

SENATE—Thursday, June 6, 1968

The Senate met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Dear Lord and Father of all people who mourn, we bow as a nation before Thee this sad day. One of our national leaders and a worthy Member of this U.S. Senate has been slain by an assassin's gun.

We are numb because we did not believe it could happen in this Nation we love so much. We are a country of all backgrounds, free to voice different opinions and convictions. Our brother, highly esteemed by so many, spoke his convictions so effectively seeking the Nation's highest office. Because of extremism, O God, he is now the victim of a sick mind and spirit. We find we are a part of that sickness. Tragedy upon tragedy is being written as our contemporary history. Have mercy upon us, O God. Forgive us. Guide us. Give to us a sense of divine directions in our confusion.

We thank Thee, O God, for ROBERT F. KENNEDY. We place him in Thy tender care. His was a life of deep religious faith, a life of untold loyalty and sacrifice of service to his country, a life of devotion to family. Give peace beyond human understanding to his soul. We are grateful that our spirits can hear the voice of God when we are deaf to the voice of men.

Give strength and comfort to his faithful wife, Ethel. Be with her today in divine strength in meeting the crushing demands upon her. Bless her children. Be with the Kennedy family, the mother, father, sisters, and brother in compassion and love.

Forgive us for the spirit of violence, hostility of heart, extremism and lawlessness among the people of our country and the world which causes hours like this.

Be the eternal guide to our President, this Senate, and other leaders during a dark and sad period. Through our sincere penitence help us to see how, where, and why we are facing this shocking moment.

We remember the word of God spoken through the Apostle Paul, "We are afflicted in every way, but not crushed; perplexed, but not driven to despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; struck down, but not destroyed."

Help us to learn through this, another human sacrifice, that the way of understanding, respect, decency, and love must govern our paths. We pray in the name of our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 4, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 16, 1967,

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations reported favorably, with amendments, on June 5, 1968, the bill (H.R. 16489) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1165) thereon, which was printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

AMENDMENT NO. 840

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 16, 1967,

Mr. MONRONEY, on June 5, 1968, submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 16489) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Department, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, page 6, after line 17, insert the following:

"For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Secret Service, including purchase (not to exceed one hundred and seventy-one for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, of which one hundred and twenty-nine are for replacement only), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, hire of aircraft, services as authorized by title 5, United States Code, section 3109, purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms, and, in addition, to other duties now provided by law, the protection of persons who are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time as being major Presidential or Vice Presidential candidates who should receive such protection (unless the candidate has declined such protection), after consultation with an advisory committee consisting of the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and one additional Member selected by the members of such committee; \$21,300,000, of which \$400,000 shall be immediately available.

"Hereafter, when requested by the Director of the Secret Service, Federal departments and agencies, unless such authority be revoked by the President, shall assist the Secret Service in the performance of its protective duties under title 18, United States Code, section 3056 and the preceding paragraph."

Mr. MONRONEY also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 16489, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Of-

fice of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT NO. 841

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 16, 1967,

Mr. MUNDT on June 5, 1968, submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 16489) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Department, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, page 16, after line 16, insert the following:

"SEC. 502. Section 5(b) of the Act entitled 'An Act creating a Commission to be known as the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography', approved October 3, 1967 (Public Law 90-100), is amended by striking out 'January 31, 1970' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 31, 1970'."

Mr. MUNDT also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 16489, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment, the bill (S. 2585) for the relief of Kap Rai Kim and Young Nam Kim.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73) creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-Elect and the Vice-President-Elect on January 20, 1969.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2349) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11308) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 272. An act to extend the period during which amounts transferred from the employment security administration account in the unemployment trust fund to

State accounts may be used by the States for payment of expenses of administration;

H.R. 1648. An act for the relief of Martina Zubiri Garcia;

H.R. 2478. An act for the relief of Josefina Pollicar Abutan Fullar;

H.R. 2695. An act for the relief of Donald D. Lambert;

H.R. 3681. An act for the relief of James M. Yates;

H.R. 5029. An act for the relief of Maria Balluardo Frasca;

H.R. 5815. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. William W. Gentry;

H.R. 5818. An act for the relief of Clifton R. Kindt;

H.R. 6195. An act for the relief of Peter Balinas and Lee Balinas;

H.R. 6323. An act for the relief of Dr. Rodolfo Eduardo Bustamante y Arriola;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Orloski;

H.R. 6673. An act for the relief of Lee Ok Ja;

H.R. 7047. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramon Aixala;

H.R. 7735. An act relating to the dutiable status of aluminum hydroxide and oxide, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore;

H.R. 7900. An act for the relief of Dr. Eulogio Manuel Calderin Pazos;

H.R. 7901. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Dominguez Lopez;

H.R. 7902. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel A. Santos-Buch;

H.R. 8087. An act for the relief of Henry Gibson;

H.R. 8809. An act for the relief of Maj. Hollis O. Hall;

H.R. 8816. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Sardinias Perez;

H.R. 9022. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Ortiz y Gomez;

H.R. 9089. An act for the relief of E. Christian Des Marets, Sr.;

H.R. 10457. An act for the relief of Dr. Angela Zabarte Fandino;

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Ricardo Siguancia Rosario;

H.R. 11591. An act for the relief of Dr. Eliseo E. Pulig;

H.R. 11592. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Fajardo Vargas;

H.R. 11593. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Guerra;

H.R. 11787. An act for the relief of Dr. Conrado Gonzales-Nunez;

H.R. 11901. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Alfonso Ferrara Collazo;

H.R. 12071. An act for the relief of Sung Nan Lee;

H.R. 12116. An act for the relief of Dr. Roberto de la Caridad Miguel;

H.R. 12378. An act for the relief of Demetroula Georgiades;

H.R. 12419. An act for the relief of Dr. Rodrigo Victor de Valle;

H.R. 12850. An act for the relief of Ku Eun Yong;

H.R. 13154. An act for the relief of Dr. Santiago Jose Manuel Ramon Bienvenido Roig y Garcia;

H.R. 13160. An act for the relief of William W. Hiebert;

H.R. 13353. An act for the relief of Dr. Isaac Cohen;

H.R. 13469. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Matias Rubio;

H.R. 13577. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Narciso Gonzalez y Fleites;

H.R. 13650. An act for the relief of Aydee Cordero;

H.R. 13863. An act for the relief of Choi Sung Joo;

H.R. 13912. An act for the relief of Angeliki Giannakou;

H.R. 14017. An act for the relief of Dr. Rogelio Giraldo Vidal-Lopez;

H.R. 14079. An act for the relief of Lt. (junior grade) Herbert F. Swanson, and others;

H.R. 14167. An act for the relief of Lydia M. Parsley;

H.R. 14238. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco E. Laurrauri-Laurrauri;

H.R. 14324. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Baudillo Napoles (Fernandez);

H.R. 14751. An act for the relief of Dr. Tomas Ricardo Armstrong-Martinez;

H.R. 15798. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk;

H.R. 15840. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Ponce De Leon;

H.R. 16037. An act for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans;

H.R. 16283. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward;

H.R. 17104. An act to extend until July 15, 1969, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum; and

H.R. 17268. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1581. An act to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 584);

S. 2178. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois;

S. 2634. An act to amend section 867(a) of title 10, United States Code, in order to establish the Court of Military Appeals as the U.S. Court of Military Appeals under article I of the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2884. An act to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad;

S. 3017. An act to change the provision with respect to the maximum rate of interest permitted on loans and mortgages insured under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; and

H.J. Res. 1224. Joint resolution to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1968.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 73, 90th Congress, the Speaker had appointed as members of the Joint Committee to Make the Necessary Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-Elect and the Vice President-Elect of the United States on the 20th Day of January 1969, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. ALBERT, and Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

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

H.R. 272. An act to extend the period during which amounts transferred from the employment security administration account in the unemployment trust fund to State accounts may be used by the States for payment of expenses of administration;

H.R. 7735. An act relating to the dutiable status of aluminum hydroxide and oxide, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore;

H.R. 15798. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk; and

H.R. 17104. An act to extend until July 15, 1969, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1648. An act for the relief of Martina Zubiri Garcia;

H.R. 2478. An act for the relief of Josefina Pollicar Abutan Fullar;

H.R. 2695. An act for the relief of Donald D. Lambert;

H.R. 3681. An act for the relief of James M. Yates;

H.R. 5029. An act for the relief of Maria Balluardo Frasca;

H.R. 5815. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. William W. Gentry;

H.R. 5818. An act for the relief of Clifton R. Kindt;

H.R. 6195. An act for the relief of Peter Balinas and Lee Balinas;

H.R. 6323. An act for the relief of Dr. Rodolfo Eduardo Bustamante y Arriola;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Orloski;

H.R. 6673. An act for the relief of Lee Ok Ja;

H.R. 7047. An act for the relief of Dr. Ramon Aixala;

H.R. 7900. An act for the relief of Dr. Eulogio Manuel Calderin Pazos;

H.R. 7901. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Dominguez Lopez;

H.R. 7902. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel A. Santos-Buch;

H.R. 8087. An act for the relief of Henry Gibson;

H.R. 8809. An act for the relief of Maj. Hollis O. Hall;

H.R. 8816. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Sardinias Perez;

H.R. 9022. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Ortiz y Gomez;

H.R. 9089. An act for the relief of E. Christian Des Marets, Sr.;

H.R. 10457. An act for the relief of Dr. Angela Zabarte Fandino;

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Ricardo Siguancia Rosario;

H.R. 11591. An act for the relief of Dr. Eliseo E. Pulig;

H.R. 11592. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Fajardo Vargas;

H.R. 11593. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Guerra;

H.R. 11787. An act for the relief of Dr. Conrado Gonzales-Nunez;

H.R. 11901. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Alfonso Ferrara Collazo;

H.R. 12071. An act for the relief of Sung Nan Lee;

H.R. 12116. An act for the relief of Dr. Roberto de la Caridad Miguel;

H.R. 12378. An act for the relief of Demetroula Georgiades;

H.R. 12419. An act for the relief of Dr. Rodrigo Victor de Valle;

H.R. 12850. An act for the relief of Ku Eun Yong;

H.R. 13160. An act for the relief of William W. Hiebert;

H.R. 13353. An act for the relief of Dr. Isaac Cohen;

H.R. 13469. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Matias Rubio;

H.R. 13577. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Narciso Gonzalez y Fleites;

H.R. 13650. An act for the relief of Aydee Cordero;

H.R. 13863. An act for the relief of Choi Sung Joo;

H.R. 14017. An act for the relief of Dr. Rogelio Giraldo Vidal-Lopez;

H.R. 14079. An act for the relief of Lt. (junior grade) Herbert F. Swanson, and others;

H.R. 14167. An act for the relief of Lydia M. Parsley;

H.R. 14238. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco E. Laurrauri-Laurrauri;

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 272. An act to extend the period during which amounts transferred from the employment security administration account in the unemployment trust fund to State accounts may be used by the States for payment of expenses of administration;

H.R. 7735. An act relating to the dutiable status of aluminum hydroxide and oxide, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore;

H.R. 14324. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Baudilio Napoles (Fernandez);
 H.R. 14751. An act for the relief of Dr. Tomas Ricardo Armstrong-Martinez;
 H.R. 15840. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Ponce De Leon;
 H.R. 16037. An act for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans; and
 H.R. 16283. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H.R. 17268. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes during the period for the transaction of routine morning business which will end at 12 o'clock.

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

DEATH OF SENATOR KENNEDY OF NEW YORK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 300) was considered and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 300

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, late a Senator from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of Senators join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the assassination of our late colleague, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, marked the passing from the living scene of a man of courage, dedication, integrity, and patriotism.

Senator KENNEDY was one who recognized the problems of the present and sought to find solutions for them in a manner which would bring the people of this country together, unify us as a nation, and prepare us for the ordeals which lie ahead.

I grieve for my country and for the Kennedys—all of them.

I grieve in a personal sense for this man's passing, and I grieve in a national sense because I wonder what is wrong that there can be a killing not of just a Robert Kennedy but also a President Kennedy, a Medgar Evers, a Martin Luther King, Jr., a Lt. William G. King, Jr., USMC, of Orlando, Fla., a Lt. Thaddeus Lesnick, U.S. Marine Corps, of Fish-tail, Mont., a small ranching town in my State, and a Thomas Williams of the District of Columbia.

We have a lot of questions to ask ourselves; a lot of answers to find, and not too much time to do it. The very best will be expected of all of us to see us through the travail of our domestic and foreign difficulties, and we cannot afford not to measure up.

What does it take to awaken us from our deep sleep? What in the name of God has happened to us?

Are we so blind that we cannot see?

Are we so deaf that we cannot hear?

Are we so dumb that we cannot understand?

Are we so filled with hatred that we cannot love and appreciate one another?

Are we so immersed in ourselves that we cannot live with one another in peace and amity?

Are we so violent that we fail to comprehend the basic tenets and needs of a democracy?

Have we lost our appreciation of the old values while creating nothing new and worthwhile?

Are we too sorry for ourselves; too involved with our materialism; too far away from the spiritual values of our heritage; and too wrapped up in our self-esteem?

How do we learn? How do we mature as a nation? How do we overcome the divisiveness which marks our country in this hour of trouble?

We can learn by recognizing and living up to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; by recognizing that we are a government of laws and not of men; and by punishing those who flout the Constitution and the laws made thereunder and by protecting those who live by them.

The killing of all of these men from Massachusetts, from New York, from Mississippi, from Georgia, from Florida, from Montana, my own State and my own constituent, and from the District of Columbia was totally callous. Criminals who perpetrate these crimes must and will be called to account or otherwise the law has no meaning, responsibility, no credit, and anarchy will become the norm of our society.

We cannot recall the lives of any of the human beings whom I mentioned. We can, however, learn from what has taken place and attempt to find out the causes, seek the cures, and do what we can to bring an end to the disrespect, irresponsibility, and outright contempt for life and law which is so prevalent today.

