for the transportation of children to and from any school or institution of learning.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall be forever guaranteed in this state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness or juror on account of his opinion on matters of religious beliefs; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article VIII

Sec. 147. A high degree of intelligence, patriotism, integrity, and morality on the part of every voter in a government by the people being necessary in order to insure the continuance of that government and the prosperity and happiness of the people, the legislative assembly shall make provision for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of the State of North Dakota and free from sectarian control. This legislative requirement shall be irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of North Dakota.

Sec. 152. All colleges, universities, and other educational institutions, for the support of which lands have been granted to this state, or which are supported by a public tax, shall remain under the absolute and exclusive control of the state. No money raised for the support of the public schools of the state shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school.

Article XVI

Sec. 203. First. Perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of this state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF OHIO

Article I

Sec. 7. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or maintain any form of worship, against his consent; and no preference shall be given, by law, to any religious society; nor shall any interference with the rights of conscience be permitted. No religious test shall be required, as a qualification for office, nor shall any person be incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious belief; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths and affirmations. Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to pass suitable laws, to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction.

Article VI

Sec. 2. The General Assembly shall make such provisions, by taxation, or otherwise, as, with the income arising from the school trust fund, will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools through and efficient system of common schools throughout the State; but, no religious or other sect, or sects, shall ever have any exclusive right to, or control of, any part of the school funds in this State.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Article I

Sec. 2. Religious liberty—Polygamous or plural marriages.—Perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of the State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; and no religious test shall be required for the exercise of civil or political rights. Polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited.

Sec. 5. Public schools—Separate schools.—Provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all the children of the State and free from sectarian control; and said schools shall always be conducted in English; provided, that nothing herein shall preclude the teaching of other languages in said public schools * * * etc. further, that this shall not be construed to prevent the establishment and maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children.

Article II

Sec. 5. Public money or property—Use for sectarian purposes.—No public money or

property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, or used directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary, or sectarian institution as such.

OREGON

CONSTITUTION OF OREGON

Article I

Sec. 2. Freedom of worship. All men shall be secure in the Natural right, to worship Almighty God according to dictates of their own consciences.—

Sec. 3. Freedom of religious opinion. No law shall in any case whatever control the free exercise, and enjoyment of religeous (sic) opinions, or interfere with the rights of conscience.—

Sec. 4. No religious qualification for office. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of trust or profit.

Sec. 5. No money to be appropriated for religion. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any religious (sic), or theological institution, nor shall any money be appropriated for the payment of any religeous (sic) services in either house of the Legislative Assembly.—

Sec. 6. No religious test for witnesses or jurors. No person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness, or juror in consequence of his opinions on matters of religeon (sic); nor be questioned in any Court of Justice touching his religeous (sic) belief to affect the weight of his testimony.—

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Article I

Sec. 3. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship.

Sec. 4. No person who acknowledges the being of a God and a future state of rewards and punishments shall, on account of his religious sentiments, be disqualified to hold any office or place of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

Article III

Sec. 17. No appropriation shall be made to any charitable or educational institution not under the absolute control of the Commonwealth, other than normal schools established by law for the professional training of teachers for the public schools of the State except by a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each House.

Sec. 18. No appropriations shall be made for charitable, educational or benevolent purposes to any person or community nor to any denominational and sectarian institution, corporation, or association: Provided, that appropriations may be made for pensions or gratuities for military service and to blind persons twenty-one years of age and upwards, and for assistance to mothers having dependent children and to aged persons without adequate means of support, and in the form of scholarship grants or loans for higher educational purposes shall be given to persons enrolled in a theological seminary or school of theology.

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Article II, Bill of Rights

Sec. 3. No law shall be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. There shall be complete separation of church and state.

Sec. 5. * * * There shall be a system of free and wholly nonsectarian public education * * *. No public property or public funds shall be used for the support of schools or educational institutions other than those of the state. Nothing contained in this provision shall prevent the state from furnishing to any child noneducational services established by law for the protection or welfare of children.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Article I

Sec. 3. Freedom of religion.—Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free; and all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness; and whereas a principal object of our venerable ancestors, in their migration to this country and their settlement of this state, was, as they expressed it, to hold forth a lively experiment, that a flourishing civil state may stand and be best maintained with full liberty in religious concernments; we, therefore, declare that no man shall be compelled to frequent or to support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatever, except in fulfillment of his own voluntary contract; nor enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods; nor disqualified from holding any office; nor otherwise suffer on account of his religious belief; and that every man shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and to profess and by argument to maintain his opinion in matters of religion; and that same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect his civil capacity.

CONSTITUTION OF STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Article I

Sec. 4. Religious worship—freedom of speech—petition.—The General Assembly shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government or any department thereof for a redress of grievances.

Article XI

Sec. 9. Property or credit of State shall not benefit sectarian institutions.—The property or credit of the State of South Carolina, or of any county, city, town, township, school district, or other subdivision of the said State, or any public money, from whatever source derived, shall not, by gift, donation, loan, contract, appropriation, or otherwise, be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance of any college, school, hospital, orphan house, or other institution, society or organization, of whatever kind, which is wholly or in part under the direction or control of any church or of any religious or sectarian denomination, society or organization.

Article XVII

Sec. 4. Supreme Being.—No person who denies the existence of a Supreme Being shall hold any office under this Constitution (Note: Cf. Torcaso v. Watkins, (1961) 367 U.S. 488)

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Article VI

Sec. 3. The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience shall never be infringed. No person shall be denied any civil or political rights privilege or position on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse licentiousness, the invasion of the rights of others, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the state.

No person shall be compelled to attend or support any ministry or place of worship against his consent nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. No money or property of the state shall be given or appropriated for the benefit of any sectarian or religious society or institution.

Article VIII

Sec. 16. No appropriation of lands, money or other property or credits to aid any sectarian school shall ever be made by the state, or any county or municipality within the state, nor shall the state or any county or municipality within the state accept any grant, conveyance, gift or bequest of lands, money or other property to be used for sectarian purposes, and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution aided or supported by the state.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Article I

Sec. 3. Right of worship free.—That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or mode of worship.

Sec. 4. No religious or political test.—That no political or religious test, other than an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and of this State, shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this state.

Article IX

Sec. 1. Ineligibility of ministers and priests to seats in legislature—Whereas Ministers of the Gospel are by their profession, dedicated to God and the care of souls, and ought not to be diverted from the great duties of their functions; therefore, no Minister of the Gospel, or priest of any denomination whatever, shall be eligible to a seat in either House of the Legislature.

Sec. 2. No atheist or disbeliever shall hold a civil office.—No person who denies the being of God, or a future state of rewards and punishments, shall hold any office in the civil department of this State.

(Note: Cf. Torcaso v Watkins, (1961) 367 U.S. 488)

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

Article I

Sec. 4. There Shall Be No Religious Test for Office.—No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office, or public trust, in this State; nor shall anyone be excluded from holding office on account of his religious sentiments, provided he acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Being.

Sec. 5. How Oaths Shall Be Administered.—No person shall be disqualified to give evidence in any of the Courts of this State on account of his religious opinions, or for the want of any religious belief, but all oaths or affirmations shall be administered in the mode most binding upon the conscience, and shall be taken subject to the pains and penalties of perjury.

Sec. 6. Freedom in Religious Worship Guaranteed.—All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. No man shall be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent. No human authority ought, in any case whatever, to control or interfere with the rights of conscience in matters of religion, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious society or mode of worship. But it shall be the duty of the Legislature to pass such laws as may be necessary to protect equally every religious denomination in

the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship.

Sec. 7. No Appropriation for Sectarian Purposes.—No money shall be appropriated, or drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any sect, or religious society, theological or religious seminary, nor shall property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purposes.

Article VII

Sec. 5. Permanent School Fund; Interest; Alienation; Sectarian Schools.—The principal of all bonds and other funds, and the principal arising from the sale of the lands herein before set apart to said school fund, shall be the permanent school fund, and all the interest derivable therefore and the taxes herein authorized and levied shall be the available school fund. The available school fund shall be applied annually to the support of the public free schools. And no law shall ever be enacted appropriating any part of the permanent or available school fund to any other purpose whatever; nor shall the same or any part thereof ever be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school; and the available school fund herein provided shall be distributed to the several counties according to their scholastic population and applied in such manner as may be provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF UTAH

Article I

Sec. 4. The rights of conscience shall never be infringed. The State shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of public trust for any vote at any election; nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror on account of religious belief or the absence thereof. There shall be no union of Church and State, nor shall any church dominate the State or interfere with its functions. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or for the support of any ecclesiastical establishment. No property qualification shall be required of any person to vote, or hold office, except as provided in this Constitution.

Article III

Ordinance

First:—Perfect toleration of religious sentiment is guaranteed. No inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; but polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited.

Fourth:—The Legislature shall make laws for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of the State and be free from sectarian control.

Article X

Sec. 1. The Legislature shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of a uniform system of public schools, which shall be open to all children of the State, and be free from sectarian control.

Sec. 12. Neither religious nor partisan tests or qualification shall be required of any person as a condition of admission, as teacher or student, into any public educational institution of the State.

Sec. 13. Neither the Legislature nor any county, city, town, school district or other public corporation, shall make any appropriation to aid in the support of any school, seminary, academy, college, university or other institution, controlled in whole, or in part, by any church, sect or denomination whatever.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF VERMONT

Chapter I

Art. 3rd. That all men have a natural and unalienable right, to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences and understandings, as in their opinion shall be regulated by the word of God: and that no man ought to, or of right can be compelled to attend any religious worship, or erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any minister, contrary to the dictates of his conscience, nor can any man be justly deprived or abridged of any civil right as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments, or peculia(r) mode of religious worship; and that no authority can, or ought to be vested in, or assumed by, any power whatever, that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control the rights of conscience, in the free exercise of religious worship. Nevertheless, every sect or denomination of christians ought to observe the sabbath or Lord's day, and keep up some sort of religious worship, which to them shall seem most agreeable to the revealed will of God.

Chapter II

Sec. 64. Laws for the encouragement of virtue and prevention of vice and immorality, ought to be constantly kept in force, and duly executed; and a competent number of schools ought to be maintained in each town unless the general assembly permits other provisions for the convenient instruction of youth. All religious societies, or bodies of men that may be united or incorporated for the advancement of religion and learning, or for other pious and charitable purposes, shall be encouraged and protected in the enjoyment of the privileges, immunities, and estates, which they in justice ought to enjoy, under such regulations as the General Assembly of this State shall direct.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Article I

Sec. 16. Religious freedom.—That religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forebearance, love and charity toward each other.

Article IV

Sec. 58. Prohibitions on General Assembly as to suspension of writ of habeas corpus, and enactment of laws referring to religion and other laws.— * * * No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry, whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect, their civil capacities. And the General Assembly shall not prescribe any religious test whatever, or confer any peculiar privileges or advantages on any sect or denomination, or pass any law requirinlg or authorizing any religious society, or the people of any district within this State; to levy on themselves, or others, any tax for the erection or repair of any house of public worship, or for the support of any church or ministry; but it shall be left free to every person to select his religious instructor, and to make for his support such private contract as he shall please.

Article IX

Sec. 141. State appropriations prohibited to schools or institutions of learning not owned or exclusively controlled by the State or some subdivision thereof; exceptions to rule.—No appropriation of public funds shall be made to any school or institution of learning not owned or exclusively controlled by the State or some political subdivision thereof; provided, first, that the General Assembly may, and the governing bodies of the several counties, cities, and town may, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by the General Assembly, appropriate funds for educational purposes which may be expended in furtherance of elementary, secondary, collegiate or graduate education of Virginia students in public and nonsectarian private schools and institutions of learning, in addition to those owned or exclusively controlled by the State or any such county, city or town; second, that the General Assembly may appropriate funds to an agency, or to a school or institution of learning owned or controlled by an agency, created and established by two or more States under a joint agreement to which this State is a party for the purpose of providing educational facilities for the citizens of the several States joining in such agreement; third, that counties, cities, towns and districts may make appropriations to nonsectarian schools of manual, industrial or technical training and also to any school or institution of learning owned or exclusively controlled by such county, city, town or school district.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Article I

Sec. 11. Religious Freedom—Absolute freedom of conscience in all matters of religious sentiment, belief and worship, shall be guaranteed to every individual, and no one shall be molested or disturbed in person or property on account of religion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or the support of any religious establishment: Provided, however, That this article shall not be so construed as to forbid the employment by the state of a chaplain for such of the state custodial, correctional and mental institutions as in the discretion of the legislature may seem justified. No religious qualification shall be required for any public office or employment, nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror, in consequence of his opinion on matters of religion, nor be questioned in any court of justice touching his religious belief to affect the weight of his testimony.

Article XXVI

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured and that no inhabitant of this state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Article III

Sec. 15. No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatsoever; nor shall any man be enforced, restrained, molested or burthened, in his body or goods or otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief, but all men shall be free to profess, and, by argument, to maintain their opinions in matters of religion; and the same shall, in no wise, affect, diminish or enlarge their civil capacities; and the legislature shall not prescribe any religious test whatever, or confer any peculiar privileges or advantages on any sect or denomination, or pass any law requiring or authorizing any religious society, or the people of any district within this State, to levy on themselves, or others, any tax for the erection or repair of any house for public worship, or for the support of any church or ministry, but it shall be left free for every person to select his religious instructor, and to make for his support such private contract as he shall please.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Article I

Sec. 18. The right of every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed; nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; nor shall any control of, or interference with, the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship; nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of religious societies or religious or theological seminaries.

Sec. 19. No religious tests shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequence of his opinions on the subject of religion.

Article X

Sec. 3. The legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of district schools which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable; and such schools shall be free and without charge for tuition to all children between the ages of four and twenty years; and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed therein.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

Article I

Sec. 18. Religious liberty. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall be forever guaranteed in this state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to hold any office of trust or profit, or to serve as a witness or juror, because of his opinion on any matter of religious belief whatever; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the state.

Sec. 19. Appropriations for religion prohibited. No money of the state shall ever be given or appropriated to any sectarian or religious society or institution.

Article III

Sec. 36. Prohibited appropriations. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, nor to any denomination or sectarian institution or association.

Article VII

Sec. 12. Sectarianism prohibited. No sectarian instruction, qualifications or tests shall be imparted, exacted, applied or in any manner tolerated in the schools of any grade or character controlled by the state, nor shall attendance be required at any religious service therein, nor shall any sectarian tenets or doctrines be taught or favored in any public school or institution that may be established under this constitution.

VETERANS' VIEWS ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in January 1966 and again in January of this year I directed that a survey be made of veterans discharged from general hospitals operated by the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. The purpose of this survey was to obtain a further insight into the quality of medical care provided in VA hospitals and from the point of view of the veteran who received such care. The committee is gratified to learn, through these two surveys, that almost 98 percent of the veterans indicated that in general they received good hospital care. The questionnaire was received by 21,462 veterans and 7,425 of those responded when the survey was ended on March 13. Each of the general hospitals was instructed to distribute the questionnaire to the first 200 patients discharged during the period and to have the patient complete the questionnaire and mail it after leaving the hospital. The complete survey is printed as House Committee Print 64. A summary of the survey is shown by the tables which follow:

Summary of 1967 survey, overall and by each VA general hospital

[Asterisk (*) denotes favorable response]

Question	Total responses	Number of respondents		Percent yes or no	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
1. (a) Have you ever been a patient in a VA hospital before?	6,966	5,171	1,795	74.2	25.8
(b) If "Yes," in this hospital?	4,990	4,108	882	82.3	17.7
2. Did the admitting doctor interview you in a friendly and understanding manner?	7,206	*6,959	247	*96.6	3.4
3. About your room—					
(a) Was it attractive?	6,929	*6,614	315	*95.5	4.5
(b) Was it clean when you arrived?	7,211	*7,088	123	*98.3	1.7
(c) Was it ventilated?	7,152	*6,689	463	*93.5	6.5
(d) Was it well lighted?	7,194	*7,081	113	*98.4	1.6
(e) Was your bed comfortable?	7,204	*6,998	206	*97.1	2.9
4. About your comfort—					
(a) Were you annoyed by noises?	6,800	922	*5,878	13.6	*86.4
If "Yes," was this due to—					
(1) Visitors?		273			
(2) Roommate?		544			
(3) Equipment?		401			
(4) Hospital personnel?		472			
(5) Radio or TV sets?		459			
(b) Were you annoyed by so-called hospital odors?	7,226	286	*6,940	4.0	*96.0
(c) Were you awakened too early in the morning?	7,176	840	*6,336	11.7	*88.3
(d) Were Were hospital routines arranged so you could generally get sufficient rest?	7,198	*6,557	641	*91.1	8.9
(e) Were there other patients in your room?	6,995	6,288	707	89.9	10.1
(1) If "Yes," did they disturb you?	6,288	453	*5,835	7.2	*92.8
5. About your visitors—					
(a) Were you satisfied with visiting hours?	7,222	*7,088	134	*98.1	1.9
(b) Did your visitors receive courteous treatment from hospital personnel?	7,144	*6,960	154	*97.8	2.2
6. Were hospital rules and schedules adequately explained to you	7,260	*6,860	400	*94.5	5.5
7. Were tests and treatments explained to you so that you understood what was happening?	7,218	*6,541	677	*90.6	9.4
8. Before being discharged, were you instructed how to care for yourself at home?	7,241	*6,538	703	*90.3	9.7
9. Do you feel the nurses were—					
(a) Skilled in giving you personal care?	7,235	*7,133	102	*98.6	1.4
(b) Interested in you as a person?	6,847	*6,477	370	*94.5	5.4
(c) Prompt in doing things for you?	6,935	*6,626	309	*95.5	4.5
10. Did you have as much nursing care as needed?	7,234	*7,019	215	*97.0	3.0
11. Did the following give you friendly efficient service—					
(a) Doctors?	7,231	*6,974	257	*96.4	3.6
(b) Dentists?	6,123	*5,794	329	*94.6	5.4
(c) Technicians who drew blood?	7,135	*7,063	72	*99.0	1.0
(d) Technicians who took X-rays?	7,112	*7,020	92	*98.7	1.3
(e) Nursing attendants?	7,115	*6,938	177	*97.5	2.5
12. Housekeeping:					
(a) Was room cleaned daily?	7,285	*7,043	242	*96.7	3.3
(b) Were cleaning persons considerate of you?	7,214	*7,085	129	*98.2	1.8
(c) Was a good cleaning job done?	7,180	*6,849	331	*96.5	4.6
13. In regard to food and considering whether or not you were on special diet—					
(a) Were the servings adequate?	7,219	*6,964	255	*96.5	3.5
(b) Was the hot portion of the meal served hot?	7,102	*6,428	674	*90.5	9.5
(c) Were the meals attractively served?	7,193	*6,943	250	*96.5	3.5
(d) Did you like the coffee?	6,747	*5,939	808	*88.0	12.0
14. In general, do you feel you had good hospital care?	7,172	*7,007	165	*97.7	2.3
15. Did you receive surgery?	7,207	3,091	4,116	42.9	57.1

Veterans' views on medical care in VA hospitals

Total answers to all questions:
- Number of favorable answers — 222,495
- Number of unfavorable answers — 11,473
- Percent favorable answers — 95.1

Physician care questions 2, 7, 8, 11(*a*):
- Number of favorable answers — 27,012
- Number of unfavorable answers — 1,884
- Percent favorable answers — 93.5

Nursing care questions 9(*a*) to 9(*c*), 10:
- Number of favorable answers — 27,255
- Number of unfavorable answers — 996
- Percent favorable answers — 96.5

Dietetic service questions 13(*a*) to 13(*d*):
- Number of favorable answers — 26,274
- Number of unfavorable answers — 1,987
- Percent favorable answers — 93.0

Housekeeping questions 3(*a*) to 3(*e*), 12(*a*) to 12(*c*), 4(*b*):
- Number of favorable answers — 62,387
- Number of unfavorable answers — 2,208
- Percent favorable answers — 96.6

General hospital management questions 4(*a*), 4(*c*), 4(*d*), 4(*e*)(1), 5(*a*), (5*b*), 6, and 14:
- Number of favorable answers — 52,752
- Number of unfavorable answers — 3,728
- Percent favorable answers — 93.4

Percent of favorable responses to VA hospital care received by combination groups, comparison between 1966 and 1967 surveys