Yesterday, I had a conference with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], at which time I discussed with him our jointly introducing a resolution setting up a select committee to inquire into the pathology of political and social violence which plagues the Nation. We were agreed on the need for such an inquiry, and yesterday evening spent an hour at the White House discussing the matter with the President of the United States. Out of that conference came total agreement between the President and the leadership that a single bipartisan commission was urgently needed, should be appointed, and would represent the best approach in seeking answers to the press-

ing national problems of political and social violence.

The President has acted swiftly in this hour of national tragedy, having already announced his appointments to the proposed Commission. On the recommendation of the leadership, he has designated from the Senate the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] to serve as members. They have our full confidence and support in the profound task which falls to them.

Mrs. Mansfield, our daughter Anne, and I extend to Ethel Kennedy and the children, to Senator KENNEDY and his sisters, and to the parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, our deepest sympathy and condolence in their hour of distress and sorrow. We offer our prayers for our deceased colleague and beloved friend. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in time of great national sorrow—and we are in such a time—we can take some solace in the vitality of democratic institutions. Our Nation will remain strong so long as brave, capable men seek our highest offices and hold those offices with distinction.

For this reason, I support without reservation the measure before the Senate at this moment. Its purpose is so simple. We legislate today to take every possible precaution so that our Presidents, past, present, and future, are never taken from us because our Government failed to provide them with maximum protection.

I might say parenthetically, Mr. President, that what we see by way of physical political assassination does not tell the whole story. There was given to us in some confidence the number of threats that have been made on the lives of Presidents now and before, and it is an astonishing number. In fact, it is almost unbelievable in a free country.

Only 5 years ago, we suffered the loss of our President by an assassin's bullet. Today, we mourn the brutal slaying of a man who aspired to that high office.

It was a cruel bit of fate that ROBERT FRANCIS KENNEDY should live through one assassination in his time and obviously not live through the second.

Each day the life of the present President is placed in danger. And we continue to honor and esteem our two former Presidents—Dwight Eisenhower who, as I recall, is 78 years of age, and Harry Truman, who is, as I recall, 84 years of age—and the former First Lady, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, who need and are entitled to protection from this Government. It is so little that this great Republic can do for them.

Ten years ago, during the administration of a Republican President, the present Speaker of the House of Representatives said in the course of a floor debate, "Once a President, always a President."

Mr. President, I subscribe to that. Once a man has served his nation in that most exacting office of all, he is our President for as long as he lives. Dwight Eisenhower and Harry Truman are still "Mr. President" to me.

I want our Presidents to have every protection this Government can provide them. I do not want to risk another na-

tional tragedy because we have failed to put all the personnel and resources needed behind the task of protecting them. I want each department to be in constant liaison with the Secret Service. And I want the Director of the Secret Service to be able to call upon our personnel and facilities—and without having to think twice about it—to see that the assistance is available at all times.

We had one incident out in my State where the Secret Service borrowed personnel from another agency of Government and they found themselves on the receiving end of legal action before they got through.

Perhaps we are able to do so at this time. But there should be no question about it—no failing because of proper legislative foundation. So let us make the record clear today by the passage of the measure before us.

The distinguished majority leader and I spent quite a little time last night with not only the President, but also with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General. We finally agreed upon those who should serve on this Commission and take a look at this picture and see what can be done. The Commission will have as its Chairman a very distinguished academician, Milton Eisenhower. Everybody knows him. He has been the president of several universities, and later the president of Johns Hopkins University, which has a rather international flavor. He has been one of the great servants in the Government.

The other members of the Commission are: Archbishop Terence Cooke, of New York, a very distinguished cleric; former Ambassador Patricia Harris; Eric Hoffer, the philosopher; Judge Leon Higginbotham, of New York, who has a great reputation as a distinguished judge; Senator HART, of Michigan; Senator HRUSKA, of Nebraska; Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana; Representative WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, of Ohio; and Albert E. Jenner, of Chicago, who served as counsel to the Warren Commission, and who is a very able lawyer, indeed.

Mr. President, I think that this Commission, properly implemented with staff and the necessary funds, can do a great and timely work, and it ought to be done now, because already, if one has examined the morning press, he will note that there are Soviet authorities who are already referring to us as a sick nation. We are not a sick nation. These minorities do not make us sick, but we better ascertain what the motivation is and then apply the remedy.

John Wilkes Booth had a motive when he killed Abraham Lincoln. He thought it would end the Civil War to remove the leader. A disappointed office seeker assassinated McKinley, and Garfield was assassinated. The assassins thought it proved something. There were motives there. The motive in the death of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy has never been conclusively established.

The man who has now perpetrated violence in California speaks an excellent conversationalist; and his diary is in the hands of authorities, and there are some rather fantastic entries, but

there has not been indicated what motive was behind this heinous act. We better find out what those motives are, and then, of course, the remedy can be applied.

Never was there any time in the history of this country when there has been so much fever and tumult. When they think that these violent acts and a violent way of life prove something, frankly, they prove exactly nothing.

I hope this commission can move into action swiftly and implement itself with whatever it needs and give us a quick report. It is a distinguished commission indeed, and I salute and applaud the President for undertaking this effort.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the assassination of our late colleague, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, illustrates most tragically the spirit of hate, lawlessness, and complete disregard for the rights and convictions of others which has captured the minds of too many of our people. As a result, additional laws will be promptly passed and I hope they will be strictly enforced. Today, the House of Representatives will probably pass the Senate omnibus crime bill which a large majority in the Senate feel will assure stronger law enforcement.

I hope we may have a firmer determination to enforce the law on the part of Federal, State, and local officials, including the courts. But it is very clear that there must be also a change within the hearts and minds of individual citizens supporting and, indeed, demanding stronger law enforcement and at the same time giving more tolerant recognition to the rights of others to hold and express different convictions from our own, so long as those convictions are within the law. A personal dedication of all Americans to the cause of better law enforcement, coupled with more tolerant recognition of the lawful rights of others would be the finest possible memorial to Senator KENNEDY.

In the meantime, Mrs. Holland and I join all decent Americans in mourning the death of Senator KENNEDY and expressing our deep sympathy for his widow, the children and the other members of the Kennedy family who have had to bear much more than their share of personal grief and tragedy.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Nation and the Senate mourns the tragic passing of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, and Mrs. Talmadge joins me in extending deep sympathy to the Kennedy family.

Senator KENNEDY, struck down in his prime by an assassin's bullet, was the victim of a kind of insanity that has taken hold of this great land. Sick and vicious minds have been at work. They would abandon civilized conduct and settle differences between men and issues by the sword. I can find no compassion or understanding in my heart for such bestiality. It must be expunged from our society.

It is my prayer that all the people of our country will heed the call for law and order and for the restoration of social sanity that has been issued by the Congress and the President. It is my further hope that all our people of all races and political persuasions will unite in the common purpose of advancing the wel-

fare, well-being, and prosperity of each and every citizen of this country.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, at a time of tragedy in my own family, no two persons were more sensitive and understanding than Ethel and Bob KENNEDY. Each of them contacted members of the family. They were especially kind and understanding to my daughter Sharon, whom they befriended and helped.

On the anniversary of the passage of 1 year from the death of my daughter Valerie, Bob KENNEDY handwrote me a deeply moving letter and handed it to me in this Chamber. It was an uncommonly gracious gesture, but one which typified the man.

I know of no man who felt more deeply the misfortunes of others, especially the plight of the needy in this country and throughout the world, than ROBERT KENNEDY. No man devoted himself more to helping them, despite the personal malignment directed against him because of his efforts to lighten their burdens.

This century has been a bloody one. Many millions have died in combat. Millions of others have died in concentration camps. Nuclear weapons have been developed and employed. In America, some of the best among us have been felled by assassins. Human life has been squandered.

Thus, the record of the 20th century to some seems increasingly atrocious. Despite the spread of education, particularly in the industrial nations; despite great advances in the arts and sciences; despite the diversion of greater resources than ever before to the study of human behavior, the level of violence has risen.

The problem is acute both at home and abroad. The problem is, how do we lower the level of violence and raise the level of understanding and cooperation among men and nations?

The first order of business is to stop the shooting. At home we require and deserve much stricter gun laws and strong but fair law enforcement. Abroad we have a responsibility to find a formula for ending the war in Vietnam.

If we persevere in taking every step we can toward peace abroad, peace can be won abroad. Here at home, let us rededicate ourselves to rooting out the bias that exists in our hearts and strike it down with logic. Let us teach our children that brotherhood and justice must be practiced every day of our lives. Let love guide us in our relationships with each other and with all men.

If we live our lives this way, and if we adopt such policies as a Nation, peace, order, and truth will be advanced in the world, and brotherhood and justice may yet be achieved. We cannot shrink from such efforts. Nor can we give up on ourselves or neglect our responsibility to do what must be done. No man had a keener awareness of this responsibility than ROBERT KENNEDY. Individually and collectively, let us resolve to make ourselves, our Nation, and the world more rational, more tolerant, more compassionate, and more acceptable in the eyes of God and all just men.

Mr. President, there is much that remains to be done by both bodies of this legislature. But America cannot just say to Congress, "What are you going to do

about these problems and challenges?" For each American must dedicate himself to doing something about them.

Respect for order and a sense of decency must begin within the family. It must begin with the community, the municipality, and the State before the Federal Government can act in a significant way.

Every American can say to himself, "I will find someone in this country less fortunate than I. I am not going to leave their fate to others. I myself am going to do something to help someone else, so that justice and dignity will belong to all men, so that the American dream can be a dream not just for some Americans but for all Americans, and so that this American dream can, once again—in our time—be a symbol of light and hope for all the people of the world."

ROBERT KENNEDY deeply believed in the American dream, and by his death, America has lost more than she can afford to lose. Today, our hearts go out to all the Kennedys, whose own personal losses have been exceeded only by what they have given the Nation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in this land of shock and sorrow it is fitting that here in the Senate we should pause in tribute to our fallen colleague, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. For here was centered the words and work of a great American who now belongs to the ages.

To our prayers we shall add praise for the goals of human good that this brave young man sought—and our promise that his cause has not died with him.

It was in the nature of ROBERT KENNEDY to have causes—to be concerned. He held the power of place—but was at home with the humble. He was a man of wealth—but his concern was for the poor.

He was a lawyer who had held the high office of Attorney General of the United States—and his clients were the penniless and the friendless.

He was a fond father whose children shared the podium with him in his hours of high decision—and underprivileged children shared his heart in every waking moment.

He was a son of a dedicated family which has served America well and suffered so much. He was a devoted brother—one of three who have brought great honor to this Senate.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY was a Senator from the State of New York but his real constituency was the entire world of the underprivileged.

His years were given to demanding tasks—but he remained young—and now God has chosen that he shall be a youth for all eternity.

He had an appeal to youth—and as we watched their response, and clear good nature—and evident affection for the America of Senator KENNEDY's dreams and determination—we felt a sense of relief from the violence that has been too often in the streets of our cities.

Surely, we felt a sense of mature values that must make our America secure.

Senator KENNEDY had an appeal to youth who served him on his staff with a dedicated zeal—far beyond the call of duty. He and his workers were our Senate neighbors. Across the hall and through their open doors, we enjoyed

their youth and enthusiasm—just as we sense and share their overpowering sadness in this lonely hour.

For the act of a madman in distant Los Angeles will leave its scars on many, many young lives whose days seem to change from destiny to despair.

Senator KENNEDY worked for the sanctity of the home—and he died by the hand of a son of a broken home.

Senator KENNEDY spoke against violence. "What has violence ever gained?" he asked—and he died by violence.

In the hour of the tragic death of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Senator KENNEDY delivered at Cleveland what might be his own eulogy when he said:

No martyr's cause has ever been stilled by the assassin's bullet.

Beyond any words we may utter in the Senate today—that must be our work for all days.

Even as we speak a plane is making its sad journey across the peaceful skies of the America ROBERT KENNEDY loved—for which he labored—for which he died.

The mortal remains of ROBERT KENNEDY make their way from sea to shining sea—to the requiem in the cathedral of his faith—then to journey to this city—by these very buildings—to come to rest by his brother's side—in Arlington—the immortal altar of Americanism.

To his beloved wife and children—to all the stricken family—too often steeped in tragedy—we offer our humble human consolation that they shall be remembered in our prayers—and we offer the solemn promise that their loved ones shall not be forgotten in our purposes.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, we grieve today with the loss of our colleague ROBERT KENNEDY and for a family that has experienced so much tragedy and for a Nation once again enduring the shock and self-analysis that come with the assassin's bullet.

Perhaps laws can be strengthened—and perhaps facts can be brought to public attention by commission inquiry. Nevertheless, it seems more compelling to me that all Americans examine their hearts and their minds. Never in our history, even during the tragedy of civil war, has there been evidence of so many angry people and so much divisiveness as has been manifest in America during the past few years. Never before have Americans appeared more intolerant of the views of others.

This tragic death, regardless of the motive of the assassin, has implications that strike at the very roots of our Nation. For what meaning have freedom of speech and all of the other inalienable rights guaranteed by our Constitution if violence, lawlessness, and hatred continue as prominent features of our society?

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY was not only a Senate colleague but a personal friend. Years ago, we had attended law school together.

Now, as a result of this tragedy, a part of the canvass of his life is left white, never to be painted in. In his struggle to play what he thought to be his part in the American political scene, he was not so much pushed by the plans of the past as pulled by the hopes of the future.

I find my own sense of loss to be great—not really measurable at all.

And the cost and loss to our national spirit is likewise not subject to measurement, but we must know that our democratic processes are somehow diminished.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, if America is blessed, she is blessed not only with the quality of her institutions, but with the quality of the men who guide her destiny.

Such a man was ROBERT KENNEDY. Like his brother before him, he stood tall and gave his whole spirit and being to his fellow countrymen.

And now he has given his life.

Life asked much of ROBERT KENNEDY. It gave him a wonderful family, a keen and inquisitive mind, and an important role to play in his Nation's affairs. But it also took much. It took his brother, John; it must have sapped his energy many times when he was attacked and criticized; and, now, it has demanded the supreme sacrifice.

FOR ROBERT KENNEDY, the fight is now over. But the battle goes on. And, if there is a single consolation in his tragic death, it is this: that the world was touched by this man while he lived.

His concern and dedication for his fellow man leaves this cold and cruel world just a little warmer. And his memory, during the dark days ahead, will provide a beacon to light the path before us.

His life, as Shakespeare wrote:
Was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, we are all saddened by the news of the death of Senator KENNEDY of New York. The shameful and senseless murder of ROBERT F. KENNEDY is a blow to our Nation and to our democratic processes. The Senate of the United States has lost an effective and strong and dynamic Member.

Mrs. Byrd and I want to extend our sympathy to his family, his wife and his children, his brother TED, his aged father and mother, and to all to whom he was close and dear.

The Kennedy family, which has given three sons to the service of the Nation, has been called upon to suffer and to endure more than any family should.

I join my colleagues and people everywhere in denouncing the madness of the act which took his life and expressing my own personal sorrow at the needless thing that has happened.

I am sobered by the thought that our republican form of government cannot continue to function if candidates for public office or holders of public office cannot safely go among the people to discuss issues and to comment upon the affairs of state.

If we have come to the point in our overpermissive society at which twisted minds are to be allowed to equate violence and killing with dissent and go unpunished for their acts, then our Nation cannot endure. Yet, that is the impression that is being created so often in so many places as the perpetrators of violence and murder have escaped the consequences of their crimes.

The Nation is aroused today by the emotional horror of Senator KENNEDY'S

violent death, but this will subside, and assassination and murder and violence will strike us again, unless some fundamental changes are made in the philosophy of our courts and in the moral apathy of our people and in the hearts of our people.

I call for a return to a basic principle upon which any civilized country must, in the final analysis, rest—the rule of law. Homes can inculcate in our children a regard for the sanctity of human life. Churches can teach that they must not kill. Schools can teach that a civilized nation must be based on law and order. But it remains for the Government to bring these principles alive, to enforce the laws, and maintain and preserve order.

The vicious and despicable slaying of President Kennedy is part of a degrading drama of disrespect for social order that America has allowed to unfold before the world. This drama will not be brought to an end—the simple fact is that we may expect more and more persons to give way to the dark impulses in their minds—unless society reasserts its rightful authority to protect not just the rights of criminals and those who are antisocial, but the rights of all.

The Senate and the Nation mourn today for Senator KENNEDY. Let us go forward from this moment with new determination that the desecration of American life that we have permitted to spread so widely among us will be rooted from our midst.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY was a voice of conscience in the Senate, and from that forum he worked to stir the conscience of the Nation in domestic and foreign affairs, where the Nation's conscience needed stirring most. He sought to arouse the Nation, for the poor at home, and for peace in all the world. Now he is gone; the Nation should heed his counsel.

I have worked closely with ROBERT KENNEDY in the Senate where we served together on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. He was the epitome of honor and courage. He was kind and courageous, brave, and vigilant, and unswerving in his crusade against corruption and injustice.

It has been one of my greatest privileges in the Senate to serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with all three of the Kennedy brothers, John Fitzgerald, ROBERT, and EDWARD, and to work closely with all of them on that committee, not as mere Senate colleagues, but as friends.

No other family in America has given more generously to the Nation in this generation than the Kennedys. Three of their four sons have given their lives in their country's service. No other family in America was more patriotic or brilliant. Assassins have cut down two of America's most gifted sons of this generation, early in their brilliant careers.

In mourning for ROBERT KENNEDY and his family, America must mourn for herself, for the crimes that have cut away from our Nation two of our greatest. Mrs. Yarborough and I, with overflowing hearts, are filled to the brim with sympathy for the family which has placed its son, brother, husband, and father upon

its country's altar. May a Merciful God safeguard the Kennedys where the Nation failed to safeguard them.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, violence, reflecting the intolerance and prejudice all too common among us, has struck down another member of one of America's greatest families.

The tragedy visited another time on one family is exceeded only by the great loss our Nation suffers in his death.

Many of us may not agree with the specific solutions Senator KENNEDY proposed for healing America's festering sores. But none of us can exceed the commitment to that task made by Senator KENNEDY.

To those millions of men who represent America's important minorities, he stood as a symbol of interracial concern. To those with little but hope left, he stood as a strong anchor of faith. To the poor and uneducated, he stood as a continuing inspiration, assuring them of better days ahead.

It matters little that some of us would propose different solutions to improve our society and the lives of our citizens.

What does matter is that violence has struck down a dedicated exponent of his own convictions.

What does matter is that we have not yet matured in America so as to see the wisdom in hearing all who love this country and recognizing the possibility of others being right.

Let us all dedicate our lives to the proposition that we can disagree without resorting to violence; that we can perfect our society by acting in an orderly, lawful way.

The promise that is America and the fulfillment of the American dream can be achieved in no other fashion.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I am certain that I speak for all the citizens of North Dakota when I say the shocking death of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY has caused anguish and deep sorrow in all of us.

That this young man should be struck down while attempting to become President of these United States is completely unbelievable. It is also unbelievable that enough intolerance exists in some men to commit such an outrageous act. This cruel deed by a hate-filled and twisted mind has stilled the voice of one of our great public leaders.

This act proves there is too much hate and intolerance in this country; and we must do something about it soon or it will consume us. We cannot chastise the 200 million citizens of this country for the act of one vicious killer. But, we can improve the climate that will permit us to live in harmony.

Our sorrow today is for the Kennedy family, which has already felt so much deep tragedy, including the loss of two other sons in service to this Nation.

My sorrow also is for this country, for all Americans know that we have lost a capable, energetic, righteous man. And I have lost a beloved colleague and friend.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I believe the service of the Kennedy brothers in the U.S. Senate has been unique. No other American family has given to this body three Senators. John Kennedy served on our Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare; EDWARD KENNEDY serves on the same committee; and the late ROBERT KENNEDY also served on that committee. I shall ever be grateful that I could serve on it with the three of them.

I think the service of the three Kennedy brothers on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been genuinely indicative of the compassion of these good and great gentlemen—the tragic passing of one of whom we formally mourn in this Chamber during these poignant minutes of remembrance.

The Kennedys have been very close to the people of West Virginia. That was true also of the Roosevelts, President Franklin Roosevelt and later his sons. I often think how remarkable it is that such families, and strong personalities within those families, from positions of power and affluence, would and did come into our hills and were able to understand the yearnings of our people. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and his brothers never wavered in their support of legislation and advocacy of programs which were designed to help the State of West Virginia and the fine people who live there.

So I return to my earlier thought, that the Kennedy brothers were not assigned to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; each, by personal preference, asked to be a member of that committee. Of course, there are reasons why men serve on committees. The high purposes that are to be attained by the work on the subcommittees in particular fields have their special appeals. That is understandable. But on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, ROBERT KENNEDY was a member of our Subcommittees on Labor, on Employment, and Manpower, and Poverty, and on Education.

You know, we are inclined often to speak thoughtlessly. I remember a dear friend of mine who told me, "Never speak evil of a person. Write it. Write it on the sands near the water's edge."

There are many people who, perhaps thoughtlessly stressed the impulsiveness of ROBERT KENNEDY, stressed perhaps the elements of apparent hurry which characterized his movements in speech and in walk and in approach to life itself. But the impulsiveness—which is not bad in itself—was overshadowed by the compassion and by the perseverance of the man.

I recall a witness who some members of the Labor Subcommittee—perhaps I was included in the list—felt was taking too much of our time in spreading on the record the opinions he held on pending legislation.

There was an air of, "Let us get this over." Then, very quietly, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY—let some of us who were on the subcommittee remember now—leaned into the microphone and looked down and said, "This is a fellow citizen of ours, and he has a story to tell. I want to hear it."

And this was enough to cause us to realize that we did need to hear and we did need to be patient.

I think few people realize how patient ROBERT KENNEDY really was and, perhaps even more important, how thoughtful he was.

I remember in 1965 when we had legislation pending in the Senate to create our Appalachian Regional Development Commission for those States that thrust themselves across the crest of the Appalachian Mountains.

During the debate, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY came to me, as the manager of the bill, and said: "There are certain counties in New York State that are identified with this region. Their characteristics are the characteristics of counties in States like Pennsylvania and Kentucky and West Virginia and others. I hope they can be included."

There was a difference of opinion in the Senate, understandably, about the possible acceptance of such an amendment. And there were good reasons for the positions taken on one side or the other. However, we accepted his viewpoint and we incorporated those counties into the measure, and the legislation came into being with New York counties added to the area.

That is not the reason I tell the story. That night I had delivered to me in my office a personally written note—the type of personally written note that Senator PERCY has referred to—from ROBERT KENNEDY, thanking me for what I had done.

I went one afternoon, a few months ago, to the National Airport, when the plane—the *Caroline*—used by John Kennedy in his campaign for the Presidency in 1960, now stilled in flight, was to be turned over to the National Air and Space Museum in the Smithsonian Institution. That evening, there came another personally written note thanking me for having been present for the ceremonies.

These little notes are part of my files and I mention them here today not because I wish to unduly attach myself personally to an associate in a time of tragedy or of remembrance of that person. But I feel that we come to know and respect a man because of the contacts that we have had with that person.

Mr. President, I conclude by moving to another thought which is even more vital.

We were considering legislation in the Senate not so very many days ago to attempt to bring about a stoppage of the traffic in guns by mail order—long guns, shotguns, handguns—guns that gun down people in the streets, guns that bring tragic death.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY said that legislation of this type was necessary, and I would like to ask my colleagues to listen, not to me, but to those words of his, I now repeat:

Such legislation—

He emphasized—

would save hundreds of lives in this country and spare thousands of families all across this land the grief and heartbreak that may come from the loss of a husband, a son, a brother, or a friend. It is time—

Said Senator ROBERT KENNEDY—

that we wipe the stain of violence from our land.

Now he is victim of the violence he abhorred—and which he wanted so much to be banished from this earth.

Yes, my colleagues, he spoke correctly. We mourn the loss of a husband, the loss of a father, the loss of a son, the loss of a brother, the loss of a friend.

ROBERT KENNEDY was all of these.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the assassination of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY is a terrible, terrible tragedy. Many basic political values in our country are also being assassinated by extremists who are taking the law into their own hands and violating many constitutional guarantees and basic human rights.

The most meaningful monument we could build to the memory of Senator KENNEDY and to his statesmanship would be for Congress to lead the Nation back to the enforcement and practice of government by law, both domestic and international.

Senator KENNEDY was a man of great courage; he dared to stand up for the right as he saw the right.

I know of no literary quotation that better describes his intellectual courage than the famous quotation from the speech of Carl Schurz delivered on October 17, 1899, under the heading "Anti-Imperialistic Congress."

He said:

Our country, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right.

Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY, in his recent speeches across the country delivered in his campaign for the presidential nomination of his party, spoke many times about the need for national unity. He expressed some of his views as to the reasons for the lack of national unity. He spoke out against violence in our country, and he spoke out against violence in the world.

Mr. President, in my eulogy today to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, I pay tribute to his leadership in the field of foreign policy. He recognized the great disunity in our country caused by the war in Asia. He certainly manifested his view over and over again that we must change our course in that war in order to have unity at home. Mr. President there can be no denial of the fact that millions and millions of Americans do not support that war. They know we should not be killing American boys in that war. There is no question in my mind of the cause-to-effect relationship between our participation in the Vietnam war and some of the violence here at home.

Therefore, Mr. President, I state that we can best pay tribute to the statesmanship of this great man if we, in the Congress, join forces in bringing about a discontinuance of that war. The Congress and the administration must bring our foreign policy in Asia back within the framework of international law. I think it most appropriate that we give renewed consideration in our Government to the resolution that the Senate passed by a vote of 82 to 0, calling upon the President to submit the settlement of the Vietnam war to the jurisdiction of the Security Council of the United Nations. Senator KENNEDY voted for it and supported it. I believe Senator KENNEDY's foreign policy statesmanship will go down in history, and there will be

emblazoned on his record the position he took in opposition to many of our war policies in Asia. His is a record of opposition to the resort to the jungle law of military might for the settlement of disputes among nations.

He stood out courageously for the substitution of the rules and peacekeeping procedures of international law for the rule of the military law. He sought to correct a wrong war policy of our Government.

Mrs. Morse joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy and prayers for God's comfort to Senator KENNEDY's wife, Ethel, and their wonderful children, Senator KENNEDY's mother and father, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, and all the other members of the Kennedy family.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in mourning the death of ROBERT KENNEDY.

I first knew John Kennedy in 1949. I got to know ROBERT KENNEDY in 1956, with our advocacy of John Kennedy for the Vice Presidency. Between 1956 and 1960, it became obvious to me that no man was closer or could be closer to John Kennedy than ROBERT KENNEDY.

I recall vividly the memory of the 4 years from 1956 through 1960 leading to the nomination and election of John Kennedy.

In November 1960, after the election, I was the first man whom John Kennedy asked to visit with him in Palm Beach. We discussed his coming administration, and he said to me:

ABE, you were the first man who thought I could be the President of the United States. Would you like to be Attorney General in my Cabinet?

I said:

Mr. President, I know there has been a lot in the newspapers about this, but if I have my choice, I would prefer to be Secretary of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

He replied:

Who do you think should be considered for Attorney General?

I said:

Mr. President, ROBERT KENNEDY is the man you should appoint.

He then asked me:

Do you think this Nation would take my brother for Attorney General?

I replied:

Mr. President, you are brothers. I have observed both of you intimately during the past 4 years, and it is very apparent to me that emotionally, viscerally, and intellectually you react alike. I have watched both of you in times of crisis; and every time a crisis has entered into your life, you automatically turned to BOBBY. You will be faced with many crises as President of the United States, and the man that you are going to turn to automatically is ROBERT KENNEDY. The worst thing that could happen for both of you and the Nation is to have BOBBY always coming in through the back door. It becomes important that, if he is to be your adviser, he must come in through the front door; and if this is to be the case, I believe that he should be your Attorney General.