General hospitals	All questions		Physician care		Nursing care		Dietetics		Housekeeping		Hospital management		General attitude	
	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966
Total	95.1	95.0	93.5	92.9	96.5	96.3	92.0	93.4	96.6	96.5	93.4	93.5	97.7	97.6
Albany, N.Y.	91.5	94.3	87.5	89.4	91.8	96.8	86.9	89.9	94.5	96.2	89.1	94.2	93.8	98.2
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	95.2	95.8	94.6	93.5	98.2	98.5	93.0	94.2	96.9	97.4	92.2	94.1	98.8	98.5
Alexandria, La.	97.5	96.6	98.8	94.4	98.4	97.3	92.3	91.7	99.1	99.4	96.3	96.0	100.0	100.0
Altoona, Pa.	94.7	92.6	94.9	90.4	96.0	96.2	93.5	84.6	95.7	94.3	92.4	92.6	97.7	91.2
Amarillo, Tex.	93.8	92.9	89.8	89.7	95.7	91.4	92.7	89.7	96.2	95.5	90.1	90.9	92.9	93.3
Ann Arbor, Mich.	94.8	94.4	96.1	94.9	96.9	95.2	93.5	92.3	95.0	94.7	91.4	92.8	96.8	100.0
Atlanta, Ga.	96.9	96.7	97.6	97.6	98.4	97.6	97.2	96.7	97.2	95.9	93.9	95.4	98.4	100.0
Augusta, Ga.	93.4	97.5	89.6	97.7	97.3	96.6	96.6	95.3	94.7	99.0	89.3	96.0	89.7	100.0
Baltimore, Md.	95.6	(1)	93.8	(1)	98.9	(1)	92.0	(1)	97.7	(1)	94.1	(1)	97.7	(1)
Batavia, N.Y.	96.8	95.1	100.0	93.2	99.2	97.4	88.7	90.4	97.9	97.4	97.1	92.6	100.0	100.0
Bath, N.Y.	96.9	95.0	97.3	95.7	100.0	97.1	91.5	90.8	97.2	95.8	96.1	93.4	100.0	100.0
Bay Pines, Fla.	94.4	92.4	93.9	87.0	94.8	94.7	94.4	93.1	94.5	93.6	92.8	90.1	97.3	100.0
Beckley, W.Va.	96.2	96.7	90.9	89.3	96.6	98.5	97.7	100.0	96.9	98.8	96.5	96.6	95.5	91.9
Big Spring, Tex.	95.5	91.4	85.3	79.7	94.5	91.0	95.7	95.1	99.0	95.1	96.3	89.1	95.2	84.8
Biloxi, Miss.	93.1	96.7	91.3	95.9	90.7	97.1	88.5	95.9	96.8	99.2	90.4	93.9	97.4	97.7
Birmingham, Ala.	95.0	94.3	95.9	94.7	94.4	94.7	95.7	92.6	96.7	94.0	91.2	93.0	97.9	96.0
Boise, Idaho	97.2	98.0	95.9	97.6	98.7	99.4	95.8	96.9	99.0	99.2	94.6	96.2	100.0	98.8
Bonham, Tex.	98.7	99.2	99.3	99.4	100.0	100.0	97.2	98.7	99.7	99.7	96.7	98.3	100.0	100.0
Boston, Mass.	95.0	96.0	97.2	96.0	97.1	95.3	89.4	94.6	94.9	98.4	94.3	93.1	98.3	100.0
Bronx, N.Y.	90.8	93.0	88.1	94.3	95.1	95.8	85.0	85.5	91.1	95.3	90.5	91.7	96.3	98.3
Brooklyn, N.Y.	94.1	93.1	93.4	88.4	96.1	94.9	85.3	87.6	97.3	97.0	92.3	91.4	100.0	97.2
Buffalo, N.Y.	93.1	92.3	88.5	89.7	92.3	93.5	92.1	90.8	94.9	93.2	92.3	90.3	96.2	96.1
Butler, Pa.	94.7	97.0	91.0	96.3	95.4	97.8	95.5	93.2	96.4	98.4	92.7	96.0	100.0	97.1
Castle Point, N.Y.	95.3	97.9	96.8	96.7	97.6	99.2	91.9	96.8	97.5	99.6	91.5	95.6	100.0	100.0
Charleston, SC.	97.3	(2)	96.0	(2)	98.7	(2)	94.3	(2)	99.0	(2)	96.1	(2)	100.0	(2)
Cheyenne, Wyo.	96.8	97.9	91.0	94.4	99.5	99.5	93.7	97.8	99.3	99.8	95.6	96.1	100.0	100.0
Chicago, Ill. (West Side)	94.0	95.2	92.2	92.9	95.9	96.6	90.5	93.4	94.1	98.9	93.9	90.7	98.4	96.5
Chicago, Ill. (research)	94.3	96.9	94.2	96.4	94.8	98.8	91.2	95.3	94.5	98.2	93.8	95.1	98.1	100.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	96.4	93.4	97.0	88.9	94.7	93.8	94.2	91.0	98.4	96.6	93.3	91.2	100.0	95.3
Clarksburg, W. Va.	97.3	94.2	96.8	93.9	98.9	93.3	96.3	93.4	98.9	96.7	94.5	91.9	100.0	93.3
Cleveland, Ohio	93.8	95.8	92.6	95.5	90.8	97.7	89.9	94.1	95.7	98.0	93.7	93.4	97.1	97.8
Columbia, S.C.	94.4	94.3	88.5	91.7	95.3	94.4	96.3	95.3	95.7	96.3	92.8	91.6	98.0	93.3
Coral Gables, Fla.	(2)	91.8	(2)	89.5	(2)	92.1	(2)	93.3	(2)	92.3	(2)	89.0	(2)	97.5
Dallas, Tex.	95.0	94.6	94.5	92.6	96.8	96.3	94.0	96.7	95.8	93.6	93.3	93.9	96.9	97.8
Dayton, Ohio	93.7	88.7	91.5	85.0	95.5	87.5	91.1	90.5	97.5	89.3	89.1	87.5	94.3	94.4
Dearborn, Mich.	78.7	91.4	81.2	88.2	78.8	92.7	80.5	91.1	72.0	91.5	79.6	89.9	82.9	92.2
Denver, Colo.	93.4	94.0	93.8	92.2	93.8	94.0	89.9	94.4	95.8	94.6	92.1	94.2	94.0	97.6
Des Moines, Iowa	96.1	97.6	93.1	96.0	98.6	98.1	96.1	97.4	98.8	98.9	92.8	96.4	98.6	100.0
Dublin, Ga.	96.8	97.7	94.3	94.8	99.0	99.0	95.9	97.1	98.7	99.8	95.7	96.5	98.8	100.0
Durham, N.C.	95.0	94.9	96.7	91.0	95.9	96.6	91.6	92.5	97.1	98.1	91.5	93.1	98.6	95.6
East Orange, N.J.	93.9	94.7	91.3	93.6	95.7	96.3	85.2	90.8	96.4	97.4	93.0	92.1	93.5	98.1
Erie, Pa.	97.7	96.1	98.3	94.3	100.0	97.5	98.2	94.9	98.4	97.3	94.1	94.1	100.0	97.9
Fargo, N. Dak.	97.0	96.9	93.0	94.1	98.5	97.3	97.4	97.9	98.6	98.4	95.4	95.4	100.0	100.0
Fayetteville, Ark.	97.2	96.4	93.0	94.1	97.8	96.8	98.6	94.4	98.7	98.5	96.2	95.2	97.9	97.5
Fayetteville, N.C.	96.4	95.9	91.7	95.2	99.1	98.0	96.3	93.5	97.9	97.9	94.8	93.9	96.7	98.7
Fort Harrison, Mont.	96.2	94.7	92.6	91.3	97.1	95.0	92.4	90.8	98.2	97.7	95.3	93.0	97.7	98.2
Fort Howard, Md.	96.9	96.6	95.8	94.5	99.1	99.2	95.7	95.9	97.3	97.5	95.7	96.0	93.3	100.0
Fort Wayne, Ind.	96.4	97.1	96.4	95.7	96.3	98.9	93.0	98.9	97.7	99.0	95.7	93.5	98.6	100.0
Fresno, Calif.	96.8	96.4	98.5	96.1	99.2	97.9	94.4	95.1	97.2	97.9	94.7	94.8	100.0	98.8
Grand Island, Nebr.	97.6	97.5	98.8	94.7	97.5	99.3	96.6	96.4	98.0	98.8	96.7	96.5	100.0	98.6
Grand Junction, Colo.	94.6	96.3	93.9	94.4	96.5	96.2	91.2	95.7	94.9	97.7	93.4	95.5	97.8	96.3
Hines, Ill.	87.6	89.4	85.9	87.0	87.2	87.9	85.8	87.4	89.1	91.3	85.9	89.0	87.1	90.4
Hot Springs, S. Dak.	98.8	97.2	97.5	96.5	100.0	98.2	97.4	94.7	99.4	100.0	98.1	94.2	100.0	100.0
Houston, Tex.	9.03	94.6	83.9	92.0	89.8	94.1	89.1	91.8	95.4	97.8	87.5	92.9	91.0	94.7
Huntington, W. Va.	93.4	92.8	86.9	91.8	96.1	95.1	92.1	92.5	96.8	95.9	90.9	86.9	93.5	87.5
Indianapolis, Ind.	95.9	92.1	94.7	86.4	97.9	94.7	93.6	92.5	97.1	94.6	94.2	89.8	98.4	98.0
Iowa City, Iowa	95.8	96.6	92.7	96.5	97.2	98.7	94.6	95.5	98.2	97.2	93.3	95.5	98.7	100.0
Iron Mountain, Mich.	96.3	96.7	95.6	95.5	97.4	98.2	94.4	96.7	96.9	97.8	94.8	95.1	98.6	100.0
Jackson, Miss.	95.4	96.3	93.1	94.7	98.4	97.3	92.0	93.3	97.8	98.8	93.7	94.7	100.0	96.5
Kansas City, Mo.	92.0	94.5	88.5	92.6	89.9	94.9	92.8	91.2	94.1	96.1	90.7	93.7	93.7	98.6
Kecoughtan, Va.	96.8	94.6	96.7	92.9	98.2	95.2	97.2	93.9	96.5	94.1	95.7	94.0	97.8	97.7
Kerrville, Tex.	96.3	94.8	93.9	93.2	96.6	97.8	95.4	94.1	98.5	94.6	94.2	94.6	97.6	98.6
Lake City, Fla.	95.6	97.6	94.9	95.3	96.5	99.0	91.7	96.1	98.0	98.6	93.8	97.1	97.3	100.0
Lincoln, Nebr.	97.0	96.2	95.8	92.9	98.9	99.3	95.1	98.3	97.9	96.4	95.5	93.9	100.0	100.0
Little Rock, Ark.	96.2	96.5	93.8	93.6	98.8	98.9	95.3	96.0	97.7	98.1	93.6	94.8	96.9	100.0
Livermore, Calif.	96.1	94.6	95.7	95.2	100.0	96.9	92.3	89.1	96.1	95.6	94.6	94.1	98.5	98.8
Long Beach, Calif.	92.6	92.6	91.8	89.7	94.0	95.9	88.4	89.5	92.2	92.8	92.6	92.7	98.1	98.0
Los Angeles, Calif.	92.6	81.2	92.1	85.2	93.8	90.8	86.4	71.6	95.6	84.0	90.3	78.3	100.0	92.3
Louisville, Ky.	95.7	96.4	93.8	96.4	96.2	97.1	96.3	95.4	97.7	98.4	92.8	94.2	98.7	96.7
Madison, Wis.	96.2	96.5	94.8	96.3	97.5	97.4	93.8	95.3	97.7	97.4	95.3	94.9	98.9	99.0
Manchester, N.H.	96.8	96.8	97.3	99.2	98.6	96.8	93.6	93.6	92.2	97.9	94.7	95.2	100.0	98.4
Marion, Ill.	97.1	95.1	95.9	91.1	98.9	99.9	97.3	93.1	97.5	95.2	96.0	94.6	98.5	95.8
Marlin, Tex.	97.3	97.2	95.8	92.8	96.5	98.8	97.7	98.0	99.1	98.9	95.1	95.3	98.5	98.9
Martinez, Calif.	96.3	94.9	94.1	96.2	97.8	96.2	91.9	88.0	97.7	97.0	96.7	93.1	99.0	98.6
Martinsburg, W.Va.	95.9	97.0	92.8	92.1	100.0	98.8	96.6	97.2	98.1	99.3	92.8	95.8	98.1	100.0
Memphis, Tenn.	97.0	96.4	97.3	93.3	98.4	98.0	95.6	97.9	96.9	97.1	95.8	94.8	100.0	98.4
Miles, Mont.	97.9	98.2	99.4	98.8	100.0	100.0	95.9	97.7	98.0	97.4	96.0	98.8	100.0	100.0
Minneapolis, Minn.	95.0	95.3	91.6	94.3	99.1	95.9	95.9	96.5	96.9	97.6	91.5	91.0	97.5	98.7
Montgomery, Ala.	96.1	96.6	94.0	96.7	95.8	97.2	95.0	95.0	98.6	98.2	94.0	94.3	97.4	100.0
Mountain Home, Tenn.	94.4	95.7	89.5	91.1	95.2	95.5	96.9	97.6	97.1	98.5	92.9	92.7	94.9	96.2
Muskogee, Okla.	92.9	93.8	81.7	86.5	94.8	96.3	88.1	88.3	97.1	95.6	92.7	96.1	94.4	94.7
Nashville, Tenn.	96.7	95.3	96.2	92.3	98.2	95.4	94.3	95.1	97.1	96.6	95.6	94.4	98.6	98.6
Newington, Conn.	93.4	93.4	98.3	94.8	96.5	95.3	86.2	89.9	94.0	95.0	89.7	90.4	100.0	97.4
New Orleans, La.	93.2	92.6	92.8	88.0	93.2	95.0	88.6	90.9	95.2	93.6	91.2	91.1	93.2	97.8
New York, N.Y.	(3)	87.2	(3)	85.6	(3)	89.9	(3)	83.1	(3)	87.7	(3)	86.2	(3)	93.0
Oklahoma City, Okla.	94.1	95.2	93.1	92.6	94.2	97.3	92.3	92.5	95.8	96.7	91.9	93.7	96.3	97.3
Omaha, Nebr.	95.6	95.9	94.1	92.0	96.6	97.0	95.8	95.2	97.3	98.3	93.0	93.4	97.2	97.4
Oteen, N.C.	95.3	95.4	96.0	93.0	97.6	98.3	93.8	93.5	95.8	97.0	93.6	93.9	98.6	99.0
Palo Alto, Calif.	92.4	94.0	90.1	94.8	96.1	97.5	89.7	91.4	93.9	95.0	90.9	90.6	97.6	98.6
Philadelphia, Pa.	97.0	96.0	96.7	94.2	98.5	93.8	93.4	96.5	97.5	98.1	96.8	94.9	100.0	100.0
Phoenix, Ariz.	91.8	85.8	89.5	87.4	92.8	91.3	85.3	73.8	94.0	85.3	90.6	85.2	97.8	90.7
Pittsburgh, Pa.	93.9	94.3	92.5	90.5	93.2	92.3	87.3	93.5	96.1	95.1	93.4	94.9	96.3	94.9
Poplar Bluff, Mo.	95.7	95.6	89.9	86.3	97.5	96.4	96.2	97.6	96.9	98.6	95.3	95.3	97.3	94.9
Portland, Oreg.	95.6	94.3	93.0	91.5	95.7	96.9	91.9	91.2	97.3	96.3	95.1	92.5	100.0	98.2
Providence, R.I.	95.3	94.2	92.5	91.8	98.0	93.8	90.6	91.1	97.2	95.9	94.3	94.0	98.7	97.5
Reno, Nev.	95.8	97.7	96.3	92.0	98.8	100.0	95.0	95.6	97.5	99.4	91.5	97.8	100.0	100.0
Richmond, Va.	94.1	93.7	93.6	96.2	93.9	91.7	89.2	89.5	97.3	94.1	91.9	93.2	95.3	97.4
Saginaw, Mich.	96.8	96.8	94.6	92.0	97.8	97.9	97.3	99.0	98.6	98.4	94.8	95.4	97.9	98.0
Salt Lake City, Utah	93.0	95.9	90.4	92.2	96.4	97.4	88.7	93.4	94.1	97.5	92.0	95.4	96.9	99.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Percent of favorable responses to VA hospital care received by combination groups, comparison between 1966 and 1967 surveys—Continued

General hospitals	All questions		Physician care		Nursing care		Dietetics		Housekeeping		Hospital management		General attitude	
	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966
San Fernando, Calif.	95.9	94.2	94.3	91.7	97.8	97.3	95.3	90.4	98.0	97.5	92.8	90.9	100.0	97.7
San Francisco, Calif.	89.1	94.0	88.0	96.2	90.2	96.6	89.6	92.3	87.5	93.6	88.5	91.8	97.4	96.6
San Juan, P.R.	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Seattle, Wash.	95.8	93.6	96.4	90.2	96.4	92.8	90.2	87.7	98.4	97.3	94.4	92.6	100.0	97.5
Shreveport, La.	95.9	93.1	93.5	87.4	97.6	93.3	96.4	94.7	96.3	96.0	94.1	91.2	97.6	97.1
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	96.2	96.8	90.5	94.0	98.0	99.1	97.7	96.1	97.3	98.6	95.8	94.5	98.7	100.0
Spokane, Wash.	95.3	95.3	97.2	90.5	95.7	97.8	95.3	93.4	96.3	96.8	92.2	94.4	97.1	96.7
St. Louis, Mo.	93.3	91.6	89.9	89.5	94.3	91.5	93.1	90.9	94.5	93.5	91.7	89.8	96.3	98.7
Syracuse, N.Y.	94.2	93.3	93.3	92.7	96.6	95.8	91.4	89.8	96.4	93.0	92.3	93.8	97.3	97.8
Temple, Tex.	93.2	96.7	94.1	93.9	96.3	97.2	88.9	94.8	93.0	98.9	92.0	96.1	96.3	98.4
Tucson, Ariz.	95.1	95.7	96.2	95.8	94.5	97.3	94.2	90.7	94.7	96.6	94.3	94.7	98.4	100.0
Vancouver, Wash.	95.8	95.3	96.5	93.8	99.7	97.5	93.2	95.5	96.5	94.6	92.7	94.4	99.0	100.0
Wadsworth, Kans.	95.7	97.2	92.2	97.0	97.9	100.0	94.2	96.2	98.1	97.3	93.5	95.1	95.7	100.0
Walla Walla, Wash.	96.9	95.5	91.1	87.7	98.2	97.9	98.2	95.1	99.2	97.2	94.3	96.2	92.3	97.2
Washington, D.C.	96.6	92.2	96.9	92.2	97.6	92.4	92.3	93.2	98.9	92.7	94.5	90.1	100.0	93.4
West Haven, Conn.	93.8	93.4	94.7	93.7	95.1	92.5	89.8	89.4	96.5	96.7	89.7	90.9	100.0	97.9
West Roxbury, Mass.	93.9	92.5	96.8	94.4	96.6	94.6	84.4	90.2	96.1	93.0	91.6	89.6	97.7	93.7
Whipple, Ariz.	97.1	95.0	95.3	91.5	96.3	97.0	98.4	96.5	98.1	95.4	95.7	93.5	97.9	98.2
White River Junction, Vt.	96.5	96.7	97.0	95.5	97.5	99.4	95.8	94.0	96.2	97.7	95.1	95.9	100.0	98.8
Wichita, Kans.	92.7	94.2	91.4	95.6	94.5	95.5	88.9	89.7	93.9	95.6	90.7	93.4	100.0	98.9
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	96.6	95.8	96.1	94.2	96.7	96.3	95.9	94.1	97.0	97.1	95.5	95.2	98.5	97.5
Wilmington, Del.	95.4	96.7	93.0	95.2	96.8	96.7	93.0	95.0	97.4	97.3	94.1	96.7	98.6	98.4
Wood, Wis.	95.9	92.4	96.2	87.1	97.7	94.1	90.3	91.5	98.0	94.5	94.1	89.9	100.0	96.2

[1] Did not report. A tuberculosis hospital in January 1966.
[2] Not open in January 1966.
[3] Number of veterans responding are too few for a valid percent.

OUR CURRENT TAX POLICIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to my colleagues in the Congress the remarks made by Hon. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Tax Institute of New England, concerning current developments in tax policy. The text of the remarks are as follows:

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TAX POLICY

(Remarks by Hon. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Tax Institute of New England, John Hancock Hall, Boston, Mass., April 29, 1967)

The topic of Current Developments in Tax Policy is best approached by placing present tax policies in the broader perspective of recent history and future prospects. In this way we can see how our current tax policies fit into a longer range program and a way of thinking about the uses of tax policy. For it is the attitude regarding the uses of tax policy that marks the main theme of tax policy in the present and preceding Administrations.

The main economic goal of these two Administrations has been the high level utilization of our real resources within a framework of reasonable price stability—that is, to achieve a growth in real Gross National Product that matches our potential, with unemployment pushed to as low a level as we can through appropriate fiscal and monetary policies, supplemented by special training and related programs. Also, it has been an important aim to maintain an appropriate balance of payments position, so that accomplishment of our domestic objectives will not be hindered by international financial concerns.

The *consistent* theme of tax policy through seven years has been to use tax policy in an affirmative manner to achieve this economic goal. It will be the consistent theme in the years ahead. The manner in which tax policy is so used—the substantive programs which reflect this use—has changed and necessarily will constantly change, as the economic conditions in which the goal is being pursued themselves change. For the goal is never won forever—there is no permanent trophy to be carried home for success in one year or three years. Instead, the coming of each New Year relentlessly challenges us to seek continued advancement toward our goal. We are involved in a perpetual obstacle race, with new obstacles constantly being introduced and old obstacles rearranged to appear different. Insights once obtained must constantly be re-examined and new insights sought if we are successfully to negotiate each new set of obstacles.

In the first years of this decade the main obstacles to be overcome were a growth rate lagging far behind our potential, a discouraging pattern of recessions followed by recoveries that quickly faltered into new recessions, and a consequent high unemployment rate. Tax policy in this setting was aimed at spurring investment, thereby generating a higher productive capacity and more jobs. The substantive tax program involved the adoption of an investment credit to correct a tax structure imbalance that appeared to hamper our obtaining the needed investment level. This credit was supplemented by administrative measures removing restrictive factors in the application of tax depreciation rules.

These 1962 measures were then followed by the massive tax reduction of the 1964 Act, designed to produce a strong consumer demand and the markets needed to encourage our producers to push their investment plans. The reduction in tax rates also acted to improve incentives to invest by strengthening the rate of return and cash flows.

This 1964 tax reduction was the first to recognize the power of our tax structure to generate such a strong revenue intake in periods of rising economic activity that the intake soon exerted a drag on that very activity and made continuous forward progress impossible. The 1964 tax reduction also freed us from the shackles of a rigid budget balance posture and enabled fiscal policy to provide a response that would reflect economic conditions rather than mathematically suit a figure resulting from the additions of many disparate items of expenditure and receipt in our budget. The need to strengthen consumer demand was again reflected in 1965 in the Excise Tax Act of that year, in which that need became the opportunity for a major reform of a crazy-quilt excise tax structure.

These programs met with success—a strong business expansion, rising incomes and profits, a falling unemployment rate, a GNP capable of sustaining broad social programs. But then in the latter part of 1965 the obstacles changed—the demands of the Vietnam conflict showed us once again that no economic forecasting is safe against the intrusion of external events we cannot control. A high pace of Government military expenditures demanded that a policy of fiscal stimulus be switched to a program of fiscal restraint, but without clear signs to chart the size or timing of that restraint.

Tax policy was therefore shifted from stimulus to restraint, which called for increasing revenue collections to dampen an inflationary potential. This need became the opportunity to achieve desirable improvements in our current collection procedures. The substantive programs of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 reflected this dual target—graduated withholding, a speed-up in the transition to current payment by corporations, and current payment of the self-employment Social Security tax. This was accompanied by administrative programs in both 1966 and this year speeding up the deposit of withheld taxes and excise taxes. And there is still room for further improvement, as reflected in the President's current recommendations regarding the corporate estimated tax.

As the year 1966 progressed, with a high level of economic activity insured through strong private investment, strong consumer demand and rising Governmental military expenditures, fiscal policy had to cope with emerging price instability and serious imbalances in the business expansion. Moreover, the tasks of fiscal policy were conjoined by the difficulties being experienced in charting the proper course for monetary policy. These obstacles culminated in September, 1966, in a threatening financial situation, as interest rates rose alarmingly, the money supply contracted, and business investment still proceeded at an unsustainable level.

Suspension of the investment credit was the tax policy response chosen, and another step in tax flexibility was taken. But it was taken with an awareness that the particular step was not without the problems of the two transitions in the step involved—the transition from allowance of the credit to suspension and the transition from suspension to restoration. This step was therefore accompanied by a frank recognition that only the usual events of last September—a serious financial situation, an unsustainable business investment boom, and wartime expenditures—would call for this particular response of tax flexibility. It was accompanied by strong expenditure tightening.

The immediate goals sought were obtained—the financial tension subsided, the investment pace began to be more manageable, and monetary policy could begin to ease and adjust the imbalances, as in housing, that had accompanied its tightening.

We thus come to the year 1967 and a new set of obstacles, even more challenging. The imbalances of 1966 are giving way to an economic advance that will show a more even front, as business investment moderates its prior pace and housing starts to catch up. This moderation in business investment signaled the end of the need for the suspension of the investment credit, perhaps a bit earlier than had been foreseen. The President accordingly recommended restoration of the credit, with this step thus completing the application of tax flexibility initiated last September. The differing views on the terms of the restoration underscore the belief expressed last year that only that combination of unique circumstances would call for this form of tax flexibility.

The economic radars that scanned the horizon in January forecast for the immediate months a pause in the economy, as the components of the advancing economic front regrouped and balanced their relationships. An important factor in this pause has been the downward adjustment in inventory accumulation. Other factors are the moderation in the growth in plant and equipment investment and the low level of housing activity which reflected the past period of tight money. Those radars that scanned further ahead forecast that the economic front would later gather momentum from a variety of sources—increased Social Security expenditures, the pace of Government expenditures, resumed strength in housing, the end of the inventory adjustment, and a pick-up in consumer spending. In the absence of tax action, the Federal budget would move more strongly into deficit and fiscal policy would become highly stimulative. Instability in the form of inflationary pressures would again threaten. It would be desirable to meet that obstacle through tax policy rather than through a resumption of monetary tightening lest we become locked into a level of high interest rates.

This forecast in January thus called for over-all tax restraint, in contrast to the specialized restraint in the business sector that was needed last September. The hearings and discussions of last year on the techniques of tax flexibility, notably before the Fiscal Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee—hearings that had been urged by the Administration—indicated that the most appropriate application of tax flexibility for this purpose was a surcharge of individual and corporate income tax liabilities. The President in January recommended this course. For Budget and revenue estimating purposes a precise starting date was needed and July 1 was chosen. But tax flexibility and rational economic policy obviously do not always demand rigid adherence to dates based on prior economic forecasts. The task is to match policy as closely as possible to current forecasts as these forecasts sharpen and change—not to rigidly match action to a previously set timetable that was itself only a forecast based on earlier and therefore less reliable data.