President Kennedy again expressed skepticism about the advisability of this, but later told me that he had made the

decision to appoint ROBERT KENNEDY as Attorney General.

As soon as the administration of John Kennedy was formed and got moving, ROBERT KENNEDY was always the closest to John Kennedy. In any crisis that developed or in any basic policy, either domestic or foreign, ROBERT KENNEDY was involved.

Now, it was not ROBERT KENNEDY interfering with other members of the Cabinet or the administration. He was always most circumspect to make sure that he respected the position and the jurisdiction of every member of the Kennedy administration. However, when it came to basic policy, ROBERT KENNEDY was involved—thoughtful, considerate, and wise.

Then came the tragic death of President Kennedy, and for a period ROBERT KENNEDY was a man searching to rediscover his own soul. He was bereft, beside himself, and did not quite know where he fitted into our society.

I talked with ROBERT KENNEDY when he was considering running for the U.S. Senate. I was in the U.S. Senate.

He did not believe that the Senate would be a place for him. He thought the movement of the Senate, the pace of the Senate, might be too slow for a man of such vigor and activity. I replied that I thought, personally, from my experience in all phases of Government, that the U.S. Senate was without question the greatest place in Government and the body that could give a man great opportunity for service.

He ran for the U.S. Senate, and he became a Senator from the State of New York. He entered into his duties with dedication and understanding. He served on my Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, and we undertook a number of actions, first in the field of traffic safety, then in the crisis of the cities. He discussed with me the problems of rising health costs, a subject upon which we embarked this year.

One found in ROBERT KENNEDY a man of deep commitment and deep passion for the great problems and issues facing this country. Contrary to what most people believe about ROBERT KENNEDY, he was a shy, reserved man. It was very difficult to know and understand ROBERT KENNEDY. He was not an outgoing man. While the pictures and television viewing of his campaigning would give the attitude of a vigorous man, always outgoing, ROBERT KENNEDY was not an outgoing man. Basically, he was more on the introvert than the extrovert side.

I have watched with dismay the self-flagellation that this country has undertaken during the past 48 hours. We are not a sick society, Mr. President. Keep in mind that the society that housed the assassin also housed the victim, and 200 million Americans cannot be blamed for the gun and the triggering of the shot that killed ROBERT KENNEDY.

ROBERT KENNEDY understood that this society has many problems and that this society must correct these problems. He devoted his life, his energies, and his efforts to make sure that we have justice, equality, and to correct the injustices we have.

ROBERT KENNEDY had a particular appeal to and love for young people because he recognized that the future of our Nation is in the young people of America. ROBERT KENNEDY also understood and had faith that this is a wholesome generation, irrespective of the minority that caused all the turmoil and trouble.

Mr. President, so that ROBERT KENNEDY should not have died in vain, this is an opportunity for all of society, and not only the legislative branch, but also every individual to make a dedication to the principles in which ROBERT KENNEDY believed.

My feeling is that the death of ROBERT KENNEDY might lead to a basic catharsis in the entire structure of our society. Candidates for the presidency, both Democratic and Republican, will address themselves to the basic problems and issues which ROBERT KENNEDY pointed out needed doing in this country. I believe that both presidential candidates will commit their respective parties to constructive actions at home and abroad.

I believe that every candidate for the Senate and for the House of Representatives in 1968 owes a duty to the people of this Nation to give them leadership. Every candidate for the Senate and for the House of Representatives owes a duty to come forth with a constructive program and basic philosophy, and not merely to be negative and carping.

This is a great Nation. The promise of this Nation is still ahead of it and not in the past. The greatest achievement we can make as Senators is not merely to stand on the floor of the Senate and talk about one of our colleagues who has died. If he is not to have died in vain, we should have the resolution to carry forward those beliefs and ideals of what he believed America could be. This is a great country, not a sick country. Let us get down to the business of the country. Let us not talk about the weaknesses of the few but recognize the strength of the many.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this is a tragic day for the family of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, for the U.S. Senate, and for the Nation.

A brave and dedicated young man, only 42 years old, has been struck down by an assassin, as was his brother, the late President John F. Kennedy.

The horror of this new tragedy overwhelms us and renders words inadequate. Our minds rebel at accepting the fact that Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY has been robbed of his life by a gunman.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY, who cared so deeply for his Nation and for his fellowman, is gone, and we who served with him in this Chamber are diminished by his loss.

Our hearts go out to his wife and children, and to his parents, who have borne so much tragedy.

I feel a deep sense of personal loss, for I have known BOBBY KENNEDY from the time he was a very young man until this hour of his untimely death. I have seen him grow, not only as a member of a remarkable family, but as an individual in his own right.

I first met ROBERT F. KENNEDY in 1947 when his older brother, Jack, invited me to visit the family compound at Hyannis Port.

I have seen him grow from that young man to a Senator, an individual standing in his own right and contributing much to his Nation.

But I can also recall his unselfish labor in behalf of his brother's campaign, the totality of effort, the affirmation and dedication which he brought to the causes in which he believed.

And that made an indelible impression on me, one which I will forever carry with me.

Perhaps as a contemporary of John F. Kennedy, I was closer in friendship and spirit to BOBBY's older brother, but BOBBY KENNEDY also had great qualities of his own and the tragedy which has struck him down on the threshold of what could have been his moment of greatest service is an overpowering one.

The Kennedy family has borne so much loss, that one wonders how they can bear so much pain. However, to those who know the family and the individuals within it, it is a family that wants to live—and does live—in the forefront of life's battles.

If there has to be a single outstanding characteristic of this family it is their active peerless courage.

BOBBY KENNEDY had this family attribute in full measure. He was ready to make any sacrifice for the causes in which he believed and for his Nation.

A columnist suggested recently that it was impossible for ROBERT F. KENNEDY to ignore a dare.

It was a perceptive observation, for BOBBY KENNEDY was a person who carried within him that urge to compete, that drive to win, wherever or whatever the fray.

That spirit was not one of recklessness, it was one of courage. He had within him the passion to stand up for his beliefs, to act according to his views.

ROBERT KENNEDY was a special kind of American, a young leader, of great promise. And he will be sorely missed.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this is a day of sadness for the Senate and for the country.

We have all suffered a grievous loss in the assassination of the late Senator from New York, ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

His youthfulness somehow made the Senate a more youthful and vital body.

His intelligence and wit made the Senate a livelier place.

His passionate championship of the underprivileged and the oppressed enlarged our humanity by helping to focus our attention on the inequities that still exist in our society.

His crusading zeal inspired the enthusiasm of millions of young people throughout the country.

And now this life has been cut short, this light has been extinguished. And the entire Nation mourns.

Our hearts are filled with compassion for the Senator's family, especially for his parents and for his wife and 10 children he leaves behind. And our sympathy is compounded by the knowledge of the almost incredible series of tragedies that

have been visited on this distinguished family.

Of the four Kennedy sons, three have now given their lives in the service of their country. Joseph Kennedy, Jr., killed in World War II. President John F. Kennedy less than 5 years ago was cut down by an assassin's bullet. And now another assassin has taken the life of our friend and colleague, ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Words, therefore, become completely inadequate to express the sympathy we all feel for the Kennedy family in this new bereavement, superimposed on the terrible bereavements of the past. All one can say is that our hearts go out to them.

There is one commentary I would like to add in closing.

Pious condolences over the assassination of an American President or an African-American leader or over the assassination of Senator KENNEDY, will no longer suffice. If our country is not to be regarded by the rest of the world as a nation of murderers and assassins, we must take the most energetic action to put an end to the conditions that today make America a land of murder and violence.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am too stunned and saddened to speak at length this morning. The murder of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY falls like a heavy cross upon our land. My sympathy, deeply felt, goes out to his loved ones, to his stricken wife Ethel, his many children, his parents, his brother Ted, to his sisters, to Mrs. John F. Kennedy, and to all members of his gallant family.

I grieve also for my country, and pray for some future day when the gravest dangers will no longer beset those men in our public life who stand most firmly against hate, want, and fear in America.

May the life of ROBERT F. KENNEDY strengthen the resolve of each of us to serve our country as he did, with courage, candor, and commitment. And may God deliver us the day when men of peace who search for justice can walk safely in our midst.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the murder of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY is an awful, senseless tragedy—and one more reflection of the spots of violence and sickness that blot our Nation. It is just as much a tragedy for our country, to which Senator KENNEDY had so much to give and to which he had already given so much, as it is to his family. The best memorial we can give him is a resolve to take the steps on so many fronts, at home and abroad, that can cure our condition.

My wife and I are deeply grieved and extend all our love and sympathy to his wife and brother and family.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I join my colleagues and fellow Americans in the expression of grief and shock at the tragic act which has claimed the life of one of our Nation's great public figures, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York.

Every citizen must deplore and guard against this ugly kind of violence which has entered our political life. Our shock and disbelief must now cause us to resolve, once and for all, to rid our Nation of the hate, bitterness, and divisiveness

which tears at our national purpose and weakens our unity.

I fully support the action of President Johnson in summoning a commission of learned men from this body and other communities across the Nation to study the intolerable menace of assassination and violence which has become too frequent an occurrence to be ignored.

My heart goes out to the family of Senator KENNEDY whose capacity to survive tragedy is a source of inspiration not only in the United States but abroad.

While the story of ROBERT F. KENNEDY ended today at the moment of his greatest political victory, his message will not be lost to the American people. His life was a dedication to public service and to the uplifting of the disadvantaged and oppressed. His courage and unselfish conviction to oppose injustice, poverty, and ignorance which he never hesitated to identify, brought new hope to millions of Americans and inspired free men everywhere. In these humane contributions, he has left his family and his country with a rich and unforgettable legacy.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, the death by assassination of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY has left us all with a deep sense of shock and grief. But we are also experiencing the stark realization that, while character assassination in politics has almost become an accepted course of action, we cannot be deluded by its "harmlessness." The line between character assassination and political assassination is almost indistinguishable. The price of either is too high. It behooves Americans everywhere, therefore, as voters and constituents, to raise the level of expectations from those who would serve in public life.

We are experiencing today a rising sense of anger because of what the death of this remarkable young leader symbolizes and what it may portend. These feelings mix with the sorrow that we share and the compassion that we have for the Kennedy family, which has been struck once more by unspeakable tragedy, by a sorrow transcended only by the measure of service they have given this country.

For those of us outside that magnificent family, the message is clear that we must rise up to our highest level of rational behavior, to the level of public conduct which BOB KENNEDY and his family have established as a guideline for leadership. This means that we not act out of a fit of anger or grope for quick solutions to the problem that must be solved in the hearts of Americans.

It is understandable that we hear new calls for gun legislation, or demands that we pass restrictive immigration laws because Senator KENNEDY's assassin was a foreigner. But if we do this, we will only deceive ourselves, even though there might be gratification for some who could point to specific legislation.

But we are thinking about and talking about political assassination and the hazards of leadership in our country. They are very real. Political assassination has become too real. In recent years and days it has claimed ROBERT F. KEN-

NEDY and his brother, the late President John F. Kennedy. It has claimed Dr. Martin Luther King. It has claimed Medgar Evers. And it has claimed Malcolm X and George Lincoln Rockwell, who were not greatly admired by many perhaps, but whose deaths also illustrate the frightening ease of political assassination.

This tendency reflects the evil virus of extremism injected into our body politic, first by the right wing and more lately by the so-called new left. The one describes a President as a "traitor" or a "comsymp" and the other denounces a President as a "murderer." On one side the poisonous vernacular of extremism demands "Impeach Earl Warren" and on the other it spits out "Hell no, we won't go." One brand of extremism can call a Martin Luther King "nigger," while another cries back, "Burn, baby, burn."

Political assassination differs from other crimes, but this atmosphere is also engendered by forces which affect the broader problem of crime and lawlessness in America. As child psychiatrist Robert Coles put it in *Trans-Action* magazine recently, those senseless killers Bonnie and Clyde become "us" if we pay attention to what the social critics are saying about our society today. The Neilsen ratings reflect this, too, for violence gets an audience and the media can be depended upon to go where the audience is. We must begin to demand from the media a higher level of entertainment, as well as a higher quality of news reporting which places less emphasis on the extremes and upon bloodletting, real or verbal, and more stress on the significant and substantive events that take place every day of our lives.

In politics, too, we must all learn to disagree without being disagreeable and quit demanding that candidates hit hard, low and often in order to excite their audiences. For all these factors have helped bring to the surface the kind of nut who will kill because law and order are too slow a process for him. Draft-card burners, campus rioters, those who throw molotov cocktails in the ghettos of our cities, and those who sit behind a typewriter or a microphone to produce the mood these people operate from are equally guilty of helping to foment disrespect for law and disregard for order and for their fellow men.

It is easy to point a finger at Congress, or at the State legislatures, and say "Pass a law." But that misses the point. What we have to do to come to grips with this problem is to begin with ourselves as individuals, and with our neighbors and our own communities. We must demand a higher level of conduct and forswear name calling, fear, suspicion, and distrust. We must acquire a deeper sense of tolerance and understanding of the other fellow's point of view and take to heart President Johnson's warning:

There is never—never—any justification for the violence that tears at the fabric of our national life.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we are all shocked by the tragic death of ROBERT KENNEDY, and I

join Senators today in expressing the deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

On the same day, two marine officers were killed in the Nation's Capital in an unprovoked incident.

The prevailing spirit of lawlessness which we see developing in our country has got to be stopped, and it can be stopped only by strict enforcement of the laws. The time is long past due when we should let it be known that those who would violate our laws are going to be punished.

These senseless killings have got to be stopped.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is a sad and tragic day for the American people when a man must place his life in serious danger to run for the Presidency of our country, but obviously that day has arrived.

We are a people who believe in making political choices with a ballot, not with a bullet, but now a horrible act of madness has robbed us of the opportunity to do so.

Our entire Nation—in fact, the entire world—and the Kennedy family have suffered a terrible loss—a loss that will never be forgotten.

Nothing can stop the assassin's bullet once it has been fired. Now we must try to keep the assassin away from his next target. We must unite the country in a massive fight against all criminal violence; and we must demand the respect of all for the laws of our land.

It is fitting to say a few words about Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and the Kennedy family. ROBERT KENNEDY could have chosen to lead a long, happy, and untroubled life. He chose, instead, to strive for the betterment of his country, and his vehicle was politics. Into American politics he breathed a creative energy that is legendary in its own time.

ROBERT KENNEDY's politics always combined the most noble goals with the determination to see them realized. He spoke often and eloquently of the need to improve our society, especially of the need to bring justice and economic opportunity to those segments of our society where sadly they are lacking. This year, his convictions led him into the presidential arena, because "America," he said, "can do better."

The Kennedy family has always taken seriously the need to "do better," and for many years the United States has been the beneficiary of its sense of responsibility. Many of us remember the wartime valor of Joseph Kennedy, Jr.; nobody can forget how President Kennedy uplifted our aspirations; the vision, candor, and courage of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY are a part of our lives.

American politics will not be the same without ROBERT KENNEDY, just as they were changed unalterably by the death of President Kennedy. We can draw some consolation, however, from the membership in the Senate of EDWARD KENNEDY, and I fervently hope that his intelligent voice will continue to be heard throughout America for decades to come.

The Kennedy family has contributed as much to its country and sacrificed as much for it as any other in American

history. The shooting in Los Angeles and the death of my colleague ROBERT KENNEDY emphasizes the greatness of this contribution and the tragedy of each sacrifice. To this great family, once again I express my sorrow and extend my sympathy.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Nation is saddened today.

The Senate is saddened.

No longer will the desk directly in front of me be occupied by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, of New York.

Senator KENNEDY was gunned down by an assassin's bullet.

He will be missed in the Senate and in the Nation. His colleagues one and all recognized him as a man of ability and a political leader of unusual talent.

He sought to serve his fellow man according to the dictates of his heart.

He was struck down in the prime of life, yet his experience in Government was of many years duration—having served in both the executive branch as a Cabinet officer and in the legislative branch as a Senator.

I have communicated to Mrs. Kennedy and her children my deepest and heartfelt sympathy. The Kennedy family is in my thoughts and prayers and those of Mrs. Byrd.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, shock and grief are not translatable into words. But I know I speak for the people of Michigan as I add my voice to the eloquent tributes being paid in this Chamber to our late colleague.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY was no stranger to Michigan. The people of my State knew and admired the Senator from New York—as they did his brother, the late President of the United States.

As we mourn his passing and honor his memory, I speak with a heavy heart as one who had the opportunity to work closely with Senator KENNEDY over a number of years in Congress.

Our relationship dates back to the days of the McClellan committee hearings, which preceded the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin law in 1959. He was chief counsel of that committee, and I was serving then as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Our friendship was renewed and strengthened after I came to the U.S. Senate in May 1966.

For the past 2 years, we sat next to each other and worked closely as members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We shared a distinction: He was the most junior of the Democratic members of the committee, and I am the most junior Republican. Though our politics were different—and we sometimes differed in our approach to problem solving—we enjoyed a relationship which always included understanding, cooperation, and respect.

Senator KENNEDY's quick intelligence and quiet courage, his warm compassion and keen sense of humor, will always be remembered by those who had the opportunity to work with him in matters great and small.

Mr. President, the Senate, the Nation, and the world will miss ROBERT KENNEDY.

My heart goes out to the Kennedy family which has known so much tragedy. On behalf of the people of Michigan,

Mrs. Griffin, and myself, I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is almost incomprehensible that today, less than 5 years since this body paid tribute to our fallen President John F. Kennedy, we should be mourning the tragic and untimely death of his younger brother, our friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, slain in much the same dastardly manner, at the hands of a cowardly gunman.

This latest tragedy is so horrifying it seems almost like a nightmare. Yet, stunned and shocked though we all are, we know we shall not waken to find this is just a bad dream. The breath of life has indeed been snuffed out of a young man, a young father, a young son, a young leader in Government, and this Chamber will never more be graced by his presence.

It is here that he fought some of his most important legislative battles, sometimes winning, sometimes losing, but always persistent in the pursuit of what he believed to be right. It is here that he showed his true mettle and his real capabilities in the legislative arena.

Having known ROBERT KENNEDY when he was Attorney General of the United States and having worked with him in the Senate, I was greatly impressed with his ability, with his innate decency, and with his compassion for the poor and less fortunate. Brilliant, vigorous, dynamic, courageous, adventurous, dedicated, idealistic, humane, ROBERT KENNEDY exuded the vitality and the spirit of America.

In a day when many seek escape from the pressing problems tormenting America, ROBERT KENNEDY never wavered in his efforts to overcome these problems, always giving an extra measure of devotion to duty. Born to material wealth, ROBERT KENNEDY could have existed in indolent ease, but like his brother Jack, he chose instead to dedicate his life to serving his countrymen.

It would have been thoroughly understandable if, after President Kennedy's assassination, ROBERT KENNEDY in grief and in bitterness had left Government service. But he was never a quitter, and so he remained in public life striving toward the goals so eloquently espoused by President Kennedy and adding a new dimension to modern American political history.

Our hearts go out to his wife, Ethel, to his children, and to the members of his family on whom so much anguish has already been inflicted. We can only hope they derive some comfort from these expressions of esteem, respect, and affection for their beloved BOBBY, whose memory we honor today.

Mrs. Fong joins me in extending our prayers and deepest sympathy to the Kennedys at this time of excruciating sorrow.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the death of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY robs America of its clearest and strongest voice for compassion and concern for the victims of poverty and discrimination. No man in public life was more deeply or uncompromisingly concerned with the struggle for justice for the hungry and

the oppressed. He was their champion, and what a fighting champion he was.

He was deeply admired and respected by many of his fellow Senators. But I would be less than frank if I did not concede that he had many who opposed him and disagreed deeply with him. Throughout America no one was more loved and more hated. BOBBY KENNEDY was as much distinguished by his enemies as by his friends.

It was characteristic of BOB KENNEDY that his last words were to express concern for others in his group who had been shot. He was a noble and gallant man.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, once again a tragic, senseless, and brutal assassination has darkened the spirit of our troubled land. Once again a young and brilliant statesman has been cut down at the acme of his greatness. Only tears are eloquent enough to speak of the death of ROBERT KENNEDY; words are insufficient.

Surely now we must summon the courage to look deep into the soul of America to find out what is wrong. What has bred the hatred and violence that has marked and marred our progress as a nation in recent years? What can we do to heal this sickness and bring peace to our families, to our streets, and to our society?

Some things we know we must do. We must move on, much farther than the timid steps of Congress, to curb the menace of the gun. We must call a halt to the progressive brutalization of ourselves and our children through the incessant displays of violence and death on television and motion pictures. We must press ahead toward the goal of social and economic justice for all Americans. That, more than anything else, was ROBERT KENNEDY's mission in public life.

No nation, no matter how rich or powerful, can call itself a civilized State where the rule of law has been replaced by the rule of terror, where assassination determines politics and fear stalks the streets. Our people cry out for peace—peace in our homes and cities, peace across the world. We who serve the people must strive with unremitting efforts to bring them that deeply yearned for peace.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, a small bouquet of pink rosebuds, widow's lace, and fern now rests upon the lonely and vacant desk to my right. It bespeaks the melancholy nature of this day.

The death of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY is a shattering tragedy for each of us and for our country. No expression can convey the feeling and sympathy Mrs. Harris and I have for Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and the family at this sad, sad time.

Senator KENNEDY daily lived with enormous personal burdens of duty and moral commitment which caused him, with incomparable courage to take upon himself the cloak of the alienated, the despised and dispossessed and to become their voice.

Those of us who survive him will never again be the same, though we must take heart and seek renewed purpose from the lessons and ideals of his life.

Appropriate now for him and those

who worked closely with him in this body and in other endeavors are the words he loved from Shakespeare's "King Henry V":

This story shall the good man teach his son;
And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
From this day to the ending of the world,
But, we in it shall be remembered;
We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
For he to-day that sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
This day shall gentle his condition:
And gentlemen in England now a-bed,
Shall think themselves accursed they were
not here,
And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any
speaks
That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's
day.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Vice President of the United States expressing the sorrow of the German Bundestag at the death of Senator KENNEDY, and signed by the president of that legislative body.

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

GERMAN EMBASSY,

Washington, D.C., June 6, 1968.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The President of the German Bundestag has asked me to transmit to you in your capacity as President of the United States Senate the following message of condolence of the German Bundestag:

"Tiefbewegt spreche ich Ihnen, Herr Präsident, und dem Senat der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika die aufrichtige Anteilnahme des Deutschen Bundestags aus zu dem überaus schmerzlichen und tragischen Verlust, den Sie und die Vereinigten Staaten durch den Tod von Senator Robert Kennedy erlitten haben. Der Deutsche Bundestag trauert mit Ihnen um eine große Hoffnung Ihres Landes. Er gedenkt in herzlichster Anteilnahme auch der zweifach schwer geprüften Familie Kennedy.

"Ihr aufrichtig ergebener

"GERSTENMAIER,
"Präsident des Deutschen Bundestags."

The English translation reads as follows: "Deeply moved, I express to you, Mr. President, and to the Senate of the United States of America, the sincere participation of the German Bundestag in the painful and tragic loss which you and the United States have suffered through the death of Senator Robert Kennedy. The German Bundestag is in mourning with you over a great hope of your country. It also is thinking with heartfelt sympathy of the again so severely tried Kennedy family.

"Very sincerely yours,

"GERSTENMAIER,
"President of the German Bundestag."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared for delivery by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who is necessarily absent today.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

The passing of Senator Robert F. Kennedy is a tragic loss to the country. His death is a personal loss to the District of Columbia

Committee, on which he served, and to the residents of the District of Columbia, in whose interest he worked.

Senator Kennedy devoted himself to improving the way of life for citizens living in the Nation's Capital. As a member of the District Committee, he consistently supported legislation to provide better medical care for more people through expanded hospital facilities and public health programs.

Senator Kennedy went out into the community to see for himself the deplorable conditions under which many people have to live within sight of the Capitol. He was a co-sponsor of legislation to improve the shameful situation, and to stop abuses of the poor by some of the landlords.

Robert Kennedy was well known for his love of children. He was a strong supporter of programs to help children in Washington to rise from the slums and to become productive members of society. Senator Kennedy favored legislation to improve the quality of education for the youngest children just starting school through the young adults graduating from high schools and colleges in Washington. He was a guiding force behind examinations of public assistance in Washington, especially as it pertained to children, and helped to secure Senate approval of plans to provide adequate day care service and foster home care for dependent children. Also, he was interested in recreational facilities, and helped to establish recreation areas in which children could play.

Robert Kennedy championed home rule for the District of Columbia, and he supported each step on the road toward achieving the goal of true representational democracy in the Capital City.

Senator Kennedy worked for the people of Washington, and they in turn loved and respected him.

The Committee will miss his contributions. The District of Columbia will miss his presence.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I join Senators in expressing my great sorrow at the passing of our colleague from the State of New York and with them offer my heartfelt sympathy to his widow and family.

His loss is great to his family and State; but the force of his personality and the vigor of his advocacy of the ideals in which he believed made him well known throughout the Nation and the world, and his loss is therefore much greater. His children, cruelly deprived of their father, can always know that by his life he enriched the lives of all of us.

In my contact with Senator KENNEDY, I always found him to be cordial and friendly. On several occasions when he had an interest in matters in Delaware, he was most understanding and thoughtful. I consider it a great privilege to have known him and to have served with him in this body.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, twice in 2 months bullets have been fired that have sounded to the farthest corners of the earth. The first, fired last April 4, brought an end to the earthly life of Martin Luther King. The second exploded just yesterday morning. It ended the brilliant career of ROBERT FRANCIS KENNEDY, U.S. Senator, candidate for the Nation's highest office, dedicated citizen and patriot, and outstanding leader. Both, young men, have been savagely destroyed in the prime of their lives.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and now ROBERT FRANCIS KENNEDY—all dead, all victims of assassins' bullets. So many before them. How

many to follow? Mr. President, I am overcome with grief. I mourn. I mourn for ROBERT KENNEDY, for his wife and young children, for his family so beset by tragedy time and time again. I mourn for the Nation, constantly recoiling under a wave of violence which threatens to envelop it.

Violence fills the air. Violent death ever threatens to end the lives of any of us. Our leaders have become easy prey to madmen. Private citizens are consumed by fear. They fear being in their homes. They fear being on the streets. Emblazoned across the daily headlines of our newspapers is news of murders, rapes, burglaries. Countless numbers of lives are snuffed out in the time it takes to bat an eye.

How does one react to tragedy twice visited upon a nation in such short time? The horror, the revulsion, one initially experiences eventually gives way to more refined emotional reaction. Emotion and intellect merge, groping for understanding. Somehow the enormity of these brutal acts must be reduced to human comprehension. We must hunt for causes and seek reasons. We look for culprits—scapegoats, if you will. We search for ways to lessen the guilt we all feel, to lessen the pain and anguish. We want desperately to console the bereaved family, to lessen their grief. We want to reassure the Nation. And from it all, we look for some hope, some sign that good can come from evil, some indication that all is not lost.

I have searched the depths of my soul, Mr. President, but have found no answers. I do not know what I can do. My remorse is too great. In some less emotional moment, farther removed from this catastrophe, we can judge better what can be done to bring hope from the despair which overwhelms us.

I pray for the soul of ROBERT FRANCIS KENNEDY, Mr. President. I pray that the bereaved family and friends may find comfort. I pray for the Nation.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I join Senators in paying tribute to our departed friend, ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

The Nation and the world are stunned and in mourning today over the wounding and subsequent death of Senator KENNEDY. My heartfelt sympathy and prayers are extended to his courageous wife and family. They bear the greatest loss, rewarded, in part perhaps, by the knowledge that he made a great contribution in the service of his country.