The economic radars still indicate that in the months ahead the predicted momentum will gather. While the radars are still not equipped to pinpoint the exact month of change, this summer is still the governing forecast. The important point, however, is to recognize that as forecasts sharpen and more clearly foretell the change, we should not be misled by looking backwards or even around us at the figures that reflect the pause we are now moving through. Instead, we must concentrate on what is forecast for the period ahead. We must be willing to act on what that forecast implies, not because it is infallible but because it is far better than the unfounded assumption that the present condition will continue simply because it is the present. We can be willing to act on the forecast because the tax change that is being recommended—a temporary income tax surcharge—is an adjustment that after its adoption can be readily removed earlier than the targeted date for its termination if the economic radars then begin to forecast different and unexpected signals.

We must remember that the aim is not always to see that forecasts are borne out. Rather, it is to so alter economic conditions that forecasts of undesirable instability ahead, either of an inflationary nature or a downward trend, will not turn out that way and that the forecasted instability will instead be replaced by a more desirable economic situation. The surcharge thus rests on a forecast of too exuberant an economy in the latter part of the year and an intention to prevent that forecast from becoming actuality. The recommendation of the surcharge was a frank statement of Government opinion and policy—what it expects will happen without policy action and how it plans to solve the problem. If the problem starts to shape up differently, then of course a different solution will be called for—but as of now that is not what our current knowledge tells us.

The use of tax policy is thus at present an exercise in tax flexibility—as we attempt to keep our high level economy as close to optimum operating conditions as we can in the face of inevitable instabilities flowing from the Vietnam hostilities. Necessarily tax flexibility means tax change, to keep the economy on a proper course. Rigidity in tax policy is an impossible course—the Policy that brought success in one year can bring great difficulties the next year. We must seek tax adjustments responsive to predicated economic conditions, and attempt to structure them so that the change is accompanied by the least strain on taxpayers and tax administration in applying and accommodating to those changes. Change is necessary because rigidity is disaster, but change should not itself cause needless instabilities.

When Vietnam hostilities end, a new set of conditions will appear and the use of tax policy will in turn have a different content. A most likely use is that of tax reduction, as the revenue structure will presumably have to adapt to lower military expenditures. The nature of the adaptation—how much reduction, in what mix of temporary and permanent change, in what mix of rate change and structural alteration—necessarily must await the events that condition the tax response.

Let me turn now to another goal and another use of tax policy. Whatever the ever-changing character of the economic role of tax policy, we are always involved in the raising of revenues to pay for Government expenditures as well as to fulfill the revenue raising targets that the economic role sets. Tax policy is charged with the task of raising those revenues with fairness, with the least interference in the efficient utilization of our resources, and with the lowest possible level of difficulty in compliance and administration. It is this use of tax policy with which tax reform is concerned.

The achievement of this goal of tax policy is one of constant efforts at improvement—past decisions turn out to have been misguided or no longer sensible under changed circumstances; a new pattern of economic and social conditions forces tax thinking into new areas; new compliance techniques make certain steps feasible for the first time; perennially intractable problems may yield to new solutions; a better understanding is gained of the effects of taxation in a particular area. The needs for improvement are endless and the response must be continuous over many areas. This use of tax policy in this decade has proceeded steadily, through a variety of measures aimed at improving the tax structure—the Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964, the Excise Act of 1965, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966, the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966. Along with these major legislative measures have been many major administrative measures in Regulations and rulings—consolidated returns, the international tax area, unrelated business income, for example—and many minor legislative measures.

But the effort must remain continuous. We are all aware of the many possible areas of inquiry. We will have different sets of priorities and different approaches and different emphases—but we are all seeking change in our tax structure rather than embalmment. The Treasury has often mentioned some of its current concerns—industrial revenue bonds, multiple corporations, private pension plans and foundations, to name a few. It has called attention to the fact that the estate and gift taxes represent the only part of our Federal tax structure that has remained unexamined by the Congress over a long period. The recent parallel studies by the Brookings Institution on the economic side and the American Law Institute on the legal side clearly indicate that there are promising paths to improvement of these taxes.

An area of reform now before the Congress concerns the President's recommendations for revision of the income tax treatment of the elderly. The existing income tax benefits extended to the elderly cost about $2.3 billion annually in tax revenues. The Administration's proposals for revision of these tax rules would not alter this revenue cost. The proposals aim only to redirect this relief, in a uniform manner, to benefit those elderly most in need of it and at the same time to simplify the structure of the tax rules applicable to the elderly. But these proposals appear to be surrounded by a fog of confusion and misrepresentation.

Some critics portray in detail the suggested elimination of the present $600 added exemption and the retirement income credit. But they do not mention the substitution under the proposals of a simple blanket special exemption of $2,300 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple where both are over age 65. Other critics state that Social Security benefits will be subject to tax, and add that this is unfair because the beneficiaries will have made payment of Social Security taxes before retirement. But they do not mention that the costs of those taxes will be taken into account through the blanket exemption, which in no event would be reduced below one-third of the benefits included in income. Nor do the critics point out that about two-thirds of the elderly now subject to income tax will receive a tax reduction under the proposals—almost all married couples below $11,600 and single persons below $5,800.

There are about 20 million persons over the age of 65. Of these, about 4 million now pay income tax or join in the filing of a return on which income tax is paid. The President's proposals will not change the tax-free status of the almost 16 million elderly who now pay no tax. Of the remaining group of elderly, about 2.8 million will have tax reductions. Thus, for the great majority of the elderly—over 18.5 million persons, more than 94 percent of the total—the recommendations will not change their position of being free of income tax burdens, or they will result in a tax reduction.

The tax liabilities for the remaining group of elderly will be increased and thereby brought more in line with the tax liabilities of those taxpayers under age 65 with similar amounts of income. This also has been criticized. But in criticizing the increases that are involved for the wealthier elderly, the

critics do not indicate why a person with $20,000 or $50,000, or $100,000 of income, even though elderly, needs the special tax benefits that Congress granted because of the special financial problems associated with age. The financial problems of most of the elderly come down essentially—as do all financial problems—to a lack of income. But—where the income levels are in these higher ranges—there is no justification to apply a lower tax on a $20,000 or $50,000 income when received by a person over age 65 than when received by a person under that age. To keep the matter in perspective, an income of $20,000 a year is over twice the average family income in the United States. In addition, many of the needs that a younger family faces have already been met by the family over 65—the house and furniture are paid for, and the like.

Editorials and similar comment critical of the taxation of Social Security benefits may well have given those now receiving those benefits the impression that their well-being is threatened. But the real facts are completely the other way around. Under the proposed changes annual tax reductions of approximately $220 million dollars would go to the taxpaying elderly below $10,000, and the overwhelming number of Social Security recipients are below that level.

Nor do the real facts end here. The proposed special exemption ($2,300 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple) take fully into account the present levels of Social Security benefits. But this does not mean that future Social Security benefit increases will automatically be taxed to all recipients. The regular income tax exemptions and deductions, which are allowable in addition to the special exemption, will together with the special exemption shelter from income tax payment future Social Security benefit increases for all who have only this source of funds and, indeed, for most other recipients.

For example, the maximum Social Security benefit payable to a married couple under present law is about $2,500 per year. This would rise to about $2,700 under the President's Social Security proposals. But this is not even half the amount of income necessary before any income tax would be due under the proposed changes, since the couple would not owe tax until their income exceeded $5,800 a year. In other words, for a married couple living only on Social Security benefits, the maximum benefit level would have to more than double before the income tax would become a factor. If they are now receiving average Social Security benefits (about $1,500 per year), their benefits would have to more than triple before they would owe any tax. Viewed in another way, it is only the addition of non-Social Security income tax that could cause a tax to occur and here the leeway is also significant. Even if Social Security benefits were to reach $3,000, there would still be a $2,800 leeway to absorb pension or other income before the recipients became taxpayers.

In sum, for the overwhelming number of Social Security recipients, the proposal will have no effect on their Social Security benefits or will actually result in a tax reduction. This will also be true well into the future. There are 14 million Social Security recipients. About 12.6 million are now free of income tax, and would remain so. Only about 1.4 million are taxpayers now. Half of these would receive tax reductions under the proposal. The rest—700,000 out of 14 million recipients—would have increases, but to do so they must have an income of over about $6,000 if single and about $12,000 if married. And for many these increases would be *offset* by the increases proposed in Social Security benefits.

It is therefore a pretty safe assumption—keeping in mind the kinds of people who are prone to be concerned about anything touching their Social Security benefits—that the letters any newspaper, any organization, or any Congressmen may be receiving from Social Security recipients who have become concerned by what they read or hear about these proposals can be answered simply and clearly: "If you are not paying an income tax today, you will still continue to be free of tax—if you are paying a tax, you will receive a tax reduction."

To continue with our discussion of general tax reform, the President in his Economic Report has stated that he will submit a tax reform message later this year. He has delineated several useful principles to apply at this time to tax reform proposals—they should be considered apart from significant rate changes or temporary tax increases or decreases, such as the six percent surcharge, and they should not occasion a significant net gain or loss in revenue. While the various components would thus involve revenue-raising or revenue-losing measures, over-all they would balance out with no significant net change.

We may, of course, as respects this use of tax policy, look ahead even beyond this reform message to notice that many significant policy areas will be under study, in Government and in private research. We must learn more about the relationship of the income tax system to those persons who lie outside that system, and this involves the interrelationships between our Social Security system, our welfare system and the proposals for negative income taxes and income guarantees. The President has stated he will appoint a Commission to study much of this ground. We must also make sure that the benefits of economic growth spread to all and that all may share in them, or the affluence we seek for our people will become social injustice. We must strive to protect against any unfairnesses that may result from the necessary uses of tax flexibility, the necessary adjustments in monetary policy, and the necessary reliance on macroeconomic measures. We must not allow our tax system and its uses for economic policy to be regarded as involving only sterile counters remote from the human beings whose lives they affect. The measures to accomplish all of this will not, of course, lie entirely within the tax system. But those who work with tax policy must aid in joining tax policy with other economic and social measures to achieve these desired objectives.

I have been considering the uses of tax policy. These uses, as you can see, are many and varied, and perhaps to some may even appear too ambitious or wide-ranging in what is sought to be accomplished. But let me hasten to assure you that they are indeed modest alongside the claims that some have made for the use of tax policy.

There are those who urge tax policy as the solution for almost all of our social ills and problems. If you object to polluted air or polluted water, then a tax incentive will clean it right up. If a college education appears too costly to a family, then a tax credit will open the college doors. If our business firms are not training enough workers, then a tax incentive will set them to improving worker skills. If private enterprise and city officials will not eradicate our slums, then a tax incentive will remove this urban blight. If businesses won't locate in depressed areas, then a tax incentive will show them the way. If electric companies will not place their transmission lines underground, then a tax incentive will turn the soil. If urban transportation is too slow and too antiquated, then a tax incentive will make it fast and attractive. Indeed, all you need to learn what is wrong with America is to read the tax bills in Congress—wherever you see a tax proposal, that is where the action is.

Now, as Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, I am not at all sure why I should object to these suggestions that the tax system can cure all our problems. For clearly I could well become an economic czar were Congress to agree to this course. I, and my small staff, could control all our new social programs and the other Departments, such as Labor, HEW and HUD, would have so little to do they could be merged into one small Department and thereby simplify Government. All this almost seems to be how the world would look to a Treasury Department official on an LSD trip.

But I do not use LSD and I have the cautious feeling our social problems can not be so simple that a tax device—indeed the same tax device—will solve all of them. I suspect that there are better ways to clean our rivers and skies, to eradicate our urban ills, to give a college education to all who are qualified. Those ways will require loan guarantees, credit programs, direct subsidies and other Federal expenditure programs, and our facing up squarely to the costs involved.

A major appeal of the tax device is that it hides the budgetary cost and, of course, this appeal is strong from the standpoint of the private interests affected. But this should not deter us from the rational calculations and analyses which must be made to weigh the benefits of alternative expenditure programs. The sheer weight of the various demands being placed upon Government makes it urgent we obtain the utmost efficiency in the use of public funds, and that we fully recognize the amount of funds allocated to each demand. That efficiency and recognition cannot be obtained by hiding the costs in the intricacies of our tax system. Nor could that tax system survive the cumulative weakening of its strength and its fairness that would be involved in this massive use of tax incentives.

We must therefore be alert to the nonuses as well as the uses of tax policy. Nor is this sentry duty assigned solely to Government officials. Those who work daily with the tax system—those lawyers and accountants and scholars who know the strengths and the weaknesses of that system—must also stand their watch. For it is you who counsel daily with a far wider audience of businesses and individuals than the words of Washington can reach. Those businesses and individuals have a vital stake in how our tax system is shaped. Yours, then, is a vital role in explaining the issues surrounding tax policy, in clarifying the choices. No one can ask for blanket agreement and conformity on the choices to be made. But we can hope for an understanding of the concerns that must be weighed in reaching those choices. And it is to this task that your talents can bring accomplishment.

A YEAR TOWARD TOMORROW—VISTA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, VISTA, as we know, stands for "Volunteers in Service to America." It is the volunteer corps within the Office of Economic Opportunity which serves our less fortunate Americans in their struggle against the misery of poverty.

I recently had the opportunity, together with other Members of the Congress and administration, to attend a showing of a VISTA recruitment film here in Washington. The film is called "A Year Toward Tomorrow"; it is not

an ordinary film and will not soon be forgotten by those who see it. A well-deserved tribute was paid to this film by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. At their 39th annual academy awards ceremony they presented the coveted "Oscar" to Mr. Edmund A. Levy who directed the film for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Mr. Paul Newman, the actor, narrated this outstanding 28-minute production, generously donating his service to OEO for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, "A Year Toward Tomorrow" tells realistically and in down-to-earth fashion a story of the struggle, heartbreak, and success that VISTA volunteers experience in their work with the Nation's poor.

One of the VISTA volunteers shown in the film is Eric Metzner, a Navy veteran, who joined VISTA for a year of work in Atlanta, Ga. Working with low-income families in a tenement section of the city, Eric met with frustration and failure as he began his effort to improve the living conditions in the community in which he now lived and worked. By earning the confidence and trust of his neighbors, however, Eric soon was able to assist with the organization of a tenant's association which, with his guidance, embarked upon a successful campaign of improving the surroundings of the neighborhood.

This VISTA film also describes the work that volunteers are doing on Indian reservations and the difficulties they have overcome in gaining acceptance among these first Americans. Two courageous young girls, from comfortable backgrounds, exchanged a life of relative ease for the difficult and demanding tasks of serving as VISTA volunteers among the Indian population. They met with initial failure and frustration, but with perseverance were able eventually to establish a kindergarten class for the children of the reservation and to bring to the Indian women new skills in cooking, sewing, and health care.

"A Year Toward Tomorrow" provides us a glimpse into the dedicated and compassionate work that VISTA volunteers are providing in the Nation's struggle against poverty. One of the fundamental reasons VISTA is successful in its part of the OEO campaign is well illustrated by this film: We are shown volunteers who serve while living and working among the poor. They become part of the community, accepting its challenges, understanding its needs, and participating fully in its efforts to secure community progress and self-respect.

Mr. Speaker, over 6,500 men and women of all ages and backgrounds have served and are serving in the VISTA program. In the OEO campaign for a fuller life for America's poor, "A Year Toward Tomorrow" traces the good work of three of these volunteers, but it illustrates the idealistic and common sense approach that is typical of all VISTA workers. This film is a masterful and moving documentary of the vital spirit of voluntary service that is an important part of our history. VISTA, as one of the important ways in which American volunteer service is being expressed today, deserves our congratulations and continued full support. Its work, as the film so well describes, is effective and inspiring.

WHOSE CREDIBILITY GAP?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished superintendent of the Pittsburgh schools, Dr. S. P. Marland, has recently telegraphed me the reasons for his strong opposition to the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Dr. Marland's telegram quite accurately points out that the Quie substitute will not provide general aid, but rather a general shell which will simply serve to conceal the aid it takes away from those who need it most. I think Dr. Marland's telegram shows that the Quie proposal does not provide general assistance for the problems of the schools, but merely offers a general anesthetic which will temporarily take our minds off the problem.

Under unanimous consent I place Dr. Marland's telegram at this point in my remarks:

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
April 28, 1967.

Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The proposed changes in the distribution of Federal funds for elementary and secondary education would critically damage big city Federal programs in education. Barely started over the past 18 months, categorical programs aimed squarely at the children of poverty have brought a beginning of hope to the poor and the minorities heavily populating the cities. The suggested partial removal of categorical restraints, and reversion of control and procedure to State authorities would defeat any chance of inner-city recovery, or of significant help for rural poverty. State systems of fund distribution historically and quite universally discriminate against cities. Notwithstanding the desirability of long term goals or general aid, the present level of funding even at full authorization, is insufficient to meet the essential costs of categorical compensatory education as per title I. Any effort toward general aid should be in addition to, repeat—in addition to, the present categorical support, not instead of. When Federal funds are available at some future date in quantities sufficient to justify noncategorical distribution, over and above present categorical needs, we would strongly encourage such aid.

Urge you to give strong support to present ESEA program, funding title I at full authorization and spurn blandishments that speak seductively of general aid that indeed is not general aid, but a thin layering of token monies to be so widely diffused as to have little significance in American education. State formulaes for distribution vary so widely as to give no assurance that funds would be used where needed, or for innovation in increased services. Absorption of Federal funds by States to meet present mandated State support programs has occurred in the past and could recur. General aid and present level of funding would simply result in higher expenditures for the status quo.

Dr. S. P. MARLAND, Jr.,
Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools.

Our Republican friends have been asserting, with increasing shrillness lately, Mr. Speaker, that the President, the Office of Education, the Democratic members of the Education and Labor Committee, and the private school administrators have all been "misrepresenting," or, more charitably "misunderstanding" the Quie amendment. I hope they do not strain our credulity further by asserting that professional public educators, like Dr. Marland, whose interests are solely in the development of the best formula for Federal assistance in the pressing problem of education, "do not understand" what their own needs are.

While we are on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by a joint statement recently issued on the Quie substitutes by the gentleman from Minnesota and his leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD FORD]. The burden of this statement was to the effect that the supporters of the committee's bill are all twisting the facts. As an "example" of this, the statement contained the following remarkable paragraph:

The President has falsely asserted that Republicans "trot out a new version" of their school aid substitute every day. The truth is we have made slight additions to calm the fears of private school leaders—groundless fears stirred up by the Administration through a scare campaign based on false statements.

Translating this into plain talk, our friends seem to have said that "we have not changed our bill, and when we did, it was only to meet the objections of private school leaders—but the objections were not based on facts, anyway, so we changed it anyway, but we did not have to, but." Now, whose credibility were you talking about, gentlemen?

FATAL IGNORANCE OF HO CHI MINH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Press recently ran an editorial entitled "Fatal Ignorance of Ho Chi Minh," which, I believe, deserves to be spread upon the record. The Press editorial, citing a speech by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], makes the point that Ho Chi Minh is on dangerous ground if he assumes that the existence of dissent in this country, and argument over the course of the war, means that the American people are on the verge of upsetting their country's course.

This country has always been hospitable to the free mind. We have always leaned over backward, as well we should,

to let everyone have his say about whatever great endeavor the Nation was engaged in at the time. This has been a healthy exercise in the development of our Nation's greatest strength. I hope and trust, Mr. Speaker, that we continue our faith in the positive value of letting people say things most of us do not agree with.

But our national penchant for free speech has constantly confused and misled rulers of countries where they do not enjoy this right. Hitler never believed the American people could unite against him because all he could see was the loud argument between the "hawks" and "doves" of 1939 and 1940. Even after he had declared war on the United States, he made the fatal mistake of assuming that because we lacked the artificial "unity" of a dictatorship that we should not, therefore, fight with the unforced unity Americans showed from Kasserine Pass to the Elbe. If Ho Chi Minh is making this same mistake, he is due for the same surprise.

As the Press editorial states, "Americans don't like this war." Americans have never liked any war—a fact for which we should thank God daily. But free men, who have and need no one to tell them what to say or think or write, can win wars in spite of internal criticism, while followers of rigid ideologies, who remain deeply dedicated so long as their world remains in accord with their theories, find themselves confused and disheartened whenever the discontent of their own people finally finds expression. Freedom is the natural condition of man. Those who repress freedom, those who themselves feel a need to stamp out its manifestations, can never understand that a free country like ours can withstand all kinds of internal dissent without weakening in its resolve.

For the sake of the peace which we all seek, for the sake of the Vietnamese people, north and south, against whom Americans bear no grudge, someone should have a long talk with Ho Chi Minh and explain this to him. What may sound to Ho Chi Minh like a nation cracking under the tensions of war, is merely the customary sound of a noisy, independent, and free people, whose freedom is the measure of their strength. In the words of the editorial:

Ho Chi Minh ignores this fact to his own peril.

The editorial follows:

FATAL IGNORANCE OF HO CHI MINH

In his letter to President Johnson, North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh displayed his ignorance of the temper of this country.

He wrote that his country's "cause" evoked sympathy and support from "broad sections of the American people."

The facts are otherwise.

Americans don't like this war. They gripe at the draft and the taxes. They weep for the dead and the wounded. They sorrow for the Vietnamese who are casualties of the conflict. They abhor the destruction of homes and fields and forests. They yearn for peace.

But, being in the war, the vast majority of Americans are ready, willing and able to continue until there is victory or an honorable peace assuring the protection of the freedoms of South Vietnam, and putting an end to one more aggression.

There is, of course, opposition to the President's policies. Some very loud-mouthed opposition.

But what Ho and those like him ignore is that in total this opposition is small and in Congress relatively impotent.

"There is no question whatsoever that they (the enemy) misinterpret the weight of the opposition to the Government's policy," Defense Secretary Robert McNamara lately told a House committee. Ho's letter makes that apparent.

Rep. George Mahon, Texas Democrat, was speaking the real view of Americans when, before that same House committee, he said:

"In my opinion, the American people generally feel more is involved than the independence of the people of South Vietnam. They feel they are engaged in a war and are making these sacrifices in money and blood in order to build the kind of world that will make the people of the U.S. more secure in their pursuit of freedom and happiness."

Ho Chi Minh ignores this fact to his own peril.

PRIORITY OF FUNDS FOR THE EDUCATION OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the need for rapidly improving the education of children at the lower end of the economic scale is so great that our first concern should be to allocate our resources so we can be certain that they are used in areas where there are large concentrations of such children. If we really believe this, then it certainly follows that the main test of a distribution formula should be the extent to which it meets this need.

So far, the only formula we have seen that makes a serious attempt to meet the test of putting money where the low-income children are is the one provided in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Probably one of its most unique and useful characteristics is that it distributes the funds according to the relative concentration of such children—whether it be a northern city or a southern rural area.

Although useful for many purposes, distribution formulas based mainly on per capita income, as is the Quie substitute, cannot meet this test for the simple reason that they are based on averages and, consequently, do not take into account the fact that areas with the same per capita income can vary greatly in the concentration of low-income children. In this instance, the old axiom that many things can be hidden in averages certainly becomes an all-important point in assessing the utility of the Quie per capita income distribution scheme.

My conviction that the present title I formula is the best available for improving the education of our most disadvantaged children is not lessened by my awareness that we still have problems in this area. We know that it would be better to have more current census data and that we may need to make some adjustments in our distribution system. We are trying to solve such problems as soon as possible. However, I completely reject the notion that we should solve these problems by destroying the most effective tool we have ever had for channeling funds directly to areas where concentrations of disadvantaged children reside.