Mr. President, his every expressed thought showed concern and consideration for his family, his nation and his fellowman.

It was my privilege to travel with him in connection with the Subcommittee on Indian Education. He was the chairman of the subcommittee and devoted much effort in field hearings around the country seeking worthwhile solutions to problems in this area. His dedicated work and compassionate consideration of the problems of our Indian youth were an inspiration to all who participated in this activity. His goal in this endeavor was to help these unfortunate first Americans to rise above their poverty and deprivation. Already his efforts

have produced tangible results that will multiply because he was willing to give the time and leadership necessary to this program.

A side of Senator KENNEDY perhaps little known or appreciated was his wit and humor, which were a rich blend of subtlety and mirth. Senator KENNEDY often surprised those around him with a sense of humor that was so subtle as to be overlooked in public.

His contributions to the Government of the United States will be lasting.

He leaves a shining and exemplary record of public service, and above all, I think, a dedication and devotion to public service found among few men no matter what their rank or station. His unselfishness in private life was well known to those about him, and while many may disagree with his approach to some of the problems of our times, none can say that he did not give everything he had to the task at hand.

His passing is a great loss to the Nation. I mourn his death, as do all Americans of good will, and pray that from this tragedy may arise an understanding and basis of communication that will unite our Nation as never before.

Just one thought comes to mind at this moment, Mr. President. It is a saying often expressed in many ways, but one which I think particularly suits the tragic timing of Senator KENNEDY's passing in the heat of the battle and the bloom of life, cut down we think by the bullet of a foreign assassin.

Whom the gods love die young—no matter when they die.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is with profound regret that I join Senators in expressing sorrow over the death of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. It can be said that the assassination of Senator KENNEDY was the deed of one irrational man—a misguided extremist. The same could be said of the murder of his brother, the late, great President John F. Kennedy, and of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. That is a valid explanation insofar as it goes, but it does not absolve our society from some responsibility for these tragic events. The truth must be faced that these insane acts are in some way attributable to the dangerous tensions and the deep stresses that have afflicted our Nation in recent years.

Let us hope that the senseless assassination of Senator KENNEDY will result in a dedication by all Americans to eradicate the deviousness that threatens to alienate one American from another and a renewal of the bright promise of America.

Mr. President, violence and crime are increasingly rampant throughout the Nation. We Americans need God's help. The watered-down gun-control bill recently passed in the Senate is inadequate. We in the Congress have responsibility to enact into law more effective gun control legislation to minimize the danger of bloodshed, violence and death contributed to by the present unrestricted and insane traffic in firearms.

I extend my sympathy to Mrs. Ethel Kennedy and her children and to all members of the Kennedy family who have known death and heartbreak as

few families have. They have lost a husband, father, son, and brother. The Nation has lost one of its finest sons and a leader of great promise.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for whom do we mourn?

Not only for the Kennedy family, but for the American people, for a Nation in which unreasoning violence has claimed all of us among its victims.

How do we honor this man?

As he was concerned for the need of social change, we must here and now begin a new foundation of social and economic hope and opportunity. We can honor him only by returning to the unfinished business of America—national unity, respect for life, and for the human aspirations of those less fortunate in our common heritage.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Justice Holmes once said:

As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time, at peril of being judged not to have lived.

ROBERT KENNEDY lived the action and passion of our time. He died in action. He spent his life; he gave his life in highest service to his country and to his fellow man. To those ignored he gave attention; to those in despair he gave hope; to those in need he gave help. To citizens blind to the fate of their fellow man he presented the discomfiting specter of the other America. He gave himself.

BOB KENNEDY, my friend, is dead. But the challenge of a newer world he pursued so selflessly remains. Let us be equal to that challenge.

In the long roll of history it will be marked for BOB KENNEDY, as it was for his brother John: "There was a man." We will not soon forget these men or their compassion. As Pericles said centuries ago:

Heroes have the whole earth for their tomb; and in lands far from their own—where the column with its epitaph declares it—there is enshrined in every breast a record unwritten with no tablet to preserve it, except that of the heart.

God have mercy upon the soul of ROBERT KENNEDY. God have mercy upon his family. God have mercy upon us all.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, all of us in the Chamber today feel understandably compelled to express our grief and our horror.

Our grief and horror, I know, is of the same measure as that felt by every citizen of the Nation—so we say nothing new of revealing.

By the same token, no words we can utter will be of much comfort to a family overburdened with grief.

Yet we do it—I suppose because we feel to a very small degree relieved by pouring our sorrow and shock into a common pool.

In Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, we have lost a fine talent, a keen intellect and a compassionate leader. We grieve with his family, a family that has already endured so much.

After that, all other words seem hollow and repetitive. I am deeply depressed. We all are. We are anxious about a society in which this could happen.

And if there is any comfort we can offer the family, it would be to express

our unanimous resolve that we will devote ourselves to what will be a complicated and difficult task—the task of reducing and eliminating the chance of its happening again.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to express my profound sadness on the passing of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. I often vigorously disagreed with him on major issues that confront our people and, on occasion, engaged him in debate.

He was a worthy adversary—a man of considerable intellect and talent. I have always believed that responsible dissent and disagreement are healthy manifestations of a free country.

I am outraged when the advocate of any political point of view in this country is killed by the senseless and cowardly means of assassination. Senator KENNEDY had a view of government and its role in American life that it was certainly his right—indeed his duty—to advocate. I am profoundly sorry that this outstanding public servant is no longer with us.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the whole Nation mourns the death of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. To indict the American people for the murder of this great man is to be false to his memory. Millions loved him; others who did not agree with him admired and respected him. His courage, his intelligence, his energy, but above all his sympathy and compassion for the poor, the distressed, the deprived, and the underprivileged, captured the hearts of Americans everywhere. Senator KENNEDY had endeared himself to the miners of western Montana and the farmers of our eastern prairies just as he was loved by the people of his own State of New York.

The senseless act of a sick man has deprived America of a dynamic leader, a thoughtful and innovative student of government. The loss of his leadership will be felt for many years ahead. Mrs. Metcalf and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Senator KENNEDY's family and express our sorrow at the death of our friend.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by sadness at the death of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY. His assassination is an act of barbarism that does violence to the whole meaning of America.

I grieve for Senator KENNEDY's family. But I grieve equally for a nation that chooses its leaders under the rule of law and then loses its leaders under the wrath of violence.

In less than 5 years, three Americans who espoused progress in our Nation have been shot down by fanatics who intruded their own warped wills upon our constitutional processes.

I commend the House of Representatives for acting promptly to pass the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which earlier passed the Senate. I am a cosponsor of that legislation. It provides new controls of hand guns and offers additional measures to fight crime in America.

But we need to do much more. Every American who has lost a family member because of the brutal act of a criminal suffers equally with the survivors

of this latest assassination. We as a society do not provide the basic protection against assaults upon life and limb which daily add to the grim statistics of death and mayhem.

We need to get at the root causes of crime in America. We must work harder to prevent crime. And we need to stiffen and speed up the procedures to try and punish those who violate our laws.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, my sympathy and my prayers are with the members of Senator KENNEDY's family. Our ranks are lessened today; our Nation, diminished. The tragedy which has taken from us one of our most dedicated public servants is a senseless and shameful example of the madness which is defiling our country. It is my fervent hope that this act of violence which has numbed us all shall serve to renew, to intensify our efforts to seek out those ways by which our Nation can be returned to the peaceful pursuit of its destiny, a pursuit uncorrupted by the outrages to man's dignity which have become so increasingly frequent.

Let us rededicate ourselves to this endeavor. May the memory of our fallen colleague serve as an inspiration in our search for those answers which will help to erase violence from our land.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this is a day of profound grief and sorrow for each of us as we mourn the tragic death of a beloved colleague and friend.

It is a day when we seek to marshal all our spiritual resources as we pray for ROBERT KENNEDY and his loved ones, and for our country.

It is a day for grave contemplation of those shortcomings of our society and ourselves which can generate such violent and terrible consequences.

It is a day of foreboding, and disquiet, and uneasiness as we face the uncertainties which tomorrow may bring.

Above all, it is a day to pray for the wisdom, the understanding, the patience, and the will to do what must be done to make our country a just and peaceful place, where each of us is a neighbor to all others.

It is clear that there is much work to be done to deal with grievances, to eliminate inequities, to build a society governed by laws which dispense justice as well as maintain order.

ROBERT KENNEDY was identified in the eyes and hearts and minds of human beings around the globe with a burning desire to do what he could to eradicate injustice. It was for this purpose that he turned to the democratic political process which he understood so well.

As we mourn him—all of us—let us dedicate ourselves to that same process to do effectively the work that must be done—applying reason, balanced judgment, tolerance, and determination to that end.

There is no more appropriate way, Mr. President, to pay tribute to this unusual man of great talent and deep compassion.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for 15 of his 42 years I was privileged to know ROBERT FRANCIS KENNEDY as his friend, associate, and colleague.

He was a man of dogged determination, giant capacity, and great courage.

His life was devoted to serving his country, and in those few years he made an imprint which will last. He took up the mantle of leadership at a tragic time and carried on to bring new inspiration and purpose to the lives of millions of Americans.

He had personal wealth, but his greatest concern was for those not so fortunate. He spoke and acted forcefully on behalf of those who have not shared fairly in the fruits of our country, socially or economically.

ROBERT KENNEDY was a man with great love for his family. Love for each other was manifest in the family life of all the Kennedys. His wife, Ethel, and the children were a part of all he did, and he was a part of all they did. The Kennedys were constantly together around the country and around the world.

The Kennedy family is an inspiration and example for all Americans. In this time of renewed tragedy, our hearts and our sympathies go out to them.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I mourn with all Senators this morning—indeed I mourn with all America and all the world the passing of ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

My mind rebels at acceptance of such a great tragedy, and I am haunted by memories of 4 years ago when in the same brutal and senseless manner President John F. Kennedy was torn from our midst.

ROBERT KENNEDY was a brilliant, dedicated, active, and uncommonly promising leader. At the peak of his promise and in a moment of triumph he was cut down.

How my heart aches for Ethel and their children—and how I wish that I could bring comfort to them.

How I mourn for TEDDY and Joan. TEDDY and BOBBY were so close. A great void will exist for our colleague who remains in this Chamber.

How my sympathy goes out to father Joseph P. Kennedy and mother Rose Kennedy who have suffered such grievous sorrows and tragedies with their brilliant and vital family.

And to all the sisters and their families, the in-laws, and especially the nieces and nephews goes my sympathy. BOBBY had a special relationship with young people. His river trip last summer was an outing of young folks, as were all of his outings.

On this sad day I offer a prayer for ROBERT F. KENNEDY and his loved ones.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, our thoughts today are with Mrs. Robert Kennedy, with the children, and with all the Kennedy family, struck by the tragedy of this latest crushing blow.

I did not know Senator KENNEDY as well as I knew his brother, the late President John F. Kennedy, but thinking of his work in the Senate and public life, one concern of Senator KENNEDY stands out clearly—his concern for the disadvantaged, the underprivileged, those with unequal and little opportunity—the poor, from whatever cause.

His work expressed his compassion and sense of justice. Perhaps our best tribute will be paid, if the Congress and the

country move quickly toward the accomplishment of his ideal—an equal chance in life—equal justice and equality for all our citizens.

Much has been said about violence in our country—and it grows from many roots. Perhaps this tragedy will arouse our country to the study of its causes and their removal. Many have spoken of the devotion of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and his wife and family to their church and to religious belief. We may hope that their example may be followed, and exert a healing influence in our troubled country.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am grief stricken for the Kennedy family. I am heartsick for my country. Violence breeds violence. Unless we set our faces sternly and relentlessly against violence and disorder by anybody, anywhere, in any form, the Nation will shortly become something I do not want to live to see.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I cannot express how profoundly and deeply I am grieved by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY's death.

Senator KENNEDY and I were next to each other in Senate seniority. We sat next to each other in the back row created for freshman Senators in 1965. We stood together on most of the issues which came before this body.

While the tragedy of the death of a friend and a colleague is quite enough in itself, the country has also suffered a serious blow in the brutal slaying of Senator KENNEDY.

Senator KENNEDY was a magnificent leader. He met all the standards of leadership—devotion to the real issues of the Nation, the courage and determination to take the best positions in the face of opposition, the ability to gather support in this body and in the Nation for the causes he supported, the faith in our system which enabled him to move on in the face of personal tragedies—and remained optimistic in spite of the problems he helped to identify and bring to the attention of the national conscience.

There are never enough men like ROBERT KENNEDY in our Nation. The violence and senselessness of his death are a deep shock to the very structure of the American system of government.

For it has now been proved beyond doubt that no man may run for high office or pursue high causes without serious risk to his very life. Among all the categories of lawlessness, violence, and intolerance, there is no more terrible arrogance and intolerance than that of a man who is determined to decide issues by force and by death.

If it is now in fact true that a free expression of one's opinion—whatever that opinion might be—places his life in the hands of those who disagree, then the country is in danger of losing its heritage and its claim to moral leadership.

I offer my sympathy and shared grief and that of my family to Mrs. Ethel Kennedy and her children, to Senator EDWARD KENNEDY and his family, to all of the Kennedy family, and to all of those who deeply admired and respected ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

We have all suffered a great personal loss. And America has suffered as well by the loss of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, another light has gone out of our lives.

I remember the overwhelming feeling of loss that my wife and I shared with the Nation in 1963 when John Kennedy was taken from us.

I remember our sense of profound relief when, after we had gone down together in a plane in Massachusetts in 1964, we learned in our own hospital beds that EDWARD KENNEDY would recover.

I suppose we believed then that the tragedy with which the Kennedy family had lived for a generation had ended, and that only the blessings they had reaped through the unstinting public service would remain.

And now, this.