EXEMPTIONS FROM COMBAT ASSIGNMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9636, which I believe urgently meets the demands of compassion and human suffering, while recognizing the needs of our military forces in the field of combat. So often in my service as a Member of this august body, I have received letters requesting assistance in securing exemption for sons and fathers who are in combat zones in Vietnam, where already one son has been killed in action. While I view all war as tragic for the families whose loved ones are killed or maimed, even more tragic is the suffering of those who, having already lost a loved one, are yet being asked to sacrifice the life of another. This I believe is far more than the exigencies of the moment require in the interest of our national security. I have therefore proposed H.R. 9636 which will remove from the soldier himself the need to make a request for an exemption when a father, brother, or sister has already been killed in action or died in the line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces in a combat zone. After such a loss of an immediate family member, the surviving brothers, sisters, or father will be as a matter of regular course transferred out of the combat zone. The present rules and policy of the Defense Department already require that such a family member be relieved of combat duty for a period of 6 months. Thus his release is already part of the procedure recognized as proper by the Defense Department. No disruption of regular procedure would be required by my bill; however, the release would be permanent rather than temporary.

My bill, H.R. 9636, would also prevent the simultaneous assignment of more than one member of a family to a combat zone, except if the other member volunteers for such service. The current rules of the Department of Defense provide for such an exemption which applies only upon an affirmative request. My bill would remove the requirement of a formal request and in order for the second member to be assigned to a combat zone, he must volunteer.

I urge my colleagues in this House to consider H.R. 9636 carefully, and I hope after careful study and consideration that many of you will join me in urging its swift enactment into law.

VETERANS DISABILITY COMPENSATION BENEFITS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advise the House of a bill, H.R. 9637, which I have introduced regarding the payment of veterans disability compensation benefits. It has come to my attention that in a number of instances veterans who have sustained service-connected injuries which are today compensable were under previous laws not eligible. The change in the law making a previously denied claim now compensable is not often brought to the immediate attention of the veteran. Where these changes in the law have been made, the Congress has placed the burden upon the veteran to make a timely reclaim. His compensation rights, however, do not vest until the date of the reapplication. Thus if he waited 5 years before refiling, he has through no fault of his own lost 5 years of compensation benefits. While I am thoroughly aware of the rule of law which says that ignorance of the law is never an excuse, I earnestly believe that in this instance the burden of loss upon the veteran is far too great. H.R. 9637 does not seek to benefit the veteran who has never sought his rights to compensation. It seeks only to help those who have acted in good faith upon their belief that their claims were compensable, but who were turned down, not because the disability was not service connected, but solely because the statute did not render authority to pay for other reasons. If this statutory requirement is later amended or modified, and a heretofore denied claim is now compensable for the sole reason that the law has been changed, then I feel that the veteran ought to be allowed to come in at any time thereafter and his claim ought to be payable to him beginning from the date of the change in the law. This is all that my bill, H.R. 9637, does.

I urge my colleagues to study this bill carefully, and in doing so I know that you will have to agree with me. Justice and equity require such legislation, given these special circumstances.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN DAY CARE CENTERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers. My bill would provide funds for supplementing educational programs for preschool children who spend the day in child care centers, many of which now furnish primarily only custodial care. The enhancement, expansion, and enrichment of educational programs in these child centers is urgently needed to supplement what we have started in other Federal programs such as Headstart. Most of these preschool children being cared for in day care centers do not qualify for Federal programs currently in operation because their parents' income is greater than criteria established for these programs.

The Congress has recognized the needs of preschool youngsters; it endorsed the concept of early childhood education when it allowed funds for this purpose under the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. More and more we are being shown that the learning process begins earlier than at age 6, and that greater benefits for these preschool children must be provided.

We took cognizance of the younger child when we authorized funds for Operation Headstart under the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. We are presently seeking expansion of these opportunities for some 3 million children in the preschool years whose family incomes are under $3,000. But we need to further extend this excellent effort to thousands of other children who need enrichment. These additional services can be readily provided them because they are already in attendance at these centers.

President Johnson recognized the importance of early childhood education when he called for increased day care services including training for new careers in child care and the establishment of parent-child centers in his message of February 8 to Congress on children and youth. A child's future is shaped by his early experiences and we must not overlook these young children already in centers. Provision must be made for more than physicial care; the 3- or 4-year-old needs and thirsts for expertly directed primary educational experiences to motivate and inspire his young mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that there is a tremendous need for funds so that these child care centers can upgrade, supplement, and increase the educational impact of their day care programs. At present there are day care facilities for about 310,000 pre-school-age children. In 1965, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there were an estimated 7,334 licensed day care centers in the United States. According to March 1965 statistics released by the U.S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau, there were nearly 26 million working mothers in the United States. Two million of these mothers had children under 3 years of age; 1.7 million had children between 3 and 5. These children number 2 million under age 3; 2.5 million between 3 and 5 years of age. The number of working mothers has increased more than sixfold since 1940 and is expected to continue to rise. There were then 1.5 million mothers working and this has more than doubled since 1950, when 4.6 million mothers were working. These mothers represented almost two-fifths of all working women in March 1965, compared to a tenth in 1940 and a fourth in 1950.

The employment of mothers will also continue to rise. With respect to mothers of preschool children, for example, the Department of Labor has projected an increase of about 55 percent between 1960 and 1970 in the number of mothers 20 to 44 years of age who will work.

The fact that these statistics clearly show that the vast majority of children of preschool age cannot be reached immediately by this bill makes even more urgent the need for Congress, recognizing the importance of early education, to provide funds to supplement the educational services of existing centers now caring for 300,000 of these children, a figure which is expected to increase as more working mothers enter our labor force. Financial support by the Federal Government for these child centers will serve to encourage the States to wage an aggressive program to assure the children of working parents greater opportunity for the stimulus to learning these centers can provide. These child day care centers can be developed into centers of learning which will begin to provide important educational experiences for these children and which will have a vital influence upon their development.

My bill which is titled "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act" would authorize for fiscal year 1968 and each succeeding fiscal year, $300,000,000 to make grants available to the States. States participating in the program will designate a State agency broadly representative of these public and private child care centers and submit to the Commissioner of Education a State plan for participation. Priorities shall be given to centers with children in greatest need of such programs and which best demonstrate that they can achieve the objectives of this act, while still leaving maximum flexibility for the development of State plans and standards. These centers and groups to qualify must first be approved by State licensing agencies for safety and sanitary conditions and the projects they submit to the Commissioner must be approved by the designated State agency created under this act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to urge its enactment in the present session of Congress for the thousands of youngsters this bill will help.

The full text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9720

A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes the value of early childhood educational programs. Millions of pre-school-age children whose parents work have no opportunity for this kind of experience. Congress believes that these preschool education programs should be extended to the Nation's child care cen-

ters by providing supplementary education services.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each succeeding fiscal year, the sum of $300,000,000 to make grants under this Act.

ALLOCATIONS TO STATES

SEC. 4. From the sums appropriated for a fiscal year to make grants under this Act, each State shall be allocated an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of working mothers, in such State bears to the number of such mothers in all the States, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

SEC. 5 Any State which wishes to participate in the grant program under this Act shall designate or establish for that purpose a State agency which is broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care and other child education groups, and submit to the Commissioner through such agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State commission") a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it will be administered by the State commission,

(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 6, objective standards and methods for determining which day care centers shall receive grants and the amounts thereof,

(3) provides for approving and recommending to the Commissioner the day care centers which shall receive grants, and the amounts thereof, solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods,

(4) provides for affording to every applicant for a grant an opportunity for a hearing before the State commission as to its action under paragraph (3) with respect to such applicant, and

(5) provides for the making of such reports, in such form, and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this Act.

BASIC CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING PRIORITIES

SEC. 6. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining which day care centers shall receive grants, and the amount thereof, shall be subject. Such basic criteria shall be such as will (1) give a preference to day care centers where the Federal grant will provide the greatest educational and cultural enrichment to children most in need thereof, and (2) best tend to achieve the objectives of this Act while leaving opportunity for flexibility in the development of State plan standards and methods which will best accommodate the varied needs of the several States.

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

SEC. 7. (a) Child day care centers which wish to obtain grants under this Act shall submit applications therefor at such times, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application for a grant under this Act if—

(1) the grant will be used only to provide supplementary educational services and education equipment for day care centers;

(2) the State or the political subdivision in which the day care center is located enforces standards for the operation of day care centers which give assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that such centers will be operated in a manner which will not be unsafe, unsanitary, or otherwise detrimental to the children there, and the applicant meets such standards;

(3) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission; and

(4) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, that sufficient funds are available in the State's allotment to make the grant.

AMOUNT OF GRANT—PAYMENT

SEC. 8. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this Act, the Commissioner shall reserve from the appropriate allotment the amount of such grant. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this Act, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with provisions of section 5, or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this Act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 10. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 5 or with his final action under section 9(b), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified finding of fact shall likewise be conslusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 11. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "supplementary educational services an education equipment" means services (and related equipment) which provide educational and cultural enrichment of the day care center's program, such as the services of art and music teachers, psychologists and other child development specialists, as well as the use of books and audio-visual material and equipment.

(2) The term "child day care center" means a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution which provides, at one or more centralized locations, for the care, guidance, and supervision of children during the day if (A) the daily period of care, guidance, and supervision is at least eight hours for a majority of the children involved, and (B) a majority of the children involved are aged 3 to 5, inclusive.

(3) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

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

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 12. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

COLLEGE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about the critical college housing situation which I believe requires the review and attention of the Congress lest our efforts to expand higher education opportunities will be a promise to young America which cannot be fulfilled, because of the lack of living accommodations on our college campuses.

In 1950, under the able leadership of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Congress authorized a Government program of direct loans at a 3-percent interest rate, with an annual authorization of $300 million for college dormitory construction. This assistance has enabled our Nation's institutions of higher learning to mount a program of dormitory construction since 1950 totaling $2.875 billion.

However, today, accelerated college enrollments over the past decade have expanded the need far beyond what can be loaned under present authority. The backlog of requests for college housing loans became so formidable, in fact, that the administration had to declare a moratorium on applications back in January of 1966, with $760 million worth of unfulfilled requests on hand. If the moratorium had not been declared and applications were still accepted, the backlog today might well be in excess of $2 billion.

While the Federal loan program has contributed to the financing of some 600,000 housing units since 1950, a survey report prepared for the American Council on Education last year projected a need for an additional 1.5 billion accommodations over the next decade, which with a conservative estimate of $5,000 per unit, will call for minimum expenditures of $10 billion in the decade ahead, for new college housing.

I am certain that many Members of Congress have had this problem brought

to their attention during recent months, and it has become obvious that the present program, unless greatly expanded, will not suffice to provide more than a fraction of the accommodations as college admissions mount year after year.

This problem has reached staggering proportions in Hawaii. The University of Hawaii now has an enrollment of just under 15,000 students with only 1,200 dormitory accommodations available, 600 of which are assigned to East-West Center students, leaving only 600 rooms for the regular college enrollment. With an anticipated enrollment of 25,000 in the very near future, we are faced with a problem of great magnitude. Some 2,100 students applied for the 684 spaces currently available in the 1966–67 school year, and even with present plans for the immediate construction of an additional 1,140 rooms, by 1968 less than 10 percent of the university's student enrollment will have campus housing.

Many students live in Honolulu and can commute, but public transit is a problem on Oahu as in most other communities, and more importantly students miss out on a very significant facet of a well-rounded education if they are forced to leave the campus environment every day because there is no dormitory to house them. Too many of these young people have had to move into substandard off-campus housing, and the consequent dislocation of their lives cannot be doubted to have adverse effects on their academic progress. As in other institutions, we are faced with overcrowding of present facilities, and the practice of squeezing three or more students into quarters designed for two cannot be considered adequate to their needs.

In addition, we are in the early stages of an ambitious program of developing a community college system, and if these are to accommodate other than students in the immediate environs of the school, some housing will have to be planned. A new 4-year institution, Hawaii Loa College, expects to open its doors to its first freshman class this fall, and has had an application for Federal housing funds pending for more than a year now. And a recent study done by a New York consulting firm on future educational needs in Hawaii calls for yet another 4-year State college that would be capable of handling 5,000 undergraduates by 1975.

I have had this problem under consultation for some time now, and have met with officials of the University of Hawaii and mainland colleges, Department of Housing and Urban Development experts, and representatives of major educational associations in an attempt to work out a solution. The result was the introduction of my college housing bill, H.R. 8647, on April 17, 1967, which I ask my colleagues who share with me in this concern to cosponsor.

H.R. 8647 is designed to supplement the existing loan program and provide the needed housing at a cost within the reach of students and their families without imposing a serious burden on the Federal budget. It would be done through private financing, with the Government providing only that margin of assistance necessary to give colleges the benefit of the same 3-percent financing available under the existing loan program.

The approach in my bill is very simple: The university would finance the housing by selling serial bonds to private investors at the market rate of interest.

Under a contract previously entered into, HUD would make an annual payment of the difference between the actual debt service and the debt service at a 3-percent interest rate. Before HUD could enter into any such contract it would have to obtain approval from the Appropriations Committee. The 3-percent direct loan authorization in existing law would remain available to be used in cases where the private market required an inordinately high interest rate, with discretion left to the Secretary to determine the dividing line.

Under H.R. 8647, $10 million would be made available to institutions for this interest subsidy for each of the next 2 fiscal years. The impact on the Federal budget in any year under the supplemental interest payment approach would be very small. For example, assuming an average private market interest rate of 5½ percent for public and private universities together, an annual supplement of less than $10 million would achieve the effect of 3-percent interest for $300 million of college housing financing.

I am pleased to note that the initial reaction of educators has been favorable to the principle embodied in my bill. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, termed my bill a constructive approach to the problem. I am also in receipt of a copy of the letter forwarded to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on housing by the Association of State Colleges and Universities, an organization comprised of 213 institutions of higher learning and seven statewide systems of State colleges in 41 States and Guam. In this letter the chairman of the association's legislative committee, President Earle T. Hawkins of Towson State College in Maryland, asks that "the Federal Government assist higher education in generating a capital funding source of at least $1 billion each year for the next 10 years for single and married student housing at an interest cost of not more than 3 percent and for debt terms of not more than 50 years." The letter, which was written on the same day that I introduced my bill, also called for an interest subsidy plan at a cost of no more than 3 percent to the institution, or an alternative program of capital grants that would have the effect of reducing the interest cost on construction of housing to at least a 3-percent level for the term of the debt.

I am further advised that the Investment Bankers Association of America has also gone on record in favor of programing Federal subsidies to higher education. The association points out that the Federal interest rate of 3 percent is more attractive than current private market rates, and thereby has created an artificial condition which hampers rather than encourages decisive solutions to the growing problem of providing sufficient college housing. This same association suggests direct Federal subsidies by three possible approaches, one of which is a direct reflection of the provisions of my bill, to wit, a variable interest grant to absorb interest costs over a prescribed rate. The Investment Bankers conclude that "maximum construction of new college academic buildings and dormitories depends upon utilizing the private market to its full potential, and then supplementing it when necessary with a Federal Government loan program."

This is precisely the approach I concluded would be the most feasible in the drafting of H.R. 8647.

I am pleased also to have the endorsement of my own University of Hawaii, which like other educational institutions is most concerned over the effect on its budget of a proposed Federal interest rate higher than the present 3 percent. The vice president for business affairs at the university, Mr. Richard Takasaki, terms my bill a "most practical approach for assisting students with this pressing problem." Mr. Takasaki endorses the use of private market financing with the Federal Government subsidizing interest costs in excess of 3 percent, and expressed to me the concern of the university over the President's proposal to increase the interest rate from 3 percent to somewhere in the neighborhood of 3⅝ percent.

I am encouraged by the initial reaction to believe that we do have with this legislation a feasible and workable plan whose early inception at such a minimal cost to the Government can do so much to relieve the present worsening situation in construction of new college housing accommodations. I sincerely hope that this Congress will see fit to give its careful consideration to H.R.8647 as a positive approach that will draw the approval of educators and the business community in unison, while meeting an overlooked need in making a well-rounded education available to the hundreds of thousands of students who will be swelling college enrollments in the years ahead.

EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 6232, the Higher Education Amendments of 1967, presently the subject of hearings in the Special Subcommittee on Education and most particularly to express my interest in title V of the bill relating to the education professions development.

In this 90th Congress, I have again sponsored a bill, H.R. 3372, which will establish a national sabbatical leave program for elementary and secondary teachers. In the 89th Congress the identical bill (H.R. 10622) was reported out of our Committee on Education and

Labor, but did not reach the House floor for consideration.

I am pleased to see that H.R. 6232 is addressing itself to the questions of improving the quality of American education by providing programs of enrichment for our elementary and secondary teachers, which is the principal concern of my bill H.R. 3372.

While it is well known that our country faces a serious shortage of teachers, and that this bill seeks to respond to this question, I feel that it is equally important that we strengthen it by specifically recognizing the special needs of teachers who are already teaching and who have not had an opportunity to leave work for an extended year's study in their field of teaching or to develop further skills in another field in which they may have found new interests.

I heartily endorse section 532(b)(1) of H.R. 6232 which specifically refers to various subject matters such as history, civics, reading, international affairs, and the arts and humanities, in addition to education-type courses, as those which might be included in programs that institutions could provide for teachers who are presently in the specific teaching field. Paragraph (2) refers to guidance, remedial speech and reading, child development, and educational media as other areas of study for the teacher. Reference is also made in other paragraphs to special programs for teachers of preschool children, of disadvantaged children, of handicapped children, as well as programs for administrators and other school personnel.

H.R. 6232 authorizes the Commissioner to include in the terms of the grant or contract with the institution of higher education, State or local educational agency, or other agencies, payments to persons participating in these training programs of such stipends, including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents, as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under other comparable Federal programs. This provision is absolutely necessary for the teacher to participate in these programs.

A recent study by the National Education Association showed that in urban districts selected for study only 19.4 percent offered their teachers sabbatical leaves with at least partial pay for professional study. The study also showed that the smaller the school district and the more limited its financial resources, the less likely it was that any provision for such a leave was available. The study also pointed out that only 4,229 teachers were on such leaves, averaging less than one teacher from the 4,697 school districts included in the study.

The complexity of our society and the rapid expansion of new knowledge and ideas are self-evident. Equally apparent is the fact that we are not helping our teachers keep up with the current explosion of concepts and ideas, if the vast majority are left to their own resources to maintain professional competence and expertise. We are penalizing our children if we do not provide our teachers with ample opportunities to return to institutions of higher learning without undue sacrifice to their families' well-being.

Summer institutes, inservice training programs, and other short-term programs, seminars, workshops and conferences are worthwhile but in my opinion cannot take the place of offering the teacher concentrated full-time academic study in his particular field of study or in a new area which is urgently needed in his school system. For this reason, I have asked the subcommittee to amend the language on page 61 of H.R. 6232 to make specific the authority that section 532 grants to teachers already in the system may be for yearlong academic programs at institutions of higher education.

While fully supporting the provisions of the bill which provide refresher courses, as well as the degree-program fellowships which are designed to attract qualified people into the teaching profession, I am most fearful that H.R. 6232 as drafted will not make possible the intensive study many of our nondegree teachers need to upgrade their qualifications. Nor will it allow such longer periods of study to experienced teachers. It cannot be assumed that these teachers are able to maintain professional competence only through attending evening institutes or summer courses.

Also in my bill H.R. 3372, I have made specific provision for yearlong study grants to teachers who are currently teaching but who do not have a baccalaureate degree. Current figures are not available; however, a 1955 report of the NEA showed that 34 percent of all elementary school teachers lacked a bachelor's degree and in 1960 a further study revealed that 25 percent of the elementary teachers had less than 4 years of undergraduate teacher preparation. In recognition of this problem I have urged the Education Subcommittee to write specific language in H.R. 6232 to provide special programs which will accelerate the completion of the basic academic studies necessary to bring these teachers' professional requirements up to standard. Such a move is as necessary as attracting new students into teaching careers.

No matter how vigorously we work to achieve equal educational opportunity for our children, each class is only as good as its teacher. The Federal Government needs to make a firm commitment to our teachers by providing them with greater ease and access to the available knowledge and education in our universities. Finally I urge the provision of adequate funds for implementing these programs; this would be the surest guarantee of the highest quality education for our elementary and secondary school children.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a list of organizations and individuals who have written in support of my bill H.R. 3372, and also a list of the Members of Congress to date who have cosponsored my bill H.R. 3372:

ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3372

ORGANIZATIONS

American Federation of Teachers.
California Teachers Association.
Everett Federation of Teachers (Massachusetts).
Hawaii Education Association.
Hawaii State Board of Education.
Illinois Federation of Teachers.
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America.
Kauai Education Association (Hawaii).
Labor's Non-Partisan League.
Lanai Education Association (Hawaii).
Maine Teachers Association.
Minnesota Federation of Teachers.
National Education Association of the United States.
Nebraska State Education Association.
New Jersey Education Association.
North Dakota Education Association.
Ohio Education Association, Association of Classroom Teachers.
Oregon Education Association.
Overseas Education Association, Inc.
Rhode Island Federation of Teachers.
Texas State Teachers Association.
United Automobile Workers of America.
Washington Education Association.
Wisconsin Education Association.

INDIVIDUALS

Mr. Mark Cockrill, Maunaolu College, Maui, Hawaii.
Mr. Eugene C. Edgerly, Heidelberg American School.
Mr. Don B. Goodloe, The Washington Teachers' Union.
Mr. Don Kenyon, Covina High School, California.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. John H. Dent, identical bill introduced.
Hon. John G. Dow, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Ed Edmondson, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Don Edwards, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Donald M. Fraser.
Hon. Julia Butler Hansen.
Hon. Henry Helstoski, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Elmer Holland, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Hervey Machen, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Spark Matsunaga, identical bill introduced.
Hon. George P. Miller.
Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Joseph Resnick, identical bill introduced.
Hon. James Scheuer, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Lionel Van Deerlin.
Hon. E. S. Johnny Walker, identical bill introduced.

I urge the Members of this body to join me in seeking the inclusion of this program in the higher education amendments now under consideration.

OIL SHALE AND MINERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced a proposed set of rules and regulations by which he hopes to administer the de-

velopment of oil shale and other minerals on federally owned land in the Western United States.

I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to urge the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw his proposed regulations until Congress has had further opportunity to study them more thoroughly.

It is estimated that the volume of oil in shale lands runs to 2,000 billion barrels—five times the world's known reserves in the United States. The oil is estimated to be worth $5,000 billion at current market prices, which comes to about $25,000 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Since we are dealing here with the last great known reserve of oil and other natural resources still in the public domain, I believe we must be very careful to see that it is developed in such a manner as to assure the best use of the resources and the maximum possible return from them for public use.

Considering the primitive condition of the technology regarding the recovery of oil from shale, and particularly considering that 30 percent of the oil shale land already is in private ownership, I can see no need to rush.

It would be a tragic thing if this complicated situation were mishandled in such a way as to permit monopolization of this great untapped natural resource belonging to all the people of this Nation.

AMERICANIZATION DAY IN JERSEY CITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great days in my native Jersey City, is the annual Americanization Day celebration which is sponsored by the Clinton E. Fisk Post, 132, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This year I was invited to be the principal speaker at the 36th annual celebration which the Jersey Journal, a very outstanding newspaper and a reliable indicator of the public pulse in our community, described as the "greatest ever."

To observe this event, some very distinguished representatives of the Armed Forces honored our city with appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all Members of this honorable body to the remarks made at the Americanization Day ceremonies which were held at Pershing Field, Jersey City, on Sunday, April 30, 1967, and I would like to express my eternal gratitude to the officers and members of this great veterans' group for their continuing support of this event and to the city fathers of the city of Jersey City who labored with the members of the Fisk Post to make this once again a great day for Jersey City.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD the remarks made by Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, commanding general of the 78th Division, USAR, the grand marshal for the 36th annual Americanization Day parade, Brig. Gen. Edward B. Thorpe, New Jersey National Guard, and Capt. C. J. Schulz, USNR. The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN G. CASSIDY, COMMANDING GENERAL, NEW JERSEY 78TH DIVISION (TRAINING), U.S. ARMY RESERVE, GRAND MARSHAL FOR THE 36TH ANNUAL JERSEY CITY AMERICANIZATION DAY PARADE, APRIL 30, 1967

"Our Country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right. But our Country, right or wrong."