What can any of us say that would somehow ease the pain being endured by Mrs. Robert Kennedy, by her children, and by the entire Kennedy family? Only that we will try, with every fiber of our beings, to emulate the sterling example that this family has given us—the desire and willingness to serve our Nation, a manifest concern for the suffering of humanity, a deep and abiding belief that our Nation, with God's help, can become a torch that will light the way of the world toward lasting peace.

These are the things that ROBERT KENNEDY believed. If we work to fashion these ideals into reality, then he will not have lived or died in vain.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was sorry and grieved this morning to learn of the death of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York. Senator KENNEDY's office adjoins mine in the Senate Office Building, and I had occasion to see him frequently as we both went about our work in the Nation's Capital. I have sent a message to Mrs. Kennedy and to Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, expressing to them my deepest sympathy at their loss, and I have requested that my condolences be extended to other members of the family. That this prominent family has suffered yet another great tragedy touches all of us deeply. I hope and pray that each of us will assume a personal responsibility to address ourselves to restoration of peace in our land.

The Nation and the world are shocked by this tragic event, and our thoughts at this time are especially with Mrs. Kennedy and her children in the loss of this husband and father. It is indeed a sad day for all Americans.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, we mourn most deeply today the death of our colleague Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York. I wish to convey from the floor of the Senate my sympathy and condolences to the Senator's widow and children and to every one of the members of the Senator's family during this time of great grief and sorrow. It is a time, of course, of grief and sorrow and mourning for all America. And it is a time, too, when all of us are filled with revulsion at the monstrosity of the assassination and the apparently growing pervasiveness of hate and bitterness and brutality and materialism in our country.

I pray, Mr. President, for a new national commitment to the spiritual values of the Prince of Peace.

There is much to be done in this Chamber and throughout all the other chambers of government in the United States to bring sense and decency and justice to all of our land, true enough. But the long-range solution to the problems which beset us, in my judgment, must include an awareness and a commitment to the sanctity of human life and to the power of God to heal the soul.

The murder of Senator KENNEDY brought on another nightmare for many of us, and we were witness once more—once more too often—to the scenes of past political murders and also past riots in the streets, disturbances in our universities, the killing in Vietnam, and the numerous murders of ordinary citizens. We observe rage and hate. The land is a tumult. What can we learn and indeed what will we learn from these many acts which range from violent to barbaric? What is the solution or a part of the solution, for our society? What course should we follow? In short, where shall we go?

I believe that no lasting solution will be set forth here or elsewhere merely by political oratory or by repressive measures to "keep people in line." Of course we must maintain law and order. Of course we must do our utmost to attain domestic tranquility. Of course we must labor in the Halls of the Congress and in all of our citizens groups to advance the social welfare of our countrymen and erase some of the breeding places for violence, bitterness, and hatred. Of course we must do these things, and we will do them. But all of these legislative changes and institutional changes alone will not provide the fundamental answer.

Mr. President, I believe the answer we seek will be found in a spiritual revolution in America. A revolution of the spirit will be a revolution waged not with instruments of destruction, not with guns and knives and rocks and bombs, but a revolution which employs the instruments of Divine love to conquer hate. This revolution will seek to transform man into a creature who will be spiritually fulfilled rather than spiritually empty and spiritually starved. This kind of spiritual revolution will bring forth man's true relevance and importance as a human personality to God and to his fellow man.

We have many of the trappings of a rich society today; but we also have many of the trappings of a country which suffers poverty of the spirit.

Mr. President, I pray that we shall carry forward the very best which Senator ROBERT KENNEDY brought to this country; and that we shall cleanse ourselves of the disease of hate and shall bring forth once more the right, the good and the true which will bring us peace and happiness when we practice the commandment to "love thy neighbor."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, once again the Nation has been shaken by a cruel, senseless murder of an outstanding public figure. And, once again, the Ken-

nedy family is the victim of a shocking tragedy.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the Kennedy family at this tragic time.

The natural reaction is to try and lash out in bereaved anger in an effort to fix the blame. This is no time for a bereaved Nation to search guiltily for a scapegoat, rather, we need to realize that reason and compassion is needed to end this era of violence.

We are in the midst of a national mood that has permitted vocal dissidents to practice the philosophy that the end justifies the means—a philosophy that says we need not obey the laws with which we disagree. The result has been that violence has infected and jeopardized our very way of life.

I would again like to remind our people of the words of President Abraham Lincoln when he said:

Let every American remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear down the charter of his children's liberty.

We have seen enough of violence and tearing down. In the memory of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, let us reaffirm our moral integrity and begin once again to build our Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, this is another sad day for the U.S. Senate, the Nation, and the entire world. In the tragic assassination of our distinguished colleague, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, we have lost a highly respected and brilliant leader.

I have had the privilege and honor of serving with three Kennedy brothers. Like all other Members of the U.S. Senate, I had a great respect and admiration for the late President Kennedy and his brothers, ROBERT and EDWARD. This is truly one of America's most remarkable families. They are brilliant, personable, witty, and just naturally great leaders. They have the fine qualities that command the greatest esteem, affection, and loyalty of people all over the world.

Tragedy has hit this family many times. They have borne far more than their share of misfortune and tragedy. I feel a deep sense of personal loss, as I have always felt very close to ROBERT KENNEDY and all of his family. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Ethel Kennedy and all of the Kennedy family.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I join Senators in paying tribute to our departed colleague, ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York. It was with profound sorrow that I learned of his death this morning.

This was a dynamic young man who came our way, brimming with vitality, life, and accomplishments. You might say that Government service was virtually his whole life, first as the son of an American Ambassador, then as a staff member on the Hill, later at the Justice Department, and most recently as a Senator from New York.

He had a tremendous capacity for work and perseverance. History undoubtedly will devote a great deal of space to ROBERT F. KENNEDY, and I am sure he will deserve it. Certainly each time that he participated in Senate debates and was addressed as the "distinguished Senator from New York," the description went

far beyond the formalities dictated by Senate practice. He had a distinguished career—but one that was cut far short of what might have been.

This tragic end to a young and vigorous life is a deep loss to America. I hope that we can eventually look back at his death as the turning point after which we began to return to a sense of justice and personal responsibility in this country—a sense that has long been missing.

Personally, Mr. President, I feel that the country and the Senate have paused far too many times lately to pay tribute to a fallen leader cut down by an assassin's bullet.

Mrs. Bennett and I in this sad hour have extended our deepest sympathy to the Kennedy family—a family which has already known far too much sorrow and tragedy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at a time like this I am at a loss for words.

I have known BOBBY KENNEDY for a long time.

It was my privilege to work with him when he was a Senate employee, when he served as Attorney General, and when he became a U.S. Senator from New York.

ROBERT KENNEDY was a powerful influence for good in the field of National Government.

Whether one agreed with him or not on the issues of the day, all persons agreed that he kept both Congress and the executive branch of the Government on their toes and a bit more anxious to meet the public needs.

As for his wife, Ethel, and his children, we do not have to say that they have our full sympathy. They can and will be eternally proud of their husband and father. The legacy he leaves them will always be a source of pride and honor.

If there were words adequate to express our sorrow, I would hunt for them, but I realize now that such a search would indeed be futile.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart and a great feeling of personal loss that I rise to pay tribute to the memory of the late junior Senator from New York. Mrs. Prouty joins me in deepest sympathy to his widow, his children, and members of the Kennedy family. My sorrow is hard to express. It is not easy for me to translate into words the tears in my eyes, the lump in my throat, the pain in my heart when I think of the passing of ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

For me, perhaps, it can best be expressed in the simple phrase "He was my friend." This man—born and raised in New England—was a man of vision. ROBERT KENNEDY dreamed great dreams—not so much for himself as for his nation and her people.

While the means of achieving his dreams may be contested by men of good faith, the ideals and goals he held for America's future are those shared by all our citizens. Now he is gone, and we shall never know the magnitude of the contributions he might have made toward fulfilling the destiny of the United States.

Our personal grief expressed here today is symbolic of the grief of our Nation—and, yes, the grief of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. As we pass through this chapter of the

American tragedy, we must draw together in unity and rededicate ourselves to the task of finding ways to accomplish the American dream.

Son, brother, father, friend; as each, ROBERT F. KENNEDY seemed to have one goal: Excellence, the pursuit of which was his measure as a man. A man so deserving of our silent grief and our private tears.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this is one of those rare moments in the history of the Senate when all conflicts of political philosophy and sectional interest, all personal ambitions and animosities are swept away by a tragedy so unbearable and incomprehensible as to bind us together in mutual grief at the loss of our young colleague, felled at the height of his career and in the prime of his life.

The story of how a father and his sons, descendants of Irish immigrants, swiftly rose by their talent and industry to claim a place in our young Nation's history, is in itself symbolic of the American dream. Their rejection of the leisurely life which wealth assured, for a total commitment to their Nation's service, and to the ideas and ideals in which they believe, recalls to mind the words of Theodore Roosevelt:

Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat.

As I contemplate this tragedy, I am overwhelmed with the striking and prophetic similarity between the Kennedys of Massachusetts and the Lamars of Mississippi, whom his brother so deeply admired.

Our late President, John F. Kennedy, writing of the Lamars of Mississippi in his book "Profiles in Courage," quoted the following line from Washington correspondent, William Preston Johnson:

The fatal dowry of genius was on that house . . . A rollick in his father's home was an impressive experience; for Lucius Lamar's uncles included Mirabeau Bonaparte, whose charge at San Jacinto broke the Mexican line and made him the second President of the Texas Republic; Jefferson Jackson, Thomas Randolph, and Lavoisier Le Grand, indicating in the christener a changing interest from history to politics and from politics to chemistry.

Our late President recounted how the tragic and violent events of the Civil War deprived Mississippi of the talented leadership of the Lamar family, as violence has now deprived the Nation of the talent of these sons of a famous Massachusetts family.

As stated by John F. Kennedy in his book:

Among the ruling families of the South "the spilling of the wine" was especially heavy.

He recalled how Lamar's youngest brother, "supposedly the most brilliant, Jefferson Mirabeau, was killed as he leaped his horse over the enemy's breastworks at Crampton's Gap," and his cousin John fell near him, and how Lamar's other brother, "Thompson Bird, colonel of the 5th Florida, was killed in the fighting at Petersburg."

How could a young Senator from Massachusetts named John Fitzgerald Ken-

nedly feel such moving admiration for the sons of a Mississippi family that rode with and fought valiantly for the Army of the Confederacy?

Because, while the interest, the ideas, and ideals that divide us are many, there is a universal creed that binds together in mutual admiration those men in every state and nation, of every political persuasion, who in the words of Theodore Roosevelt "dare mighty things."

Perhaps this creed is best summed up in the words of the poet, Sir Henry Newbolt:

To count the life of battle good
And dear the land that gave you birth,
And clearer yet the brotherhood
That binds the brave of all the earth

While none of us can find the words to adequately express to the Kennedy family the loss we so deeply feel, I would like to conclude with the words Abraham Lincoln expressed to a mother in Massachusetts who had lost two sons fighting for the Union:

I pray that our heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, seldom, if ever, has tragedy of such similarity struck at a single American family, in the manner so sadly repeated in the tragic shooting of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY so soon after the equally tragic and senseless assassination of his President brother, John F. Kennedy. These events give us all cause to ponder and reflect upon the tenor of our times and the inadequate security provisions for our public officials as we deeply mourn the loss of a friend and colleague.

As a member of the Senate committee which gave BOBBY KENNEDY his first job on Capitol Hill in 1953, I have watched his exciting and fast-moving public career with far more than usual interest. It was when Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin was chairman of our Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, on which I then served, as now, as ranking Republican member, that I first met BOBBY KENNEDY. Joe came to me one day with the suggestion that our subcommittee engage the services of then comparatively unknown, BOBBY KENNEDY, as an assistant counsel of our committee which at that time was comprised of four Republican and three Democratic Senators as follows: Joseph R. McCarthy, chairman; KARL E. MUNDT, EVERETT DIRKSEN, Charles E. Potter, JOHN L. McCLELLAN, HENRY M. JACKSON, and STUART SYMINGTON. After meeting BOBBY and having a brief interview with him I thoroughly approved of Joe's suggestion.

With the exception of a few intermittent leaves of absence for travel or political activities, BOBBY KENNEDY served our committee until September 13, 1959, when he resigned to campaign for his brother in the presidential campaign ending in November of 1960. He served our committee well under both Republican and Democratic chairmen, as JOHN McCLELLAN reappointed him and made him chief counsel after he moved into

the committee chairmanship. He dedicated his efforts primarily to anti-Communist activities and to the disclosure of organized crime and racketeering as related to organized labor.

Later, as Attorney General and as a Member of this body, BOBBY KENNEDY continued to display the same energy, dedication to duty and his points of view, and native abilities which carried him so high in the councils of his party and made him a national figure. Words have really never been built adequately to describe the shocking, senseless, and sad-denying murder of this young man so full of life, ambition, energy, and high purpose at the very crest of his career.

To have him cut down in the midst of the celebration of his greatest personal triumph in the simultaneous primary victories he won that day in California and in my home State of South Dakota adds even more to the sorrow of this great tragedy. Mrs. Mundt joins me in extending our great sympathy to his wife, Ethel, to his family, and children, and to his parents who have already suffered more than their fair measure of sorrow and tragedy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], who is necessarily absent today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him.

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

WORDS FOR A SPRING DAY

A bright sun shines, tree leaves are glowingly green, a new life stirs our old earth, and a surging, promising existence has come to an end. Robert F. Kennedy, Senator from the State of New York, has been struck down by the hand of an assassin, just as his great-hearted brother, President Kennedy, was. We again must bear the brunt of sorrow, disgrace and shame before the entire world and all humanity.

Once more a grieving widow with children will follow a bier to a martyr's grave. Once more will the drums roll. Again, we shall hear the funeral music. Still again, an open grave will yawn to receive one of America's noblest souls.

Mr. President, my heart is sore within me for our Country. Truly, we have lost one of our soaring spirits. A heart which bled for the oppressed and downtrodden. A man who felt so deeply for those society had no compassion for, that he placed himself in the forefront of their struggle to attain our American promise. For this he was struck down in mid-flight.