I have been bestowed a great honor in being Grand Marshal for this 36th annual Jersey City Americanization Day Parade. It is one of the proudest moments of life.

As our Country is faced with so many problems in the world and in protecting innocent, defenseless peoples from Communist aggression, displays of loyalty and Americanism as witnessed here today most assuredly prove to the minority who dissent with the policies of President Johnson and our Country that our Country is right and that our President is right.

There can be no other way—But the American way and President Johnson's policies must be carried out if peace is to reign throughout the world. The war in Vietnam is a war all of us would rather not be involved with—But we are.

We are involved for good reason. We are in Vietnam to stop Communist aggression before it reaches the shores of the United States. We must hold the line somewhere.

Today we have an excellent opportunity for all of us to register emphatic support of President Johnson in the Vietnam war and complete contempt for those who would hamper the war effort and prolong the bloodshed.

The turnout of tremendous magnitude today will be an expression of utter condemnation of those with subnormal minds who would resort to such despicable acts as burning the American Flag and destroying their draft cards, and heaping abuse on official Washington. These same characters, a discredit to any nation, would be among the first, when involved in trying circumstances who would wrap around themselves the Constitution and "Old Glory" and cry for protection of their rights as citizens. Unmindful, however, are these lawbreakers, peaceniks, Vietniks to the precept that citizenship carries responsibility.

Today we will have an opportunity to imbue and rekindle in ourselves and our children—the so-called old fashioned way of patriotism, a burning devotion to the principles and ideals upon which our Country was founded.

It comes at a time when these very basics of American democracy are menaced by misguided groups who would desecrate the Flag and utter traitorous phrases against our President and a valiant, generous country's institutions.

Our prayer today is to keep the flag flying high, we can't wave it too much. Our hope is to find a way to reach the blackened hearts of the "niks" of all varieties without resorting to force and try to make them realize that in no country can they enjoy the privileges made available to them here. In no country outside the United States would their reprehensible acts be tolerated.

Organizations such as the V.F.W. and American Legion, encourage individual participations in programs such as will be conducted today and add a personal protest against the alien "isms" that are responsible for the present unrest and are threatening world peace. We must rededicate ourselves to the ideals of our forefathers conceived 191 years ago. Thank you.

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. EDWARD B. THORPE, NEW JERSEY ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AT THE THIRTY-SIXTH AMERICANIZATION DAY CELEBRATION, JERSEY CITY, N.J., APRIL 30, 1967

I wish to congratulate the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the citizens of Jersey City and Hudson County.

This annual program is most outstanding. I don't believe it is equaled anywhere in the U.S.A. In fact, it should be duplicated in every hamlet and city in the country.

I have come to the conclusion that there are too many people in this country who have forgotten the meaning of loyalty. Several events have taken place recently that prompt me to make this statement.

First, the disclosure by "Ramparts Magazine" that our Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was assisting clean-cut students to attend international student conferences. The purpose of this assistance was to send these clean-cut Americans abroad to improve our posture . . . to let the world know that the majority of our students were not long-haired Lotharios. They were not sent to these conferences as agents of the CIA.

Then a couple of weeks ago we saw these bathless-bearded, Communists and fellow travelers burn draft cards and the United States flag. In my opinion, each and every one of the participants in the march and the speakers are treading on seditious ground.

I was raised and taught to respect, love and understand that the U.S.A. is the greatest country ever founded. Stephen Decatur said "My country, may she always be in the right: but our country, right or wrong." I say "Our President, right or wrong, is always right when dealing with foreign powers in the time of war.

I compare the position of President Johnson with that of General Washington. He was surrounded by the enemy in red coats and the Tories in civilian dress. He always had to be on his guard: During the Campaign of 1777 one night he had to give the order, "Place only Americans on guard tonight." At Brandywine, Germantown, Chester and in and around Philadelphia the loyalists, the Tories and their fellow travelers were so numerous he couldn't rely on the Intelligence passed on to him because of the loyalists and the fellow travelers who were masquerading as patriots. He had his problems with the Congress, too. They delayed authorizing him 150 lbs that he urgently required for maintaining his Intelligence system.

Today, our President has a war on his hands—the Communists and their fellow travelers have organized a spy and sabotage system that is giving comfort to the enemy.

The bathless, bearded ones and a few misguided clergy are attempting to undermine every decent and patriotic principle thousands of men have died for. We can't permit these unpatriotic individuals to sabotage our President, our country, and comfort the enemy.

To the young folk, and there are many of you present, I want you to remember the rights and privileges you enjoy haven't been acquired on a silver platter. They have been earned by sweat and blood. This freedom is only temporary and it has to be earned and protected from generation to generation.

In Vietnam, we are not fighting an unorganized group of starved peasants, using bows, arrows and slingshots that these flag and draft card burners would like you to believe. The Vietcong are using weapons equal to those used by our ground forces, and they have the advantage of using guerrilla warfare tactics in the jungle. In the cities they are using modern explosives to sabotage public and private property and kill innocent citizens. They also have in their pos-

session the most sophisticated weapons of our time. These weapons are supplied by the Soviet bloc nations, including Soviet Russia and Red China.

Our pilots state that the flak around the V.C. industrial and railroad installations is greater than anything they encountered during World War II. They are also using 140mm missiles against our airports and troops. This weapon is produced in the Soviet Union and shipped to N. Vietnam.

I quote part of an article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune. This is a statement of Nicolai Lenin. Quote: "On basis of my observations gathered during my years of exile: The cultured class of the capitalist countries of Western Europe and America and the idealistic bourgeoisie should be regarded as deafmutes and treated accordingly. They will grant us credits which will fill the coffers of the Communist organizations in their countries while they enlarge and improve our armament industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers."

If Kosygin and his perverted constituents were sincere about peace and easing tensions, they could tear down the Berlin Wall and allow free passage between East and West Berlin. This would be a practical effort towards peace.

Don't forget, Khrushchev stated "he would bury us" and this is their ultimate objective.

I have faith and trust in our President Johnson; I have faith in the loyal Americans. After listening to Congressman Daniels, I am assured that our representatives in Congress have had about enough of this minor minority group of fellow travelers and their bearded patsies. I am further assured that the Congress will support our President and our men in uniform during the present crisis.

Thank you for your attention and wholesome acceptance of these remarks.

REMARKS FOR AMERICANIZATION DAY CEREMONY BY CAPT. C. J. SCHULZ, USNR

It is gratifying to see such a large and enthusiastic turnout for a patriotic event such as this. The Navy has always enjoyed the wonderful support given it by the people of Jersey City and it is pleased with the support it continues to receive during the present world crisis.

There are currently about 150,000 Navy men and Marines in and off Vietnam engaged in military operations ranging from the flying of sophisticated supersonic aircraft to sailing and searching wooden hulled junks—their design as ancient as Asia itself.

The ships, aircraft and men are conducting the most intensive air and combat operations in naval history. Many carrier pilots have flown more than 200 combat missions in this war, twice as many as most pilots flew in World War II. Navy-Marine Corps amphibious assaults from the sea, by helicoptor and landing craft along with combined United States and South Vietnamese counter insurgency operations are preventing men and material from reaching the Viet Cong by sea.

The problem of keeping 50 combat ships operating and 500 aircraft flying is considerable. The Navy directed military sea transportation service is engaged in a massive sealift operation carrying men and supplies to Vietnam—over 98% of all supplies going to Vietnam are carried by ships over the longest supply route of any war in history. Primitive harbors have had to be made into efficient modern ports.

The Navy in Vietnam is not just men fighting enemy forces, it is also Navy men and Marines building homes for orphans and helping children. It is doctors treating civilians and teaching medical students. It is Seabees teaching new methods and new tools. Navy men are helping the South Vietnamese help themselves toward a better life.

These men are working 16- to 18-hour days without complaint. General Westmoreland said just a few days ago that certain so-called peace demonstrations in the U.S. are undoubtedly the cause of loss of life among the valiant men of all services in southeast Asia. We in the Navy like to think that a patriotic demonstration such as this, may in the long run shorten this war and save lives of our fighting men.

On behalf of all Navy men and especially of the thousands of present and former Navy men from Jersey City, I want to convey our appreciation for your support. The freedom that the world seeks has a tremendous cost. It is pleasing to us to know that the people of Jersey City know that freedom is not free.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, during October 1966, there was created a permanent Judicial Conference of the Americas composed of the Chief Justices of the Western Hemisphere nations and at the same time there was adopted a Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas. The Judicial Conference is a nonprofit international organization with permanent headquarters in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Its creation grew out from a combined regional meeting of the American Bar Association and the biennial conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in San Juan, P.R., May 22–29, 1966. More than 800 lawyers and judges from 19 nations, including 500 from the United States, attended the meeting.

The purpose of the Judicial Conference of the Americas is to strengthen the independence of the judiciary, sponsor forums, conduct research, provide consultations on problems related to the administration of justice, improve judicial procedures, and stimulate the adoption and implementation of standards that dignify the judicial function.

The Judicial Conference aims to provide the means of informational exchange between the member countries to enhance the judicial function and to establish judicial schools and sponsor the exchange of magistrates and jurists in furtherance of the principles sanctioned in the Declaration of San Juan.

The Declaration of San Juan calls upon all governments in this hemisphere to recognize the independence of the judiciary as essential to "the very existence of any society that respects the rule of law."

The recent trip of President Lyndon B. Johnson to Punta del Este, which gave additional impetus to the efforts to integrate South America economically, makes this an opportune time to call the attention of our colleagues to the "Charter of San Juan." Because for economic integration to be a success, it will also be necessary for the South American countries to unify their judicial rules. The "Charter of San Juan" is a significant step in this direction.

The meeting of the American Bar Association and the holding of the biennial conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in San Juan last May, the establishment of the permanent Judicial Conference of the Americas, and the adoption of the "Charter of San Juan" is further evidence of Puerto Rico's role as an essential link between North and South America. This link which has heretofore proved valuable for economic and political communication now takes on a new meaning with the judicial function.

The "Charter of San Juan" follows:

We, the undersigned, assembled in plenary session of the Second Judicial Conference of the Americas in the city of San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico, hereby adopt the following Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas.

First: A nonprofit association named Judicial Conference of the Americas, Incorporated, is hereby created with a permanent nature and for an indefinite time, pursuant to legislation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and which in its international relations shall be known as Judicial Conference of the Americas.

Second: Its headquarters shall be in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, with the main office temporarily located at 19 Betances Street, Hato Rey, San Juan; and Mr. Luis Negrón Fernández is hereby designated, for purposes of its registration, provisional representative or agent in charge thereof, who shall later be substituted as the Board of Directors may determine through resolution of the Conference itself.

Third: The Conference shall meet in San Juan, Puerto Rico, every two years, and shall hold sessions with the absolute majority of its members, but it may meet in any other country and at such other time as the Conference itself may decide by two-thirds of the votes of the members present.

Fourth: It shall promote, execute and carry out the following objectives or purposes:

1. To sponsor forums, studies, research and consultations among the members of the judiciary of the countries of the Continent on problems related to the Administration of Justice, so as to strengthen its independence as an indispensable requirement for the prevalence of the Rule of Law; to improve and simplify all administrative and judicial procedures; and to stimulate the adoption and application of standards that dignify the judicial function.

2. To provide means of information to bring within the reach of the members of the judiciary of the Continent, texts, jurisprudence, studies, and research in the fields of law, judicial administration and court operation, and advise them of the achievements and measures adopted in different countries, within their respective systems, aimed at enhancing the judicial function.

3. To develop an educational program through the establishment of Judicial Schools and sponsor the exchange of magistrates and jurists of the different countries, with a view to the coalescence of the principles sanctioned in the *Declaration of San Juan*, which is attached herewith as part of this Constitutive Charter.

Fifth: The members of the Judicial Conference of the Americas shall be: (1) the chief justices of the Supreme Courts of Justice of the countries which were represented in the First Judicial Conference of the Americas, held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, from the twenty-fourth to the twenty-sixth of May, nineteen hundred and sixty-five, and

in this second conference; (2) the signers of the Declaration of San Juan and of this document, as long as they form part of their respective courts.

The chief justices of the Supreme Courts of Justice of other countries in America may be members of the Judicial Conference of the Americas when the Conference so decides in a plenary session, by two-thirds of the votes of the members present. The Chief Justices of the Supreme Courts who are members of the Conference may delegate their representation to another magistrate of their own court.

Sixth: The signers of the Declaration of San Juan and of this Constitutive Charter who cease to be members of their respective courts shall continue belonging to this association on an Adviser-Member capacity.

Seventh: This corporation shall not have the power to issue capital stock.

Eight: The names and addresses of the incorporators are:

Hon. Pacifício Ledezma, Sucre, Bolivia.

Hon. Osvaldo Illanes Benitez, Santiago, Chile.

Hon. Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Bogotá, Colombia.

Hon. Evelio Ramírez Chavarri, San José, Costa Rica.

Hon. José Vicente Vilanova, San Salvador, El Salvador.

Hon. Fabio Murillo Díaz, Tegucigalpa, Honduras.

Hon. Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Managua, Nicaragua.

Hon. Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Panama City, Panamá.

Hon. Luis Martínez Miltos Asunción, Paraguay.

Hon. Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Lima, Jeru.

Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Hon. Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.

Hon. Hamlet Reyes, Montevideo, Uruguay.

Hon. José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Caracas, Venezuela.

Ninth: The Judicial Conference of the Americans shall have a Board of Directors composed of a president, a vice-president, a secretary, and a treasurer, which Board, for its first term of office, is elected unanimously as follows:

Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández, President.

Hon. Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Vice President.

Hon. José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Secretary.

Hon. Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Treasurer.

The Board shall adopt its resolutions by a majority of its members.

The Board shall have, furthermore, an assistant secretary and an assistant treasurer, having been unanimously elected as such the Hon. José Vicente Vilanova, assistant secretary, and Hon. Evelio Ramírez, assistant treasurer, who shall act as substitutes for the secretary and treasurer whenever these can not attend a meeting.

The members of the Board of Directors shall hold office for a term of two years and until their succesors are elected and qualify.

Given in San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico, this twenty-eighth day of October, nineteen hundred and sixty-six.

Pacífico Ledezma, Dean of the Supreme Court of Justice of Bolivia.

Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Chile.

Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Colombia.

Evelio Ramírez, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Costa Rica.

José Vicente Vilanova, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of El Salvador.

Fabio Murillo Díaz, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Honduras.

Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Nicaragua.

Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Panama.

Luis Martínez Miltos, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Paraguay.

Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Dean of the Supreme Court of Justice of Peru.

Luis Negrón Fernández, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of the Dominican Republic.

Hamlet Reyes, Minister of the Supreme Court of Justice of Uruguay.

José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Venezuela.

JURAT

We, the Justices Pacífico Ledezma, Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Evelio Ramírez, José Vicente Vilanova, Fabio Murillo Díaz, Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Luis Martínez Miltos, Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Luis Negrón Fernández, Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Hamlet Reyes and José G. Sarmiento Núñez, being duly sworn, hereby depose: that we are of full age, married, except the one named above in third order, all lawyers, and residents, respectively, of Sucre, Bolivia; Santiago, Chile; Bogotá, Colombia; San José, Costa Rica; San Salvador, El Salvador; Tegucigalpa, Honduras; Managua, Nicaragua; Panama City, Panamá; Asunción, Paraguay; Lima, Perú; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic; Montevideo, Uruguay, and Caracas, Venezuela, being the subscribing incorporators of the preceding Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas, ratifying our agreement with the same and acknowledging the truth of the facts herein stated, all of which are of our own and personal knowledge.

AFFIDAVIT NUMBER 8729

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Justices Pacífio Ledezma, Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Evelio Ramírez, José Vicente Vilanova, Fabio Murillo Díaz, Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Luis Martínez Miltos, Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Luis Negrón Fernández, Manuel R. Riuz Tejada, Hamlet Reyes and José G. Sarmiento Núñez, of the personal circumstances above stated, all of whom I personally know, this twenty-eighth day of October, nineteen hundred and sixty-six, in San Juan de Puerto Rico. I attest.

FELIX OCHOTECO,
Notary.

POLISH CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D.C., PRESENTS POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Polish Club of Washington, D.C., Group 848 of the Polish National Alliance, presented a program commemorating the signing of the Polish Constitution in 1791 at the Franciscan Monastery in Washington, D.C. I wish to hereby submit excerpts of remarks made in my address commemorating this great event inaugurating this great milestone in Poland's long fight for freedom and self-government. The program was under the chairmanship of Tadeusz Drweski, president of the Polish Club of Washington.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN MADDEN

Mr. Chairman, I am, indeed, glad to participate in the ceremonies today commemorating the historic Constitution of the Polish nation which was signed in 1791 and inaugurated the beginning of what was then thought to be liberty, freedom and self-government for the people of Poland. The world did not know at that time that Poland would, in a short time, again be enslaved by powerful neighbor nations. During the intervening years up to the present day, the people of Poland have consistently fought for freedom and self-government. Over the generations the desire for liberty and freedom has never diminished in the minds and the hearts of Polish people whether they are living in the mother country or in other lands throughout the world.

Older people in the audience vividly remember the days after World War I when Woodrow Wilson was making his fight for the League of Nations. At that time Poland, for the first time in generations, was again given a free government and national identity. To my mind one of the darkest periods of world history was the unfortunate opposition and successful fight made by opponents of Wilson's League of Nations in the United States Senate during the early 1920's. When our nation refused to join other nations of the world in this great effort to insure world peace, many suspected then the League of Nations would fail. Had the Number One nation, the United States, participated, there is no doubt in my mind that the League of Nations would have succeeded to outlaw future international wars.

We must remember that in those days the international communist conspiracy had not been organized and the communist threat was merely in the minds of a few world insurrectionists and fanatics. Had we joined the League of Nations, Hitler, Mussolini and and Japanese war lords could not have constructed the gigantic war machines over the years during the late 20's and 1930's. This great opportunity for future world peace was destroyed by reason of party politics in the election of 1920. The Congress elected in that year rejected participation in an organization to protect the future peace of the world.

Poland again received independence and self-government after World War I and in the twenty years of the Polish Republic great progress in government organization was accomplished. No nation in the history of the world succeeded in such a short time in establishing national educational, industrial, financial programs, transportation, highways, and all the modern improvements and progress which many older nations had not established. The aggression of the Soviets and Hitler destroyed again the hopes of a free Polish nation in World War II.

The history of Poland is the history of a heroic people, a people who peacefully welded together into a nation singularly united in language and customs, an area stretching from the Baltic Sea in the north, across the verdant plains, to the Black Sea in the south.

The first Poles arrived in America at Jamestown in 1608. Polish generals were heroes of our own Revolution. Almost 900,000 Polish-Americans served in our Armed Forces in World War II.

And so it has gone, down through the centuries—in Poland or in the new homelands to which they went seeking refuge and freedom, the Polish people have never lost that indomitable spirit that has enabled them to give so much to human achievement.

The Polish Constitution, 176 years old May 3, 1967, is not merely a document in history's archives. It is a vital symbol of assurance that one day Poland will again stand in full freedom and independence. Here in this nation where we so fully reap the blessings of freedom, we must ever be prepared to support freedom.

It is in fitting discharge of that sacred responsibility that we dedicate this celebration of Polish Constitution Day to the abiding faith of the Polish people in the ultimate freedom of man.

THE VIETNAM WEEK DEMONSTRATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a 55-page report on the "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week"—April 8 to 15, 1967. The timeliness of this report is indisputable in that it informed the Members of Congress and the American people, a full 2 weeks in advance, of the now notorious April 15 demonstrations in New York and San Francisco.

The committee, which I have the honor to chair, had been monitoring the development of these demonstrations for several months, and the report, carefully compiled and thoroughly documented, proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that Communists were the prime movers behind them.

Today, as a followup to that report, I would like to bring to the attention of the House certain significant facts about the Vietnam Week demonstrations.

The first thing I would like to point out is that both Radio Hanoi and Radio Moscow publicized the April 15 demonstrations for days before they took place. In addition, organizers of Vietnam Week sent a telegram to the Communist Premier of North Vietnam, telling him of their plans to organize a "massive drive of the American people" in opposition to the U.S. Government's effort to halt his aggression against South Vietnam.

Pham Van Dong, the Communist Premier of North Vietnam, in his reply to the telegram, thanked the organizers of Vietnam Week for the "valuable support" they were giving to his country.

No one in this House, I am sure, and no one in this country will be surprised by this.

The Committee on Un-American Activities stated in its report that the global Communist propaganda apparatus would capitalize in every way possible on Vietnam Week and the April 15 demonstrations. It further stated that they would give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere, particularly in Vietnam, and that among non-Communists throughout the world, it would tend to create the false impression that a truly large segment of the American people oppose the war in Vietnam.

Communist Premier Pham Van Dong's telegram is partial evidence of the accuracy of this prediction. Its accuracy has also been corroborated by Radio Moscow, Radio Peking, Radio Hanoi, and the official propaganda agencies of other Communist capitals.

They filled the air waves with accounts, most of them highly exaggerated, of the April 15 demonstrations. Here are just a few examples:

Radio Hanoi:

The stirring demonstrations on 15 April showed the high indignation of broad masses of the American people at the wide differences between the words and deeds of Johnson . . .

Padding the attendance figures by a few hundred thousand, Hanoi continued:

500,000 Americans of all walks of life held high portraits of Ho Chi Minh and flags of the NFLSV . . .

It is important to note that these broadcasts were in English and can be easily picked up by our troops in Vietnam.

Hanoi went on:

Like a thunderbolt, the demonstrations once again exposed the unjust, barbarous, and inhuman character of the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, smashing the peace-negotiation fraud and all other intrigues of the Johnson clique against the American people and other peoples of the world . . .

Moscow Radio claimed it was "impossible to estimate precisely" the number of those who took part in the "historic" New York demonstration, but that "perhaps as many as a half a million" marched "for an end to the dirty war in Vietnam."

It is interesting to note that demonstrations against the U.S. role in Vietnam were also staged in other major cities of the world on the same day. They were, however, pitifully small. Police in Mexico City quickly broke up a small demonstration of a dozen antiwar agitators about a block from the U.S. Embassy. Only about 100 demonstrators turned out in Paris, carrying a statue of Thomas Paine and banners demanding U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam. In Amsterdam, only 700 agitators could be induced to demonstrate. Demonstrators in London lunged at Prime Minister Harold Wilson and denounced him as a puppet of the United States. Eight of them were jailed. Thirty London marchers tramped around the U.S. Embassy and shouted "Hands off Vietnam." Five thousand gathered in Vancouver, British Columbia, to hear the United States berated. In Tokyo, about 500 members of the Japanese "Peace for Vietnam Committee" marched through the Ginza area carrying signs demanding that the war be brought to an end.

Communist propagandists grossly exaggerated the number of persons who took part in all these demonstrations. Hanoi Radio reported, for example, that April 15 would go down in history as a day "of seething struggle of millions of people in the world against Johnson's war in Vietnam."

If your arithmetic is the same as mine, however, total worldwide participation in the April 15th anti-Vietnam war demonstrations was only about 200,000 people. This fact alone should give us all cause to do some thinking.

Is world opinion really against American policy in Vietnam as much as the Communists—and some of our ultra-liberal brethren—would have us believe? Apparently not. In fact, if the April 15 demonstrations are any criteria at all, just the opposite would appear to be true; namely, that the overwhelming majority of peoples throughout the world somehow see the situation in Vietnam as it truly exists.

Now, in contrast to the Communist propaganda claims, what are the facts about the April 15 demonstrations in this country?

We might as well face the truth that the Communists succeeded in one of their aims—that of staging the largest demonstrations that have ever been held in this country against the war in Vietnam.

The other side of the coin, however, is that they failed miserably in another respect. Their original plan and hope was to turn out 1,000,000 demonstrators—500,000 in New York City and the same number in San Francisco.

THE NEW YORK DEMONSTRATION

The Communist Party has claimed that more than a half million people took part in the New York demonstration. The Spring Mobilization Committee, the technical sponsor of the affair, has claimed that 300,000 to 400,000 persons paraded in New York and that there were 125,000 people in the United Nations Plaza rally which climaxed the march.

Dr. Martin Luther King, the featured speaker at the rally, has claimed that he spoke to 100,000 to 125,000 persons who were crowded into the U.N. Plaza and that 300,000 to 400,000 people turned out for the New York demonstration.

But the truth about the attendance at the New York demonstration is a far cry from these figures.

Mathematical computations made by the New York City Police Department, prove that it was a physical impossibility for more than 29,000 people to have been in the U.N. Plaza at the time of the rally. Official police estimates indicate that only 100,000 to 125,000 took part in the New York march.

Considering the fact that the New York metropolitan area alone has a population of almost 11,000,000, and the fact that demonstrators were imported for the New York rally from major population areas as far west as Minneapolis, the turnout was exceedingly small.

Communists of all varieties were prominent in the demonstration, although they by no means comprised a majority of the participants.

A contingent of the Moscow-controlled Communist Party, USA, marched openly behind a large red and white banner with the name of the party emblazoned on it. It was led by party boss Gus Hall, and included many top officials of Moscow's fifth column in the United States. The party has since gloated over the fact that it was able to demonstrate openly for the first time since 1949.

New York District Chairman Gil Green led the delegation in singing the traditional Communist revolutionary song, the "Internationale."

Hours before the parade started, the Communist Party had set up a table at the assembly point in Central Park for the purpose of distributing literature, including 20,000 copies of its official newspaper, The Worker. This issue of The

Worker, published just before the New York rally, gave complete information on assembly points for the march and the order of the march—so that every party member would know just where to go.

The Communist Party has issued a statement proclaiming "a sense of pride and joy" in the demonstrations and claiming that, through them:

> A great deal has been gained. . . . The opposition to the war . . . is more vocal than ever.

Gus Hall has boasted that the New York and San Francisco demonstrations were mass actions that had "few precedents in the history of the world progressive movement," and that they comprised "a qualitative leap" in the U.S. peace movement.

The Communist Party's youth group, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, also marched openly in the demonstration. Its units carried signs with slogans spelling out the party line. One read "Youth Unite—Resist the Draft."

The Socialist Workers Party—SWP—the Trotskyist Communist organization, also had a literature table set up at the parade assembly point in Central Park. The SWP claims that it had a "full gamut of radical literature" available for the demonstration and distributed most of it free; also, that it sold over 5,000 copies of its newspaper, the Militant, and about 1,200 copies of Young Socialist, the magazine of its youth section, the Young Socialist Alliance—YSA.

SWP contingents in the parade included delegations from Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Detroit, Boston, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis. Young Socialist Alliance contingents represented YSA chapters in Chicago, New York, Atlanta, Washington, D.C., Boston, and Minneapolis, and also various colleges and universities including Antioch College, University of Wisconsin, Queens College, Columbia University, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Other Communist groups which participated in the demonstration in New York were the Spartacist League—a Trotskyist offshoot—Youth Against War and Fascism, and the ultrarevolutionary Progressive Labor Party.

A group called the Ad Hoc Committee for a Revolutionary Contingent also took an active interest in the demonstration by stating that its members would be "marching in support of national liberation movements throughout the world." A leaflet distributed by the group openly called for the support of a Communist "victory" in Vietnam. Listed among those who endorsed this new organization were M. S. Arnoni, Maxwell Geismar, John Gerassi, Allen Krebs, Conrad Lynn, Russell Stetler, Paul Sweezy, Walter D. Teague III, the Spartacist League—New York District—Students for a Democratic Society—Free School of New York Chapter—and the U.S. Committee To Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

The U.S. Committee To Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam built a 30-foot cardboard tower in Central Park on which its members attached flags of the Communist Vietcong. Vietcong flags were displayed throughout the parade and demonstration.

The Black United Action Front which had distributed flyers promoting the April 15 march in New York, also took part in it. This flyer referred to President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara as "murderers."

"Wake up black people," the flyer urged and asked in reference to Watts and Vietnam, "What the hell are we doing there?" The Black United Action Front, formerly known as BAND—Blacks Against Negative Dying—is composed of elements of the Progressive Labor Party, the Socialist Workers Party, and black nationalist groups.

An interesting sidelight occurred on the day before the New York demonstration. Michael Laski, embittered Communist revolutionary and national secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—Marxist-Leninist—stated in a press interview that the "revisionist Communist Party in connection with the Socialist Workers Party control and dominate this particular protest."

Laski's militant organization is ideologically opposed to the Communist Party, USA and the Socialist Workers Party because it feels that the CPUSA and the SWP are not true Marxist revolutionary organizations.

The Spring Mobilization Committee distributed a list of official slogans for use in making signs for the parade and rally. The Communist Party expressed pleasure that "more militant" slogans were not banned, as they had been in some past demonstrations.

Some of the approved slogans: "Stop the Bombing," "End the Draft—Let Young Men Live," "Children Are Not Born To Burn," "No Vietnamese Ever Called Me Nigger," "Free the Fort Hood Three," "Cease Fire Now—Negotiate With the NLF."

Many groups and individuals, ignoring the approval slogans, marched with placards bearing far more militant and extremist declarations, including "L.B.J.: The Penalty for Murder is Death," "L.B.J.: Go to Hell," "Pale Face President Speaks With Forked Tongue," "Hell No, We Won't Go," "Hey, L.B.J., How Many Kids Did You Kill Today?" Other slogans used were too obscene to repeat.

As has been widely reported in the press and commented on at length here on the floor of the House, an American flag was burned in Central Park by some of the demonstrators. Draft cards were also burned. Swastikas were placed over a reproduction of the American flag.

Speakers at the U.N. Plaza rally in New York City were:

Fritz Weaver, actor, who served as master of ceremonies.

Dr. Benjamin Spock, cochairman, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles Owen Rice, pastor, Holy Rosary Parish, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mad Bear Anderson, American Indian.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Floyd McKissick, national director, Congress of Racial Equality.

Stokely Carmichael, chairman, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Nick Egleson, president, Students for a Democratic Society.

Dave Dellinger, editor, Liberation magazine.

William F. Pepper, executive director, National Conference for New Politics.

Prof. Howard Zinn, professor of government, Boston University.

Cleveland Robinson, secretary-treasurer, Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Workers Union, District 65, AFL-CIO; president, Negro American Labor Council.

Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, founder, Women Strike for Peace.

Rabbi Michael Robinson, New York City, chairman of the Jewish Peace Fellowship.

Linus Pauling.

Rev. James Bevel, national director, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Entertainment was provided by Pete Seeger, an identified member of the Communist Party, and also by folksingers Tom Paxton, Phil Ochs, Peter Paul and Mary, and the Freedom Singers.

A former official of the progressive Labor Party, Phillip Abbott Luce, witnessed the April 15 demonstration in New York and has written a detailed description of the event which he states was openly controlled by the Communists. Luce said in part:

> The marchers themselves were an odd lot. Communists, ultra-leftists, left liberals, sincere pacifists and hippies dominated the street. With that many people it was naturally impossible to note all the Communists, but I did see such people as Levi Laub, Jeff Gordon and Rick Rhoads from Progressive Labor. Laub was pushing a baby carriage full of copies of "Challenge," the P.L. newspaper . . . The protestors met in Central Park's Sheep Meadow before they were led down the parade route by the Communist Judas goats. Most of the demonstrators looked like characters out of the "Three Penny Opera" . . .

THE SAN FRANCISCO DEMONSTRATION

The "mobilization" of the Vietnam war protesters in San Francisco was an even greater failure than the New York demonstration, from the viewpoint of the number and the kind of people who took part in it. As previously indicated, the aim of the organizers was a turnout of 500,000 people. They were to pour into the San Francisco area from all States west of the Mississippi River.

Actually, only about 23,000 persons took part in the San Francisco march and only about 60,000 assembled in the city's Kezar Stadium for what was ballyhooed in advance to be a mammoth turnout of American citizens protesting against their Government. The marchers represented less than one-twentieth of those expected to attend the demonstration and, though they came from States all over the West, represented less than one five-hundredths of the population of Metropolitan San Francisco.

It is significant, too, that to get the above number of demonstrators, they had to rely heavily on the west coast beatnik element and the tambourine and bongo drum-playing "hippies" from San

Francisco's Haight-Ashbury district, the home of the so-called love generation.

Steve Murdock, columnist for the Communist Party's west coast newspaper, the People's World, had to confess after the demonstration that—

The people connected with the mobilization who threw around loose and enormous figures about the number of participants did their cause no service.

The slogans on the placards carried by the San Francisco marchers and those who took part in the rally made it clear that this was not an assembly of genuine, conscientious pacifists inspired by love of their fellow man. One sign read: "Where is Oswald now that we need him?" Another in an obvious reference to the vicious and disgraceful play, "MacBird," read: "Who killed Kennedy?"

Still another promoted the same theme as a placard in the New York demonstration which I have mentioned. A black Nazi swastika was superimposed on a cardboard replica of the American flag. The theme that the United States is a Nazi-like country has long been promoted by the Communist Party.

Stokely Carmichael, the radical leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, sent a telegram which was read to the gathering at the Kezar Stadium. In it, he accused the United States of genocide in Vietnam.

Miss Kipp Dawson, Trotskyist director of the West Coast Spring Mobilization Committee, referred in her speech to "one section of American youth who aren't with us in the stadium today."

They are—

She added—

the American youth who have been drafted to fight in Vietnam.

She then told her audience—

But because they are not with us today, we cannot assume—and indeed we must not assume—that they are against us.

She claimed that the men "who have to fight this war in Vietnam are getting sick of it."

I doubt that even her listeners believed these words. Just a few days ago, here in this House, General Westmoreland, who is certainly far more deserving of belief, informed the Congress and the Nation that the "gallant American fighting men in Vietnam understand the conflict and their complex roles as fighters and builders." Further, he added, "They believe in what they are doing."

Statistics recently released on the number of defectors from the Vietcong suggest, I would say, that if anyone fighting the war in Vietnam is getting sick of it, it is the Communist Vietcong, rather than our own troops. Eleven thousand Vietcong defected in 1965, 20,000 in 1966, and in the first 3 months of 1967 alone, nearly 11,000 more.

Miss Dawson, making use of a shopworn Communist slogan, referred to the U.S. effort in Vietnam as a "dirty war."

I agree with her. It is a dirty war, but not in the way she implied.

The Communist Vietcong, in a veritable reign of terror, have, as General Westmoreland pointed out, killed or kidnapped 53,000 teachers, clergymen, civil servants, and elected officials in South Vietnam during the last decade. They have, in addition, inflicted unspeakable atrocities on thousands upon thousands of the South Vietnamese people, including women and children.

Yes; it is a dirty war in Vietnam, but we can be proud of the fact that the dirt is not on our hands or those of our fighting men. The dirt, the filth, and the blood are on the hands of the Communists there—and it rubs off on the hands of all those in this country who demonstrate to aid those Communists.

Speakers who addressed the Kezar Stadium rally included:

Edward Keating, publisher of Ramparts magazine, rally chairman and west coast chairman, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Julian Bond, Georgia legislator.

Robert Vaughn, TV actor.

Paul Schrade, western regional director, United Automobile Workers, AFL-CIO.

Robert Scheer, managing editor, Ramparts magazine.

Mrs. Martin Luther King, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Rabbi Abraham Feinberg of Toronto, who recently made a trip to North Vietnam.

Eldridge Cleaver, Bay Area chairman, organization of Afro-American Unity.

Kipp Dawson, west coast executive director, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Elijah Turner, "peace" candidate for city council in Oakland, Calif.

David Harris, recent student body president, Stanford University.

Gerald Hill, president, California Democratic Council.

Mrs. Grace Nora Newman, sister of Dennis Mora—one of "Fort Hood Three" GI's who refused to fight in Vietnam—also a recent traveler to North Vietnam.

Charles Duarte, president, Local 6, International Longshoremens' and Warehousemens' Union.

John Burton, California State assemblyman.

Willie Brown, California State assemblyman.

Rev. Robert McAfee Brown, theologian, Stanford University.

Folksingers Judy Collins and Melvina Reynolds, an identified Communist Party member, provided entertainment.

STUDENT VIETNAM WEEK ACTIVITIES

When I revealed last January 28 that the Communists, through Vietnam Week, were instituting a crash program to sabotage U.S. policy in Vietnam and were going to rely heavily on American students for assistance, I expressed the conviction that, despite the Communists' efforts, the overwhelming majority of students in this country would demonstrate the good sense and loyalty they have consistently demonstrated in the past and would refuse to be taken in by the cynical manipulators of the Vietnam Week operation.

I am glad to say that I was correct in my judgment. It was originally hoped that one of the features of Vietnam Week would be a nationwide student strike against the war in Vietnam. That project had to be scuttled. It was then hoped by the Communists that they would at least be able to call student strikes on a half dozen or so key university campuses.

Actually, throughout all of Vietnam Week, there was not a student strike at a single college or university. Moreever, the whole student-campus aspect of Vietnam Week was an even greater flop than the New York and San Francisco demonstrations. Few of the student and campus activities originally conceived actually took place and of those that did, student support for them was negligible.

In conclusion, I would make the following observations about Vietnam Week.

Basically, it was a failure because it fell far short of the number of persons the Communist organizers had hoped to induce to demonstrate against our Government.

At the same time, it was a disturbing indication of the number of Communists, pro-Communists, and fellow travelers in this country and the extent to which they can induce significant numbers of Americans to do their will. There is reason for pause when Communist elements, whose operations have been revealed in advance, can still mobilize about 185,000 Americans for a demonstration that is designed to discredit this country and weaken one of the most important elements of its foreign policy.

The Communist effort, in Vietnam Week, to make the Vietnam war a racial issue was a failure. Despite the efforts of the Communists behind the operation, and the leadership and support of Martin Luther King and Mrs. King, Stokely Carmichael, Floyd McKissick, James Bevel, and others, Negro attendance—as was generally noted by the press—was proportionately very, very small; even negligible. Moreover, it was primarily composed of Black Nationalist and leftist elements who, today as always, represent a tiny minority of Negroes in this country.

It is my belief that the obvious lack of general Negro support for the Vietnam Week demonstrations raises serious questions about the alleged "leadership" of some of the persons I have named.

I am also convinced that the overall result of the Vietnam Week demonstrations has been a pro-American "backlash." The American people have never been impressed—they never will be—by Communists, fellow travelers, and a motley collection of unkempt hippies and beatniks, cowardly draft-card burners, treasonous flag burners, and the ilk that will unite with them.

The citizens of this country, regardless of race or nationality, have been revolted and disgusted by what took place during the Vietnam Week demonstrations, and by the misfits of our society who comprised the majority taking part in them.

The American people and peoples of the world have not been fooled. Secretary of State Dean Rusk himself has made a statement which, in conjunction with the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, has served to enlighten the American people about who is primarily responsible for these

demonstrations. In response to a question about them, Mr. Rusk stated on the April 16 "Meet the Press" TV program:

> I have no doubt at all that the Communist apparatus is very busy indeed in these operations all over the world and in our own country, but I do not mean to say by that that all those who have objections to the war in Vietnam are Communists. But the worldwide Communist movement is working very hard on this.

General Westmoreland has referred bluntly to the "unpatriotic acts here at home" which are paid for with American lives in Vietnam. In his address to the Congress, his views corresponded with the finding of the Committee on Un-American Activities that these demonstrations give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere, particularly in Vietnam. He stated:

> 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.

A BILL TO PERMIT OUR COUNTRY TO DEAL MORE INTELLIGENTLY WITH THE WORLDWIDE GROWTH OF POPULATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of years ago I suggested that if Mark Twain had the privileges of this floor it is probable he would say: "Population is something everybody does something about but nobody talks about." Today the population explosion is much more freely discussed and, hopefully, Congress will provide the leadership to increase our knowledge and concern with the consequences of overly rapid population growth.

Under our most recent rules, it is now possible for Members to join in cosponsorship of resolutions and bills. I am pleased that a number of my colleagues join with me in cosponsoring legislation to deal with the world population explosion. We thus join in the May 3 action taken by Senator GRUENING and 13 of his senatorial colleagues who introduced S. 1676, commonly referred to as the "population bill." I commend to you the detailed statement of introductory remarks, the background material provided by the Bureau of the Budget, the bill itself and the long list of distinguished experts who have testified at the various hearings on this topic. All of this information is a part of Senator GRUENING's statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3.

On April 1, 1965, I had the privilege of being the initial sponsor of similar legislation in the House. Today, I am pleased that 10 of my colleagues have joined with me in cosponsorship.

BACKGROUND FACTS

It took the earth millions of years to acquire, by the time of Christ, a population of one-fourth billion. It took until 1830 for the world's population to reach 1 billion. But in only 100 years we passed the 2 billion mark. In less than 35 years the population reached 3 billion. And, incredibly, the fourth billion will be here in but 15 more years.

If present rates are unchecked, it will take only a 35-year span to add the next billion to our present 3 billion. And it will take less than 35 years after that for the 6 billion to double to 12 billion. An increase of 1 billion—due by 1980—is equal to the total present population of all of North and South America plus all 55 nations in Europe.

Each year the United States adds more than 3 million to its population, enough to fill six brandnew cities the size of Arizona's largest city, Phoenix. Providing the additional schools, streets, sewers, post offices, and all the other facilities needed by modern society is a heavy and expensive burden.

By the year 2000 the United States will increase its population from 198 million to 340 million. Of these, 100 million will be children who need schools, playgrounds, library facilities, and so forth. And 30 million will be "senior citizens" with medical care and other problems which become acute as years advance.

Population growth, like compound interest, is self-accelerating; that is, the more people there are the greater the population growth, even though the rate of growth remains the same. When you are talking about billions of people the results of doubling are staggering.

Men and women everywhere are awakening to the possibilities of a decent life and are insisting on improvements in their standard of living. Yet the population explosion threatens to wipe out most of the benefits of economic growth—and our foreign aid program—in the underdeveloped parts of the world. For example, a key democratic nation in Asia, attempting to rise by its bootstraps several years ago, successfully completed a 5-year program by increasing its economic output 12 percent. During this same period the population of this Nation increased 15 percent and the net living standards are now worse than before.

WHY A POPULATION EXPLOSION NOW?

What caused population growth to reach such startling rates in this era? The answer is found in two words: medical science. Humans are not suddenly more fertile; our reproduction potential has not changed. In any given year the increase or decrease in population is simply the number of births minus the number of deaths.

In North America and Western Europe birth and death rates have declined more or less proportionately. But medical science has upset this pattern in the underdeveloped parts of the world. It has caused a precipitous decline in the death rates while birth rates have remained constant. The result is galloping population growth.

Never before in history has it been possible to introduce an extensive program of death control so quickly in any given area of the world. Armed with miracle drugs, insecticides, and extensive knowledge of sanitation and nutrition, scientists almost overnight can drastically curtail the rate of dying. Just since World War II, for example, death rates have been reduced more than one-third in such places as India and Malaya. In Ceylon the spraying of DDT reduced the death rate by 40 percent within a single year.

Birth rates are higher in the underdeveloped areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa—where two-thirds of all the world's people live. Where birth rates are high, there are high proportions of youth. As infant mortality has declined, family burdens have increased. And the children, when they become adults and parents, face the same prospect of endless toil just to acquire the barest of essentials.

POPULATION A NONPARTISAN ISSUE

While the wonders of medical science have brought on this problem, doctors are also concerned with its solution. We are now within sight of having, if indeed we do not already have, safe, reliable drugs and other medical means to make it possible for mankind, if it will, to regulate its growth. However, this is a matter for decision by individual citizens, community leaders, and people acting through their governments all over the world. Fortunately, the population problem is not a partisan political issue in this country.

Shortly before his death, President Kennedy said:

> We should know more and do more about the whole reproductive cycle, and this information should be available to the world.

Former President Eisenhower commented several years ago that—

> The time has come when we must take into account the effect of the population explosion on our mutual assistance system. Unless we do, it may smother the economic progress of many nations.

After his Asian tour of several years ago, Richard Nixon said he had observed poverty "worse than I have ever dreamed existed" and recommended that the United States give assistance to nations requesting help on population matters.

President Johnson, in his January 10, 1967, state of the Union address said:

> Next to the pursuit of peace, the really great challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. That race tonight is being lost. The time for rhetoric has clearly passed. The time for concerted action is here, and we must get on with the job.

This topic is, without doubt, one of those rare subjects upon which a great many leaders with widely differing political views wholeheartedly agree.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION

Central to any consideration of the population problem is the religious ques-

tion, and particularly the position of the Roman Catholic Church on birth control. It should be noted, however, that the church does not condemn birth control, but is concerned with the methods of control.

A national survey of several years ago found that at least 30 percent of Catholic couples use birth control methods condemned by the church. And a heavy majority of those polled hoped that their church would change its attitude toward birth control. It should be remembered that of the 11 countries of the world with the lowest birth rates five are predominantly Catholic: Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, and Luxembourg.

Pope Paul VI, in his encyclical "Populorum Progresso," released on March 28 of this year, indicated that government has the right to concern itself with birth control and that, officially, the government has a legitimate interest in the field. In this action, the head of the Catholic Church has taken a most important step forward in helping meet the population problems of the world. This legislation is in the spirit of Pope Paul's recognition of government responsibility and is a genuine step in the evaluation of moral and scientific aspects of control.

IT IS TIME TO ACT

When 6 or 8 billion people are shoved into the already overcrowded cities and slums of this planet, breathing polluted air and fighting for an insufficient supply of land, water, and other natural resources, then wars, revolutions and global strife are inevitable. And even if through science we manage to provide enough basic essentials for everyone we would likely do so only by sacrificing improvement of society's institutions for the sake of providing bare minimums. I believe wholeheartedly that the problems of overpopulation on this planet can be solved. But the time to begin was yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, although there is wide agreement that something should be done about the worldwide population explosion, few have objective data or complete information on which to base decisions. This legislation will provide the mechanisms within the executive branch to obtain information, share ideas, and determine appropriate actions. Basically, this legislation seeks to establish channels of communication and areas of responsibility for demographic studies and action.

One of the bill's most important features is the provision for a White House Conference on Population to be held in January of 1968. Basic to the success of a White House conference are the results and suggestions stemming from State-level conferences prior to the national meeting. The legislation provides for grants to States to assist in planning and conducting State conferences on population prior to and for the purpose of developing facts and recommendations to the White House conference.

For the reasons cited, Mr. Speaker, I now join with my distinguished colleagues in introducing this legislation designed to permit our country to deal more intelligently with the worldwide growth of population.

AUTHORIZATION OF NAVAL NUCLEAR-POWERED WARSHIPS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to consider the fiscal year 1968 Defense authorization bill tomorrow. I want to update my past reports to the Congress on the nuclear navy and I would like to again this year bring some facts concerning the authorization of nuclear propelled naval warships in the bill to the attention of my colleagues.

In my capacity as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have delved deeply into the factors involved in the value of nuclear propulsion for warships. As you all know, the Joint Committee has studied and analyzed the question of nuclear propulsion for submarines and surface warships for many years. This intensive review was required before the committee could recommend to Congress the research and development effort necessary to build a nuclear Navy "second to none."

Throughout the years our reviews indicated the research and development work was justified and throughout the years the Congress agreed with the Joint Committee's recommendations and annually authorized funds for this purpose. Time has proven the value of our actions. The United States is preeminent in the technology of nuclear propulsion for warships. The utilization of nuclear propulsion in all of our new submarines has given this country an unequaled defense force. Unfortunately thus far we have not taken the same advantage of our position of technological leadership by utilizing nuclear propulsion in our new surface warships. The bill we are to consider tomorrow takes some important steps in respect to nuclear propulsion for surface warships. I would like to review some of the facts concerning this item so that they will be fresh in our minds when we consider the Defense authorization bill tomorrow.

The Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1968 includes three nuclear attack submarines, and authorization for procurement of long leadtime items for one nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier requested by the Department of Defense. It also substitutes two nuclear-powered frigates in place of two nonnuclear-powered destroyers requested by the Department of Defense. Further, the authorization bill includes funds for performing the contract definition of a new class major fleet escort called the DXG; the Armed Services Committee report contains language which prohibits using any of these funds for the design of any major fleet escorts not powered with a naval nuclear propulsion plant—a step which I also endorse.

The aircraft carrier continues to be one of our prime naval attack weapons. It provides a movable platform from which to launch airplanes wherever they may be needed. It is a floating airbase complete with maintenance and repair facilities. It has proved to be a vital asset in support of our military activities in Vietnam. The tremendous problems and expense of building up land airbases in Vietnam continue to demonstrate the great advantages of the aircraft carrier concept.

However, to fully exploit the full potential of the carrier task group, everything possible must be done to minimize the logistic support required to sustain the ships in a combat environment. Elimination of the requirement for a continuous supply of propulsion fuel makes nuclear-powered ships valuable. This became abundantly clear to the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy when we studied this problem in 1963 and prepared our report on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels. See the December 1963 Joint Committee report entitled "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels."

The Department of Defense has finally come to realize this, in the case of aircraft carriers—after Congress repeatedly pointed it out. They still have not recognized this important truth in the case of ships built to escort nuclear carriers.

We must be able to operate attack carrier task forces anywhere on short notice. Nuclear propulsion in our naval striking forces will greatly enhance our capability to operate our carrier task forces throughout the oceans of the world—without the entangling logistic support problems created by conventional fuel requirements and free from the constant changes in the worldwide political climate.

Our one nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Enterprise*, which is now deployed for the second time to Vietnam, has set record after record since she joined the fleet 5 years ago. She has proven so effective in battle in Vietnam that the Secretary of Defense requested a new nuclear-powered attack carrier in last year's bill and has told Congress that he intends to ask for one more next year and another in a future year.

At least four major fleet escort ships—destroyers or frigates—are assigned to each aircraft carrier. These escorts are designed to operate either on independent missions against enemy targets or as part of a coordinated protective screen to destroy enemy aircraft, missiles, submarines, and surface ships that attack the force.

The two nuclear frigates which Congress has added to this bill will have the same general types of antiair and antisubmarine weapons systems as would the two nonnuclear destroyers proposed by the Department of Defense, but the nuclear frigates will be larger and will have considerably more military capability. Specifically, each nuclear frigate—in addition to being nuclear powered—compared to the destroyers—will have twice the number of missile launchers and missile magazines; will have a helicopter landing area and facilities and accommodations for a screen commander which the destroyer would not have; will have

more complete naval tactical data system facilities; and will have provisions for twice the number of torpedo launchers.

All of these factors are covered in detail in the hearings and report of the House Armed Services Committee.

A nuclear propulsion plant similar to the two-reactor plant now in the nuclear frigates *Bainbridge* and *Truxtun* is suitable for installation in either a new destroyer or a new frigate.

The shipbuilding program proposed by the Department of Defense called for building conventionally powered escorts to accompany the new nuclear carriers. The House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have studied in depth the questions of nuclear power for escorts for the nuclear carriers; both committees have concluded that to build new conventionally powered escorts to accompany nuclear carriers would be a serious mistake. Further, both committees have concluded that each nuclear carrier should have a complete complement of nuclear powered escorts.

The House Armed Services Committee has the duty of making recommendations to the House of Representatives on defense matters. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is charged, by law, with the responsibility for making continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use and control of atomic energy and making recommendations to both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act provides that the Department of Defense "shall keep the Joint Committee fully and currently informed with respect to all matters within the Department of Defense relating to the development, utilization, or application of atomic energy."

In carrying out these responsibilities, the House Armed Service's Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have reviewed this matter continuously, thoroughly and, I believe, with great deliberation. Both committees requested the complete record of correspondence between the Navy and the Department of Defense on the question of building nuclear frigates. They also requested copies of all studies comparing nuclear and conventional surface warships conducted by the Navy and the Department of Defense.

These committees have carefully reviewed the documentation furnished by the Navy and the Department of Defense. They also received extensive testimony on the issues involved. Very shortly the Joint Committee's hearings earlier this year on nuclear propulsion will be published. These studies, reports, and testimony clearly show that the increased military effectiveness of nuclear powered warships—both aircraft carriers and escort ships—far outweighs the small increase in lifetime cost necessary to provide these ships with nuclear propulsion plants.

The facts behind the action recommended by the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to proceed now on a nuclear powered surface escort warship building program can be assessed by review of the following reports:

Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels, December 1963.

Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels, October 30, 31, and November 13, 1963.

Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on naval nuclear propulsion program, January 26, 1966.

House Armed Services Committee Report No. 1536, dated May 16, 1966, to accompany S. 2950, authorizing Defense procurement and research and development and military pay.

House Armed Services Committee hearings on military posture and H.R. 13456, Report No. 64.

House Appropriations Committee hearings on Department of Defense appropriation for 1967, part 6, pages 67–147.

House Armed Services Committee Report No. 221, dated May 2, 1967, to accompany H.R. 9240, authorizing Defense procurement and research and development.

House Armed Services Committee hearing on military posture and H.R. 9240, Report No. 8.

In addition, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is currently preparing for public release a report and record of executive hearings held this year on the naval nuclear propulsion program.

The case for nuclear-powered escort ships was summarized last year by the Chief of Naval Operations in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy dated April 14, 1966. With the exception of some deletions for security reasons, Admiral McDonald's memorandum is published in its entirety on pages 8034 through 8063 of the House Armed Services Committee hearing report—No. 64—on military posture. Admiral McDonald's memorandum provides a detailed basis for the position that the increased military effectiveness of nuclear propulsion in carrier escorts fully justifies the small increase in lifetime cost of the ships and for concluding that construction of nuclear powered escort ships is in the best interest of this Nation.

The case for nuclear-powered escorts for our nuclear carriers and the importance of insuring that the new class of major fleet escorts called DXG is provided nuclear propulsion was summarized this year by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy dated February 3, 1967. With the exception of some deletions for security reasons, Admiral Rickover's memorandum is published in its entirety on pages 1804 through 1848 of the House Armed Services Committee hearing report—No. 8—on military posture.

Admiral Rickover's memorandum makes it clear that each nuclear escort substituted for a conventional escort significantly improves the military effectiveness of the overall nuclear carrier task group. His report shows that the incremental gain in military effectiveness is larger as each nuclear escort is substituted, with the largest increment being added when the all-nuclear task group is achieved.

The Chief of Naval Operations has succinctly summarized the situation with the statement:

> Nuclear power makes possible the greatest advance in propulsion since we went from sail to steam.

Congress has all the information necessary to make an assessment of whether a nuclear escort construction program is in the best interests of the United States.

As I have just pointed out, the issue of nuclear propulsion for surface warships has already been studied in great depth. The studies of this subject furnished Congress by the Department of Defense and the Navy when piled on top of each other make a stack several feet high. Most of the effort in these studies has been devoted to analyzing costs, rather than determining military effectiveness.

The time has come for us to stop these futile cost comparisons between nuclear and conventional surface warships. Let us get on with fulfilling our country's urgent need for nuclear propulsion in the surface fleet.

The danger of continuing to make extensive cost studies is that they divert attention from the real issues that nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load and return—all without logistic support. Oil-fired warships must be refueled every few days. This requires a vulnerable, worldwide distribution system of tankers and storage facilities to provide fuel oil for conventional ships. Admiral McDonald's memorandum which I referred to earlier cites many examples from the history of modern war where major military defeats were brought about by the inability of military forces to maintain an adequate supply of propulsion fuel to the forces in combat. The U.S. decision to bomb the fuel oil storage facilities in North Vietnam has again emphasized to the whole world the importance and yet the extreme vulnerability of petroleum supplies in modern war.

I cannot understand the logic which admits the vulnerability of the enemy's fuel oil supplies but will not admit that our own fuel oil supplies are also vulnerable. Admiral McDonald's memorandum points out that—

> The vulnerability of our overseas logistic supply lines is greater today than at any time in the past and is continuing to increase for the following reasons:
>
> a. The increased threat of submarine attack because of the improvements in conventional submarines and the advent of nuclear powered submarines.
>
> b. The increased threat of air attack because of the increased range of aircraft and missiles and their improved means of detection.
>
> c. The amount of fuel which must be transported has increased because of the higher fuel consumption rate of post-World War II military units.
>
> d. Each tanker lost has a greater impact because of the substitution of a smaller fleet of larger tankers for the large fleet of small tankers used in World War II.
>
> As the number of nuclear submarines and air-striking capabilities of our potential

enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support when our supply lines to our combat forces are under attack gets worse. One principal reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce the logistic support required for our fighting forces.

Vietnam operations have shown that two-thirds of the fuel used by a conventional carrier task group—a carrier plus its escorts—is used just to keep the ships running. One-third is used for carrier propulsion, one-third is used for escort propulsion, and the other one-third is used for aircraft fuel. So, if the need for fuel for the escorts and the carrier itself can be eliminated by utilizing nuclear propulsion, only one-third the amount of fuel is needed. This simplifies the logistic problem tremendously.

In supporting this position the Chief of Naval Operations has stated:

The compelling reason for the Navy's strong recommendation for nuclear power in surface warships is based on the increased survivability and tactical flexibility which derive from freedom of dependence on propulsion fuel oil logistic support.

The dependence of U.S. air power on the fuel distribution system in the western Pacific is well known. The vulnerability of the system to attack, particularly the overland and terminal fuel distribution required for land-based air operations, is a matter of concern. While the Navy's underway replenishment groups are considered to be less vulnerable, they can also be brought under attack. Current utilization of *Enterprise* and *Bainbridge* is reducing our dependence on fuel oil and thus strengthening our total tactical air posture in Southeast Asia. The introduction of CVAN-68 and other nuclear powered warships could be of critical importance to the efficient projection of air power during the early 1970's. (See House Armed Services Committee Report 1536, p. 40, dated May 16, 1966.)

The scope and magnitude of the logistic effort to provide propulsion fuel for the fleet is often not fully appreciated. For example, the total amount of petroleum products the Navy alone is using each month in Southeast Asia today is as great as the maximum monthly rate the Japanese were able to import into their home islands in World War II, and nearly as great as the average monthly requirements for the U.S. carrier strike forces during the peak of naval operations in the Pacific during World War II.

Admiral McDonald has pointed out to Congress that one torpedo, fired by an unidentified submarine in Southeast Asia, could "radically change the entire concept of our operations" on both land and sea. See hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, January 26, 1966, page 62. As reported in the newspapers, Red China has about 30 submarines, and the Soviets now have over 400 submarines—of which about 45 are nuclear, which have unlimited attack range—and they are building more. Why would they build attack submarines unless they wanted the capability to sink our ships and cut off our supply routes? Do you realize that U.S. submarine forces with only 250 submarines nearly strangled the Japanese fuel oil pipeline during World War II.

It is vital that our Navy have the capability to detect, identify, and sink enemy submarines in time of hostility. In this connection it should be noted that only nuclear-powered escort ships can give unlimited chase to any nuclear-powered submarine without having to abandon the chase to refuel.

Each time a nuclear-powered warship is substituted for a conventionally powered warship in a carrier task force, the overall capabilities of the whole task force are improved. When a nuclear carrier is substituted for a conventional carrier, the range of a carrier task group with four conventional escorts is about doubled. When two of the escorts accompanying the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is almost doubled again. When all of the escorts with the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is essentially unlimited.

The nuclear aircraft carrier must, of course, be replenished with aviation fuel and ammunition. However, it must be remembered that when the escort ships are conventionally powered the nuclear carrier itself must carry the oil to supply them. When the carrier is able to have its own tanks devoted solely to aviation fuel, it can launch many more aircraft strikes than when much of its fuel tank space is devoted to carrying fuel oil for conventional escorts. When the new nuclear carrier has all-nuclear escorts, she will have almost twice the aviation fuel capability of the most modern conventional carrier.

The most recent Navy studies show that when the estimated lifetime construction and operating costs of a nuclear frigate or destroyer are compared to the comparable costs of a conventional ship with the same military features, the nuclear ship is less than 25 percent more expensive than its conventional counterpart. See House Armed Services Committee hearings on military posture, report No. 8, page 1845.

Since nuclear propulsion in the escort ships improves the military effectiveness of the task group as a whole, the increased cost of the task group as a whole is the cost which should be considered in determining the "cost effectiveness." Each escort for a nuclear carrier that is changed to nuclear propulsion adds about 1 percent to the overall lifetime cost of the nuclear carrier task group. Thus, making all four escorts nuclear would increase the lifetime cost of the entire group by only 4 percent. Surely the tremendous increase in effectiveness of the task group fully justifies this small increase in cost.

If the two conventional aircraft carriers and the nine conventional frigates authorized since 1960 had been provided with nuclear propulsion, the United States would now have in being or under construction three nuclear-powered carrier task groups instead of only one. These nuclear-powered task groups would have given the United States a much stronger Navy with which to face the uncertain and perilous future that lies ahead. Even with the nuclear frigate which was included by Congress in the fiscal year 1967 shipbuilding program, it will not be until our Nation's first nuclear powered aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, has been at sea for 10 years that this country will have its first all-nuclear carrier task group.

Our surface Navy is aging rapidly and is even now faced with widespread block obsolescence. Of the cruisers, destroyers, and frigates in the active fleet today, 81 percent are over 20 years old.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's there was a vigorous warship construction program. This was also the time that nuclear propelled surface warships were introduced in the fleet. However, since that time there has been a long hiatus in surface warship construction—nuclear and conventional. The only surface warship escort of destroyers size or larger in the approved shipbuilding programs of the last 5 years—fiscal years 1963–67—nuclear or conventional, is the nuclear frigate provided by Congress last year. It is clear that this hiatus cannot last much longer without the capability of the U.S. Navy sinking far below the needs of our national security.

In 1963, Secretary McNamara testified to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that "we will be building literally tens" of major surface warships, destroyer leaders and large destroyers, "during the remainder of this decade." See hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels, October 30, 31, and November 13, 1963, page 187. However, two conventional destroyers proposed by the Department of Defense again this year are the only major fleet escorts they have proposed in the last 6 years.

The U.S. Navy needs more surface warships and needs them with the unique capabilities provided by nuclear propulsion. Recognizing this, Congress has supported a major scientific and engineering effort to achieve this capability. We have been successful. Today, the U.S. Navy is preeminent in the field of nuclear propulsion. We must take advantage of this lead by building more ships which have the tremendous advantages nuclear propulsion can give them.

The cost effectiveness studies of nuclear versus conventional warships assume that we will have adequate advance overseas bases from which to operate our conventional ships. They assume we will have no trouble maintaining our logistic supply lines at sea and that fuel oil will be available whenever and wherever needed. They assume that our forces will not be subject to attack. They assume that we will not need sustained high speed endurance in our warships. They assume all these things, but the studies cannot insure that the assumptions will be correct. Once these assumptions are made, the possibility of situations arising where these assumptions are not valid is removed from consideration. Yet it is in just such situations where nuclear propulsion in our warships could mean the difference between victory and defeat.

During the 20- to 30-year lifetime of any warship, there will be many changes in the world situation. Since World War II, our three major enemies have become our friends and two of our previous major allies have become our antagonists. Bases in foreign countries upon which we must presently depend for

storage of fuel oil for our oil-fired warships may not be available when needed in future conflicts due to changes in the international situation. Further, as the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air strike capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support will increase. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support—support which will be most difficult, if not impossible, to provide in wartime.

It is in the heat of battle that the superior mobility, flexibility, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled military advantage, an advantage which could be crucial to deciding the outcome.

The argument used by the Secretary of Defense against building nuclear powered escorts is the same argument used a decade ago by those in positions of authority who did not want to go to nuclear power in submarines because it cost more; by those in authority a half-century ago who did not want to convert from coal to oil for naval ships; and by those a century ago who did not want to shift from sail to steam. The argument against obtaining improved capability in warship propulsion because of its higher cost is just as fallacious today as it was a hundred years ago, 50 years ago, and 10 years ago.

The only argument the Defense Department makes against nuclear power for naval surface ships is that they are "too expensive." The argument can be made that all new weapons are "too expensive" when their costs are compared with the obsolete weapons they replace. Apparently when the Department of Defense decides it wants something, expense is never the criterion. When Congress wants it, it becomes "too expensive."

Aside from his vague statement about expense, no other reasoned or technical judgment has ever been given by the Department of Defense to justify its stand. Those who do recommend nuclear powered ships gave reasoned arguments—arguments which have never been specifically rebutted.

The impression given to the public is that the Defense Department has reached its conclusions based on scientific analysis. The Department of Defense has not given our committee this scientific analysis. We must therefore conclude that it will not stand the test of objective scrutiny.

I am puzzled and distressed by the reluctance of the Defense Department to accept nuclear propulsion in the new escorts being built to accompany the nuclear carriers.

Based on detailed study and appraisal of the military effectiveness and the cost of nuclear-powered and conventional warships and careful consideration and study of past and present experience of naval forces in combat, the Chief of Naval Operations stated:

The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistic support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st Century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security. (See House of Representatives Report No. 1536, Authorizing Defense Procurement and Research and Development, and Military Pay, May 16, 1966, p. 25.)

The United States is committed to a nuclear aircraft carrier building program. The issue before Congress is very simple: Shall we have all-nuclear carrier task forces?

The new Defense authorization bill answers that question with an unequivocal "go ahead."

Congress must take this step. The language in this bill that "the contracts for the construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest," makes it clear that it is the will of the people of this country voiced through their elected representatives in Congress that the two new nuclear frigates be constructed as a continuation of the nuclear escort building program started by Congress last year.

The determination of overall force levels and the precise number of new escort ships needed in the next several years will no doubt be the subject of continuing study by the Department of Defense. However, with the obvious problem of the obsolescence of the United States Navy staring us in the face and the exemplary performance of the nuclear carrier *Enterprise* and her nuclear escort ships *Bainbridge* and *Long Beach*—all now performing outstanding combat service off Vietnam—it is clear that construction of the two nuclear frigates contained in this bill is a minimum requirement and should proceed forthwith and not be delayed while more studies are made.

Your approval of the provisions of the Defense authorization bill to authorize three nuclear-powered attack submarines, to authorize long-lead-time items for a nuclear-powered attack carrier, and to authorize two nuclear-powered frigates—and your endorsement of the recommendation of the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that all future major fleet escorts be nuclear powered—will go far toward determining the strength and flexibility of U.S. seapower for decades to come. Future generations of Americans will recognize that it was this Congress—the 90th Congress—that had the foresight, wisdom, and courage to take this initiative to strengthen the defense of our Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Messrs. KLUCZYNSKI, HOWARD, ZION, and MCDONALD of Michigan (at the request of Mr. FALLON), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

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. SELDEN, for 60 minutes, on May 18.

Mr. HÉBERT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to 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:

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. RARICK.

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

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

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

Mr. DINGELL.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.

Mr. ROYBAL in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 443. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 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:

729. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and

to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

730. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report on the first year's work of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–352; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

731. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of audit and inspection programs conducted by U.S. agencies in Vietnam during 1966, Department of State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

732. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of claimant's contributory negligence, to clarify the procedure for appeal from certain claims determinations, and to limit the amount of attorney fees thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

733. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

734. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on forest and grass fires, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–769; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 9711. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9712. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9713. A bill to amend section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the Attorney General to furnish a certificate of citizenship to a person holding certification of birth issued by the Secretary of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9714. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9715. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple in their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's of father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 9716. 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. LUKENS:

H.R. 9717. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9718. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9720. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9721. A bill to require that a portion of Government parking facilities at national monuments and memorials and Government buildings be reserved for use by visitors confined to wheelchairs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9722. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9723. A bill to amend section 4(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effect of foreign competition on domestic employment when a complaint is filed by an employer or labor organization; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9725. 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. TEAGUE of California (for himself, Mr. SISK, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. MATHIAS of California):

H.R. 9726. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported olives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 9727. A bill to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), and section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9728. A bill relating to taxation by States of the incomes of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9729. A bill to amend section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to make it clear that the program of low-rent housing in private accommodations may not be restricted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to specified types of housing on the basis of vacancy rates in a community; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9730. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9731. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a taxpayer may become eligible for the existing exclusion from gross income of gain from the sale or exchange of his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 9732. A bill to prohibit mutilation and desecration of the national flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 9733. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 9734. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Southeastern Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9735. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Southwestern Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9736. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 9737. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9738. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide scholarships to selected persons for education in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9739. A bill to liberalize the provisions of the retired servicemen's family protection plan under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9741. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 9742. A bill to designate certain real property of the Unied States in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service as the Eleanor Roosevelt Square; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9743. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9744. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9745. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for control of interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9746. A bill to charter a National Home Ownership Foundation, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 9747. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 9748. A bill for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 9749. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 9750. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. Con. Res. 340. Concurrent resolution 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; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H. Res. 465. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to provide that an estimated cost figure be applied at the time a bill is introduced; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 467. Resolution authorizing the printing of extra copies of part 2 of the hearings relating to "Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States," 89th Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 9751. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inez Augusta Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9752. A bill for the relief of Douglas E. Kennedy and Alvin V. Burt, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9753. A bill for the relief of Aida Calacas Valenciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9754. A bill for the relief of Maria Sole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9755. A bill for the relief of Natale Cangialosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9756. A bill for the relief of Maria Antonietta Storino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 9757. A bill for the relief of John W. Watson, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9758. A bill for the relief of Claudio Amauri Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9759. A bill for the relief of John Lee Adams and the estates of his wife, Altheia J. Adams, and his sons, David John Adams and Mark Edward Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 9760. A bill for the relief of Kamal Husein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

73. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the distribution of U.S. Federal aid to education funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

74. By Mr. UTT: Petition of Charlotte Snell and others, of El Toro, Calif., relative to the giving of aid in any form, directly or indirectly, to our Communist enemies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

75. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Wyman C. Lowe, Atlanta, Ga., relative to the general election of November 8, 1966, in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia; to the Committee on House Administration.

76. Also, petition of Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Union, N.J., relative to its opposition to any tolls on that portion of the Garden State Parkway that runs through Union County; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mothers Crusade for Victory Over Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, I witnessed a new invasion here in Washington, D.C.—a first, and perhaps just the start—mothers crusade for victory over communism.

Hundreds of nicely dressed and well-mannered mothers carrying American flags visited their National Capital protesting peaceably for victory over atheist communism.

These ladies were from almost every State in the United States and represented many national origins. Some mothers from captive nations under communism wore the native dress of their homeland. Many had sons in Vietnam—some were gold star mothers who have lost sons in battle.

One of the national shrines they visited was Arlington National Cemetery where the Honor Guard permitted a special prayer for those lost and the living.

Their question was: If we are fighting communism in South Vietnam, why not stop trading with Communist countries—why not fight communism here at home?

A wonderful group of sincere, concerned Americans lobbying in the true, God-given right of every mother for victory over tyranny, deceit, and oppression—victory over communism.

Railroad Passenger Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a concurrent resolution calling for an investigation and study by the Department of Transportation into the passenger railroad service of the Nation. The resolution calls for the ICC to declare a moratorium on the discontinuance of railroad passenger service as well as the Post Office Department to declare a moratorium on the cancellation of railroad postal contracts.

This resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado, and I sincerely hope the House will see fit to take early action on the measure.

Passenger train cars and passenger rail miles have declined almost 50 percent in the last 15 years, and many of our smaller communities are being abandoned by the railroads. Recently in Nebraska, the Burlington Railroad requested discontinuance of two passenger trains in one community alone. I think the time has come to make a thorough investigation into the reasons for the discontinuance of such railroad service as well as the reason for the Post Office Department to cancel many of these rail contracts. I am hopeful that such a study will reveal the true ills of the matter and allow us to take appropriate action to remedy the critical condition of our national railroad passenger service.

Geographical Distribution of Research and Development Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am introducing an amendment to H.R. 9240, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics I have seen

that committee and NASA gradually embrace the idea of geographical distribution, that is, the principle that Federal funds for research and development should be spread around the country as much as possible. It is recognized that the projects concerned must be given first priority, but this can often be done without detriment to the project and to the great advantage of a region, an educational institution, by solicitation of other than the 20 or so best known educational institutions for receipt of Government funds.

Two-thirds of the funds colleges and universities use come from the Government and some 13 percent of the administrative Federal budget is directed to research and development. We cannot, then, fail to recognize the importance of where these funds go. If those who have continue to get, we cannot hope to develop other significant centers of science and technology throughout the Nation. Yet this we must do, if we would increase the number of our scientists and provide some kind of equality of educational opportunity to all American citizens.

Moreover, the Federal research dollar affects regional economies, the growth and diversification of industry, the availability of trained manpower, the quality and quantity of educational facilities, even the overall scientific and technological progress of our Nation.

The amendment I am proposing will read:

It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the Department of Defense should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible.

I believe such an amendment would endorse the principle of geographical distribution and urge its application, providing a healthy competitive stimulus to smaller universities, colleges, and industries, which might now expect to receive Federal funds regardless of their locale.

Small Business Loans Beneficial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1967

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has spoken and acted many times on behalf of small business in the Nation. The legislation relating to small business associations passed by the Congress over the years has improved and strengthened the national economy and has had a salutary effect on the economic life of many communities.

Since the Small Business Administration was established in 1953, through March 16, 1967, it has approved loans to more than 900 small Oregon firms for a total of $48.3 million.

SBA approved loans by congressional districts for the years 1953 through 1962 show that my district ranked 30th among all congressional districts with $5,854,450 in loans to small businessmen. SBA-approved loans by congressional districts are not available through December 31, 1966, but the Small Business Administration gave me figures by States and for my district. Oregon ranked 22d in the Nation on December 31, 1966. My district through December 31, 1966, has had 187 business loans amounting to $9,709,219; 54 disaster loans amounting to $1,037,805; 6 loans to businesses displaced by Federal construction projects in the amount of $871,000; and one local development company loan of $297,500 These total 248 loans amounting to $11,915,524. This, in contemporary times, does not sound like a great quantity of money. However, it is not always the volume of dollars that is important. Oftentimes a little seed money will result in a good harvest.

A dramatic and encouraging part of this program in my district is the superlative record of Portland businessmen in meeting their obligations of repayment. Only one-eighth of 1 percent of the $11,915,524 was chalked up to bad debts. This record reflects the industriousness and integrity of Portland businessmen.

Impressive as these statistics are, the story can be told best by the impact it has had on people.

The story of Mr. Donald W. Byers, a successful businessman in Portland, portrays the human side of the Small Business Administration program. In 1946 Mr. Byers was discharged from the U.S. Navy. As chief photographer's mate, with $2,000 of hard-earned savings and a determination to own and operate his own film processing laboratory, in partnership with G. T. Orengderiff, Byers opened his business in April of 1947.

The firm expanded and in July 1947, Byers bought his partner's interest and began expanding his business to handle an increasing volume of business.

Husband and wife, working side by side, not only expanded volume but began to diversify their photographic business. In order to provide service to take advantage of new developments in film processing, Mr. and Mrs. Byers decided to build a new laboratory to meet the new specialized requirements. In 1955 they moved into the new modern laboratory.

In 1956 they formed Byers Color Laboratory, Inc. In the following months technicians were trained, specialized equipment was installed, and service was immeasurably improved. By 1958, the firm was a success, its sales having jumped six times in 10 years. However, growth and success bring problems to any business, and Byers Color Laboratory was no exception. Their expansion had cost a considerable amount of money, and the firm was saddled with a substantial short-term debt. Forty thousand dollars was needed to retire the debt in an orderly manner.

Small Business Administration came to the rescue. In 1958 a 7-year $40,000 Small Business Administration loan enabled the firm to retire its debt and continue to improve its service.

In 1964 a $48,000 addition was built to provide room for the company's rapidly expanding business.

Byers and his wife, still a young couple, are the owners of a vigorous and successful business. They provide employment, pay taxes, and add to the economic strength of Portland and the Nation.

This story dramatizes that cooperation between the National Government and local small businessmen can pay handsome dividends in local communities, States, and the Nation.

Success on the Campus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK EDWARDS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, most college students in the news these days are the minority who are the malcontents and the protestors.

The great majority of college students everywhere are constructive-minded, well-adjusted, serious, thoughtful students who have a balanced perspective of themselves, their colleges, their Nation, and their world.

This was proven once again at Auburn University, in Alabama, when recently a Red Cross blood drive produced 4,812 pints of blood in 2 days.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the chairman of the blood drive project is a fine young man from Mobile in the First District of Alabama. He is a credit to this Nation and is a shining example of what is good and wholesome and right on our college campuses. I think we ought to give more headlines to the Larry Menefees of this Nation and quit playing up the wild antics of a few troublemakers.

As further information on the remarkable effort, the university's report follows:

Patiently they stood in a line that wound 100 yards from the processing center in one building to the bustling Red Cross blood center next door.

One by one, as an aide raised a hand to signal an empty station, the students moved forward, arms bared, and carrying empty containers they would fill with life-giving blood.

That was the scene at Auburn University from the time the doors opened Wednesday, April 5, at 9:30 a.m., until weary workers, surveying the long line already processed for donations, closed the intake center at 4:30 p.m. the following afternoon.

There had been no records to break but their own, those set last year when Auburn University students racked up 3,507 pints of blood in 2 days to prove themselves the champion donors worldwide.

Shortly after noon Wednesday a new world record was set and by midafternoon the students had passed their own goal of 4,000 pints. Still they came, standing often more than an hour in the steaming, crowded receiving area to drive the total to a final 4,812 pints.

The success of the Auburn "bleed-in" came as no surprise to officials of the American Red Cross who are familiar

with the annual demonstration beginning in 1952 in support of the Korean war and the Salk polio research program. Since that time, Auburn students have contributed 20,170 pints of blood.

Student leaders of this year's drive based their appeal on the Vietnam conflict. Actually, the plasma is designated for use at American military installations throughout the world.

A committee of 17 students laid the groundwork for this year's drive. Throughout the 2-day period, however, some 275 students—members of honor organizations campuswide—assisted at the center.

As bone-tired workers and donors returned to classes Friday, a wire was flashed to Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, U.S. Army, Vietnam, by the commandant of the School of Military Science at Auburn telling the commanding officer—"Auburn has done it again—War Eagle."

The American Promise: Equality of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, there is a grim human paradox in America today. It mars our national journey to a better social order.

More than 6 years of the mightiest economic upsurge of all time has carried the Nation far. For most citizens, it means better jobs at better wages than ever before.

In 1966 alone for example:

The overall jobless rate plunged below 4 percent, hitting a 13-year low.

Seventy-four million Americans were working, 2 million more than the beginning of the year.

After-taxes income of American families rose 3.5 percent, even after allowances for price increases.

But, behind this bright and heartening picture is quite another picture—a picture that shows a large body of Americans who are denied the opportunity to share in our vast abundance.

These are the victims of problems beyond their control—ethnic prejudice, language difficulty, inadequate education, advancing age, outmoded skills. They are prosperity's disadvantaged.

As President Johnson said in his 1967 Manpower Report to the Congress:

> These Americans need hope, not handouts. They want—and deserve—work and training, not welfare.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go to achieve this goal, but let us make no mistake that a great deal of progress has been made toward insuring that all Americans, regardless of their background, may enjoy brighter and more productive lives.

In the Los Angeles area that I represent, a major beginning has been made to provide Americans of Mexican descent with the opportunity to prepare for the future—to get fresh starts in life.

Mexican-Americans of all ages are benefiting from Department of Labor programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

These Americans, by preparing for useful work careers, are setting their sights on bigger and more equitable shares of our national abundance.

Briefly, I want to recount some of the progress that is being made in the Los Angeles area under these strategic efforts for citizens of Mexican descent, many of whom have English-language difficulties.

First, under the Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job training program, 400 Mexican-Americans are training in a number of fields in an 18-month program sponsored by the Mexican-American Opportunity Foundation.

In this program, operating with $224,308 in Federal funds, trainees are being groomed for jobs as metal and honeycomb integral tank sealers, machineshop helpers, structural and production assemblers, wire pressers, and laminaters.

A skill center operated by the Los Angeles School District with Manpower Development and Training Act money was opened in East Los Angeles last June. About 64 percent of the population in this area is Spanish speaking.

With a Federal appropriation of $8,041,247, the institutional program is designed to train 1,410 disadvantaged adults and 830 disadvantaged youth. Four hundred enrollees are currently being trained for such jobs as aircraft sub-assembler, auto body repairman, clerk-typist, electrical-mechanical assemblers, licensed vocational nurse, truck mechanic, laundry appliance repairman, fork-lift mechanic, food-service worker, and motorcycle repairman.

I understand that the placement record for graduates of this institutional program has been excellent. In fact, 100 percent of the graduates trained as nurses aides and licensed vocational nurses have been placed. That is a pretty heartening record any way you look at it.

More than 1,500 Mexican-American youths are enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in the Los Angeles area. They are performing useful jobs for the city and county of Los Angeles and the Federal Government. This important antipoverty program enables them to continue their education or to gain valuable experience to launch work careers.

The words of the trainees themselves best illustrate the great benefits they are reaping from these programs. Seguire M., an on-the-job trainee in his late twenties said:

> My work on Northrop's S-5 Freedom Fighter gives me personal satisfaction and the future looks real good.

And Joe M., a 22-year-old machineshop trainee, said:

> I'm glad to be learning a skilled trade and hope to work as a machinist for many years.

There is no question in my mind that these and other vital training programs are proving extremely valuable not only to the trainees themselves but to the entire Nation. Every day these national programs are spelling an end to the public dependency that hinders so many of our citizens. These programs are quite accurately turning tax-eaters into taxpayers.

I urge Congress to give its wholehearted support to the President's requests for sufficient appropriations to help eliminate disadvantage in America. It is a challenge we must meet. To ignore it would be perilous to the entire Nation.

As we act to translate the American promise of equality of opportunity into an everyday reality, we should keep in mind the words of President Johnson:

> We will never lose sight of our goal—to guarantee every man an opportunity to unlock his own potential; to earn the satisfaction of standing on his own two feet.
>
> Our goal, in short, is to offer every citizen one of the greatest blessings: a sure sense of his own usefulness.

The FCC and the Communications Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last May, Subcommittee No. 6 of the Small Business Committee held some hearings on the importance to small businessmen of adequate land mobile radio communication. In the course of these hearings, the truth of the statement of Chairman EVINS, our very able and distinguished chairman of the full committee, became very clear, indeed. He had said at the time he created the new subcommittee to study the activities of regulatory and enforcement agencies relating to small business:

> Perhaps no other facet of our Government has more impact on the small business community than the regulatory agencies.

Time after time in the course of our hearings with respect to the Federal Communications Commission we heard how small businessmen used land mobile radio to better serve both themselves and their customers. We heard how a fuel oil dealer is able to respond more rapidly to the needs of his cash customers who are generally old folk or live in trailer communities because he could use his two-way radio to divert his truck to serve them quickly after receiving their call, instead of waiting until the truck made its next day's trip. We heard how this ability to serve his customers better meant more dollars and more success for him.

We heard how an electrical contractor uses two-way radio in pulling cables from the basement to the 10th story of a building, thus saving the time and cost of communicating by messengers running up and down the stairs. Incidentally, the building he was talking about was a building to shelter our senior citizens as a part of our Federal program to assist them.

We heard how night patrolmen can

move more safely on their security rounds if they can call for assistance by their two-way radio. We heard how hundreds of people in an air-conditioned building in Atlanta which had nonopening windows were saved the misery of being in almost a furnace when the air-conditioning plant broke down because the service contractor was able to quickly get a message to one of his radio equipped service trucks to go immediately to the building and fix the trouble.

We heard how a livery car service on the south side of Chicago, where the cabs of the major taxi companies were scarce, is able to provide transportation for the thousands of people in that area because of the speed and flexibility in dispatching which they have as a result of land mobile radio.

We heard how a tractor repair service in the hills of North Carolina increased its business 15 percent during a 2-year period largely due to its trucks being two-way radio equipped. We heard how a packing company in Des Moines, Iowa, which processes about 275,000 cattle per year, uses two-way radio to make sure that it would have a steady flow of cattle into its plant. We heard how a food vending machine company in western Massachusetts uses two-way radio to provide prompt service to the machines it operates.

In short, we heard how land mobile radio affects the life of almost every person in this country in one way or another.

Since these hearings, we have also become aware of the tremendous importance of land mobile radio to the police departments of this country in preventing crime and apprehending those who commit crime. The Crime Commission, established by President Johnson, has itself urged the need for more frequency channels for crime prevention. We have heard also how land mobile radio has cut the costs of city water departments, sewer departments and other phases of State and Government activity.

We learned, too, that almost all of these uses for land mobile radio have developed in the past 10 or 15 years as equipment which was adequate and practical for such uses has become available. We also learned that public benefit from the use of land mobile radio is being hampered because these uses are all compressed into an amount of radio frequency spectrum which was allocated by the FCC 20 years ago, before these uses were thought of. Indeed, the FCC in its annual report for 1966, which was issued not long ago, said, and I quote:

> With the possible exception of a few unavailing voices, no one then envisioned the birth of so many diverse services and the astonishing growth pattern of the entire group.

Because of the importance of this problem to the people of this country, I was very gratified to see the public notice of the Commission which it issued recently, stating that the Commission is undertaking an intensified study of the feasibility of meeting the needs of the land mobile services within spectrum space now allocated to the upper and lower ends of the bands now assigned to UHF television, with an objective of providing essentially needed spectrum space for the explosive growth of land mobile use with a minimum impact on our nationwide television service. The Commission also stated that it would examine the more efficient use of the frequencies now assigned to the land mobile services, sharing of various types and combinations of these possibilities. It noted that it invited and encouraged studies by land mobile radio groups and requested that they be expedited and the results promptly submitted to the Commission.

For this action I commend the Commission. It has shown, by this public notice, its determination to attack this problem and solve it, fully aware that it is a difficult problem but one which must be solved in the public interest.

I know, too, from the information I have received in the few weeks since this public notice was issued, that all of the people who are affected by this shortage of frequency spectrum in the land mobile services are grateful that the Commission has indicated its determination to attain its objective which, in the Commission's words, "is to provide essentially needed spectrum space for the explosive growth of land mobile use with a minimum impact on our nationwide television service."

While I am very much encouraged by the notice which the Commission has issued, the mere fact that such a notice has been issued does not mean that I will not be interested in knowing how the FCC is coming along with its efforts. I rather suspect that there will be many who will be watching to see that solid progress is made by the Commission in reaching its objective.

We are all well aware that there are many matters competing for the attention of the busy Commission, and we are aware that for too long this matter has been put aside until, now, the matter has reached a crisis stage. The Commission described this crisis stage in its 1966 annual report when it said that:

> The condition is not unlike that of a main highway on a summer weekend, so overcrowded with vehicles that traffic has come to a standstill. Getting it moving again in orderly fashion becomes a problem of gigantic proportions.

In the interest of the people of this country, I shall follow closely the steps the Commission takes to find an adequate solution to this problem.

H.R. 8000—The Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, because of the fast-growing evidence of widespread national support for a program of bilingual education to offer America's millions of non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school children a better chance to realize their full educational aspirations, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my bill, H.R. 8000, the Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act:

H.R. 8000

A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that one of the most acute educational problems in the United States is that which involves the more than two million bilingual and bicultural children of non-English-speaking ethnic or nationality background; that little headway has been made in finding adequate and constructive solutions to this unique and perplexing educational situation; and that the urgent need is for comprehensive and cooperative action now on the local, State, and Federal levels to develop forward-looking approaches to meet the serious learning difficulties faced by this substantial segment of the Nation's school-age population.

BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating title VII as title VIII, by redesignating sections 701 through 706 and references thereto as sections 801 through 806, respectively, and by adding after title VI the following new title:

"TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the 'Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act'.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 702. In recognition of the special educational needs of the large numbers of students in the United States to whom English is a second language, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs.

"AUTHORIZATION AND ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 703. (a) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot an amount to each State based upon the number of non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school students in such State and the per capita income in such State in such manner as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title. For the purposes of this title 'non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school students' means elementary and secondary school students born in, or one or both of whose parents were born in, a non-English-speaking area such as Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, or French Canada, and in States for which such information is available, other students with Spanish surnames, and where the Commissioner establishes additional objective criteria which he deems appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this title, other students determined on the basis of such additional criteria.

"(c) A State's allotment for a fiscal year pursuant to subsection (b) shall be available, prior to such date in such year as is established by the Commissioner, for grants to local educational agencies in such State pursuant to this title. Allotments not reserved prior to such date may be reallotted to other States and made available for grants pursuant to this title prior to the end of such fiscal year in such manner as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"SEC. 704. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 705, for—

"(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of programs designed to meet the special educational needs of students who speak English as a second language, including—

"(1) special bilingual and bicultural educational research and demonstration projects; and

"(2) pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans and programs so developed; and

"(b) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such programs and acquisition of necessary equipment, designed to meet the special educational needs of students who speak English as a second language through activities such as—

"(1) intensive preschool, Headstart-type programs specifically designed to orient and prepare non-English-speaking children for smoother transition to and more rapid advancement in the elementary education environment;

"(2) the utilization of the ability to speak a language other than English as a bridge to the learning of English;

"(3) regular, ongoing comprehensive bilingual educational programs;

"(4) the teaching of English as the first or primary language;

"(5) the teaching of the language spoken in the home as a second language;

"(6) programs designed to impart to non-English-speaking students a knowledge of and pride in their ancestral culture and language;

"(7) programs to attract and retain as teachers promising individuals of non-English-speaking ethnic or nationality background;

"(8) efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home; and

"(9) other activities which meet the purposes of this title.

"APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

"SEC. 705. (a) A grant under this title may be made to a local educational agency or agencies upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Such applications shall—

"(1) provide that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

"(2) set forth a program for carrying out the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of section 704 and provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(3) set forth a program of such size, scope, and design as will make a substantial step toward achieving the purposes of this title;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 704, and in no case supplant such funds;

"(5) provide for such fiscal control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

"(6) provide for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title and to determine the extent to which funds provided under this title have been effective in improving the educational opportunities of persons in the area served, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioners only if—

"(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a);

"(2) the program set forth in the application is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within each State, which criteria shall be developed by him on the basis of a consideration of (A) the geographic distribution of non-English-speaking students within the State, (B) the relative need of persons in different geographic areas within the State for the kinds of services and activities described in paragraph (b) of section 704, and their financial ability to provide those services and activities, and (C) the relative ability of particular local educational agencies within the State to provide those services and activities;

"(3) in the case of an application for assistance for a program for carrying out the purposes described in paragraph (b) of section 704, the Commissioner determines (A) that the program will utilize the best available talents and resources and will substantially increase the educational opportunities in the area to be served by the applicant, and (B) that, to the extent consistent with the number of children enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served whose educational needs are of the type which this program is intended to meet, provision has been made for participation of such children; and

"(4) the State educational agency has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations.

"(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"(d) The Commissioner shall encourage local educational agencies to utilize in programs assisted pursuant to this title the assistance of persons with expertise in the educational problems of the non-English-speaking. He shall also encourage local educational agencies to make optimum use in such programs of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'cultural and educational resources' includes State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, nonprofit private schools, public and nonprofit private agencies such as libraries, museums, musical and artistic organizations, educational radio and television, and other cultural and educational resources.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 706. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 703 the Commissioner shall pay to each applicant in that State which has an application approved under this title an amount equal to the sums expended by the applicant under the application for the purposes set forth therein.

"(b) Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 707. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Increasing Educational Opportunity for Bilingual Children, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. At least four of the members of the Advisory Committee shall be educators experienced in dealing with the educational problems of children who speak English as a second language. In addition, at least four of the members of the Advisory Committee shall be of non-English-speaking ethnic or nationality background.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner (1) on the action to be taken with regard to each application for a grant under this title, and (2) in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"LABOR STANDARDS

"SEC. 708. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all minor remodeling projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar minor remodeling in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c)."

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

SEC. 3. (a) Section 601(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after the second sentence a new sentence as follows: "Any such grant or contract may include a curriculum designed for the special training of teachers of bilingual children."

(b) Section 603 of such Act is amended by striking out "$18,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,000,000".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "and each of the two succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "and the succeeding fiscal year, and $51,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968".

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (3), by striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or", and by inserting after such clause a new clause as follows:

"(5) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in special educational programs for bilingual students."

AMENDMENTS TO COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT

SEC. 5. subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Cooperative Research Act are each amended by inserting "and title VII" after "section 503(a)(4)".

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Why art thou cast down, O my soul? Hope thou in God.—Psalm 42: 5.

Our Father in heaven and on earth, who dost love all the children of men, teach us to trust Thee and to live in good will with all our people.

Forgive those moments when we find it difficult to believe in Thee, discouraging to trust one another, and disheartening to have faith in ourselves. We are weighed down by the problems we face as a nation and by the burdens we carry day by day. So often we want to change conditions and circumstances without any thought of changing ourselves or of letting Thy spirit change us.

So we pause in Thy presence, praying that Thou wilt change us, restoring our faith in Thee, retrieving our belief in one another, and renewing our respect for ourselves.

Thus, may we live this day keeping our lives and the life of our Nation in Thy strong hands. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 270. An act to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THIS AFTERNOON AND DURING THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit during general debate today and during the balance of the week.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may sit while the House is in session during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Ashbrook	Feighan	St. Onge
Ashley	Giaimo	Saylor
Aspinall	Goodell	Scherle
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Skubitz
Bow	Howard	Smith, N.Y.
Burleson	Kluczynski	Steed
Collier	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Conyers	McDonald, Mich.	Utt
Cowger	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Culver	Morse, Mass.	Willis
Davis, Ga.	Pool	Winn
Diggs	Rees	Younger
Eckhardt	Resnick	Zion
Evins, Tenn.		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SIOUX INDIAN CROWNED MRS. SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. REIFEL. 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 Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, not since 1964 when a South Dakota Indian boy, Billy Mills, gained the respect and admiration of the American people by winning an Olympic Gold Medal has the proud State of South Dakota and the Sioux Indian people had so much to be proud of.

Mrs. Ramona Zephier, a fullblooded Sioux Indian from Flandreau, was crowned Mrs. South Dakota last week and is presently competing for the title of Mrs. America in San Diego, Calif.

Our State's new homemaker was born and raised on South Dakota's Pine Ridge Indian Reservation and is a graduate in home economics from my alma mater, South Dakota State University. Mrs. Zephier represents not only South Dakota but also is a tribute to the Indian people of America.

She views the title as an opportunity to "destroy some of the stereotypes of how the American Indian works and lives."

She says her goal is twofold: to show people that all Indians are not bad and to show the Indian people that whatever they want to do, they can.

For the past 10 years Mrs. South Dakota's husband, Andy, has been athletic director of the Indian school in Flandreau.

Mrs. Zephier is a versatile substitute teacher in the same school where her husband works and is the loving mother of three children.

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 463 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 463

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9240) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 9240, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 666), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 9240 as passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution discloses, this is an open rule, providing 3 hours of debate, making in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 9240 as reported out of the Armed Services Committee, authorizing the expenditure of more than $21 billion for pro-