President Kennedy was assassinated toward the end of his term in the late fall. His brother was stricken down in the midst of this troubled but lushly beautiful spring. Death can mean many things to many people. To some, it is an end. To others, it is a beginning.

I choose to look upon it as a start for our country, rather than a finish. I choose to regard it as an impetus for the dreams Robert F. Kennedy had for this republic. His existence, career in the national life of our Country, and personal goals symbolize his belief in those dreams. It is my feeling that he embodied a significant portion of the noblest elements of the American ideal.

We must not allow his death to be separated from what he died for. His passing must serve this republic as an affirmation rather than a denial of the rights of man and the reason for being of this nation.

We were founded upon a belief in the dignity of the individual. Senator Kennedy reaffirmed this truth by his life and death. It is for this society, imperfect as it is, to echo this reaffirmation and make it real to those who look to us for hope and accomplishment.

I speak not of the world now. It is for the soul of this nation that we must struggle. A death grapple looms ahead of us, perhaps immediately. A society has a spirit as surely as a man does. Robert Kennedy's spirit was in tune with that of all mankind.

He was a humanist among us . . . almost a Renaissance individual. His interests and ideas were generously wide. Although he could have secluded himself from his responsibilities to society, he did not. Like Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, he turned his back upon a life devoid of social duty and plunged back into the turmoil of American life, determined to illuminate and purge the darkest corners of our land.

He held up a torch of intellectual illumination and social responsibility. A finger of accusation was directed at society, following it unerringly wherever it sought to elude that pointing finger. None of us could return to a life of comfort in our homes without being reminded by him that we owed it to ourselves, our society and beliefs to set right what we had suffered to go wrong around us.

Now his fight is done. But we can make real what his sacrifice has left undone. Let his torch of illumination and idealism be taken up by compassionate hands. Let us see him to his rest with sorrow and understanding. Then let us turn as one person to the unfinished work that remains.

Let us see to it that all Americans share fully in our dream. Let us search our individual consciences and act accordingly.

A nation looks to us. We have it within our power to act and do what must be done. In days to come and challenges that will present themselves face to face with us, let us act according to dictates of conscience and intellect rather than pettiness and partisanship.

Humanity and compassion transcend desire for personal glory and bitterness. The most fitting tribute to Senator Kennedy and thinking he represented will be this type of contribution.

But now we must grope for words. Yet they fail us. Let us then seek eloquence from our own rich past. Senator Kennedy loved poetry and used it often. There is a verse by one of America's noblest spirits that perhaps says better than we can what his death and life symbolize.

Walt Whitman said:

"When lilacs last in the dooryard bloom'd,
And the great star early droop'd in the western sky in the night, I mourn'd, and yet shall mourn with ever-returning spring."

And then he wrote a few words that perhaps best symbolize what Senator Kennedy left to us as a legacy:

"No really great song can ever attain full purport till long after the death of its singer—till it has accrued and incorporated the many passions, many joys and sorrows, it has itself aroused."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the fanatical shooting of Senator KENNEDY is a sad, tragic, and dangerous commentary of our time. The loss of great moral values and sanity in the last one-third of the 20th century must be corrected at all levels and by all citizens.

I regret that medical science—which Senator KENNEDY, and his late brother President Kennedy, did so much to bring to its present state of excellence—could not avoid this tragedy.

This senseless act of violence makes it clear to every American that it is in

the public interest to provide protection to major candidates who are daily exposed to the hazards and risks of national political campaigns.

The great loss to the Nation and world in Senator KENNEDY's death will be realized far more as time moves on and this tragic evidence of violence becomes history. His vigor and dedication and quality of leadership inevitably marked him to, at some time, succeed his brother as our Nation's Chief Executive.

My deepest sympathy is with his entire family on this third visitation of tragedy. The deaths of all three sons were deaths in action for America's safety, future, and progress.

No words can truly express our shock at the tragic death of our colleague, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the precedents and protocol of the Senate, that the distinguished Vice President, who is now occupying the chair, may be permitted to address some brief comments to the Senate at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair in his function as President of the Senate would like to make a very brief statement of respect and affection on the life and memory of our late, departed colleague, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

This is a day of national sorrow and personal grief.

A valiant, brave, and good man, a gifted colleague to every Member of this body, and a personal friend of many, has been taken from us.

We have lost a great American, a man whose deep concern, compassion, conscience, and commitment have inspired all of us in this Chamber—as well as millions of fellow Americans and countless other men and women throughout the world.

Mrs. Humphrey and I feel a sense of profound personal loss. Our hearts go out to Senator KENNEDY's dear wife, Ethel, and her loving family of dear children. Also to the Kennedy family which has known tragedy beyond human endurance.

As has been said—and well said—Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY was an uncommon man, with uncommon faith in the ultimate worth of American democracy and its processes. He underwrote his faith with a life of vigorous action, and was taken from us by an irrational act of hatred while doing the most sacred work of a free man; namely, the work of public policy and public affairs.

It is now the obligation of all of us, in our sorrow and pain, to realize the society of human and individual justice which Senator KENNEDY sought. For the high purposes to which we have dedicated our Nation cannot longer survive except in the reality of freedom and justice.

May our Nation find the strength, the faith, and the wisdom to dispel the forces of unreason and hate—of extremism and violence—from our midst. May it find a way to replace them with the love of man and the love of God.

May Divine Providence bring comfort to those who sorrow.

May Divine Providence forgive us our transgressions.

I wish to thank the Senate for indulging the Chair in this rather unusual procedure. It is one which I wanted very much to have the privilege of being given.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by the clerk.

The bill clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 301) as follows:

S. RES. 301

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY, late a Senator from the State of New York, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is my sad duty, as the colleague of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York, to ask the Senate to adopt the resolution which I have submitted.

Mr. President, in the years since Senator KENNEDY first became my colleague, he became my friend, and I feel the loss which we have all suffered—which our country and the world have suffered—very deeply and very personally.

I feel, from many, many, many contacts and conversations with Senator KENNEDY, that he, too, felt that there was an illness affecting us, which drove people to violence as a substitute for reason and debate because they were impatient with these processes. And yet in his own life, he passionately believed in these processes. He became the magnet for tremendous, clamoring crowds because many people felt that his was the voice which could lead to action through reason.

I feel that he would want the tragedy of violence which caused him to pass from this world to be burned into the conscience of all of us in the United States, so that we may again repair with confidence to the constitutional processes in which he believed so very, very deeply. I feel that he would hope that all of those who, out of excess zealotry and other misguided attitudes, might think there are shorter cuts to action would have been appalled and dissuaded by this tragedy—a tragedy that snuffed out the life of one so gifted and vital and effective.

Senator KENNEDY had a passion for the integrity and quality of our society and a passion for justice especially for the underprivileged, the oppressed, and the young. He carried this feeling out not only in New York but in the United States and all over the world, as witnessed his famous trip to the Union of South Africa.

This insistent dedication of his inspired us all. It had a profound impact upon me and all the rest of us with whom he served. It had, and will have, a profound impact on our time.

I sought out him particularly with regard to legislation on which we worked in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as in activities of a state character. For example, I joined him, as did Mayor Lindsay, as he carried out a

particularly noble and worthwhile plan with respect to one of the most difficult slum areas in the United States, the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, N.Y.

Senator KENNEDY's passion for these causes and his inspiration will live on, in my judgment, for many generations, for whom it will remain a guiding light.

I could not close, Mr. President, without expressing the profound personal loss and sadness which my wife and I feel, and our deep sympathy for Ethel Kennedy, for the children, for TED KENNEDY, another of our colleagues, and for the whole Kennedy family.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will act affirmatively on the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 301) was agreed to.

FUNERAL ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, arrangements have been made or are being made for Senators on both sides of the aisle—and their wives, if they desire—to go to New York to attend the funeral services at St. Patrick's Cathedral at 10 o'clock Saturday morning. That transportation will be by air.

It is also contemplated that a railroad car will be set aside for Senators and their wives who may accompany them to join the KENNEDY funeral cortege on the way from New York to Union Station in Washington.

Cars will be at Union Station for those who arrive by train and also for those who find themselves unable to go to New York. If Senators meet the train on its arrival or be at the Capitol steps, transportation will be furnished.

If there are any questions about the session today, earlier this morning I discussed the matter with several members of the Kennedy family. They felt that what we are doing today is what we should do. This is what Senator ROBERT KENNEDY would have wanted done.

When we get through with our business today, we will adjourn out of respect for the memory of our late, highly respected, and beloved colleague, and we will not meet tomorrow as a further mark of respect to his memory. We will probably meet around 12 o'clock on Monday next.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will now go into executive session to consider the three tax conventions with Brazil, France, and the Philippines.

TAX CONVENTIONS WITH BRAZIL, EXECUTIVE J, 90TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION; FRANCE, EXECUTIVE N., 90TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION; AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES, EXECUTIVE D, 89TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the three conventions—a separate vote on each.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

TAX CONVENTION WITH BRAZIL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of June 4, 1968, as modified, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the resolution of ratification, as amended by two reservations, of Executive J, 90th Congress, first session, relative to the ratification of the Tax Convention with Brazil.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent because of the tragic death of his brother.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 175 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Aiken	Carlson	Fong
Allott	Case	Griffin
Bartlett	Church	Gruening
Bayh	Clark	Hansen
Bennett	Cooper	Hart
Boggs	Cotton	Hartke
Brewster	Curtis	Hatfield
Brooke	Dirksen	Hayden
Burdick	Dodd	Hickenlooper
Byrd, Va.	Eastland	Hill
Byrd, W. Va.	Ellender	Holland
Cannon	Fannin	Hruska

Jackson	Morse	Ribicoff
Javits	Morton	Scott
Jordan, Idaho	Moss	Smathers
Lausche	Mundt	Smith
Long, La.	Murphy	Spong
Magnuson	Muskie	Stennis
Mansfield	Nelson	Symington
McClellan	Pastore	Talmadge
McGee	Pearson	Thurmond
McGovern	Pell	Tower
McIntyre	Percy	Tydings
Metcalf	Prouty	Williams, Del.
Mondale	Proxmire	Yarborough
Monroney	Randolph	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Harris	McCarthy
Baker	Hollings	Miller
Bible	Inouye	Montoya
Dominick	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Ervin	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Long, Mo.	Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification, as amended by the reservations, is agreed to.

TAX CONVENTION WITH FRANCE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on the resolution of ratification, with a reservation, of Executive N, 90th Congress, first session, relative to a Tax Convention with France, Treaty No. 2. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent because of the tragic death of his brother.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr.

KUCHEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 176 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Aiken	Gruening	Morton
Allott	Hansen	Moss
Bartlett	Harris	Mundt
Bayh	Hart	Murphy
Bennett	Hartke	Muskie
Boggs	Hatfield	Nelson
Brewster	Hayden	Pastore
Brooke	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Burdick	Hill	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Percy
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Prouty
Cannon	Jackson	Proxmire
Carlson	Javits	Randolph
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Church	Lausche	Scott
Clark	Long, La.	Smith
Cooper	Magnuson	Spong
Cotton	Mansfield	Stennis
Curtis	McClellan	Symington
Dirksen	McGee	Talmadge
Dodd	McGovern	Thurmond
Eastland	McIntyre	Tower
Ellender	Metcalf	Tydings
Fannin	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Fong	Monroney	Yarborough
Griffin	Morse	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Hollings	Miller
Baker	Inouye	Montoya
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Dominick	Kennedy, Mass.	Smathers
Ervin	Kuchel	Sparkman
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McCarthy	Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification, with a reservation, is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE D (89TH CONG., 1ST SESS.) TAX CONVENTION WITH THE PHILIPPINES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, with a reservation, of Executive D, 89th Congress, first session, the tax convention with the Republic of the Philippines. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent because of the tragic death of his brother.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New

Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 177 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Alken	Hansen	Mundt
Allott	Harris	Murphy
Bartlett	Hart	Muskie
Bayh	Hartke	Nelson
Bennett	Hatfield	Pastore
Boggs	Hayden	Pearson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pell
Brooke	Hill	Percy
Burdick	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Cannon	Javits	Ribicoff
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Case	Lausche	Smathers
Church	Long, La.	Smith
Clark	Magnuson	Spong
Cooper	Mansfield	Stennis
Cotton	McClellan	Symington
Curtis	McGee	Talmadge
Dirksen	McGovern	Thurmond
Dodd	McIntyre	Tower
Eastland	Metcalf	Tydings
Ellender	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Monroney	Yarborough
Fong	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Morton	
Gruening	Moss	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson	Hollings	Miller
Baker	Inouye	Montoya
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Dominick	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Ervin	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Young, Ohio
Gore	McCarthy	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 79 and the nays are 0. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification, as amended by the reservation, is agreed to.

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

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

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, pursuant to the provisions of Senate

Concurrent Resolution 73, 90th Congress, appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] to the Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect on January 20, 1969.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1968

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 1268, which appears on the calendar under "Subjects on the Table," be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

I am made to understand that there are certain emergency items that have to do with social security that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare wants very much to have considered. There are also certain Senate legislative items that need to be considered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I say first that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has been extraordinarily understanding of our deadlock in conference on a supplemental appropriations bill in which these items are incorporated. Second, I, too, have been apprised of the desirability of bringing this measure into committee so that whatever is added may be added and that I may move to add items that I feel need to be added in order to give balance to the measure.

The measure will then be brought back to the Senate, and the Senate will express its will. I think this is an orderly way in which to do it.

Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1153, H.R. 16489.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 16489) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the pending bill, H.R. 16489, be considered and agreed to en bloc—with the exception of the amendment beginning on line 19 of page 9 and ending on line 3 of page 10, and the amendment beginning on line 6 and

ending on line 7 of page 10—and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$7,688,000" and insert "\$7,668,000".

On page 3, line 1, after the word "operation", insert "and"; and, in the same line, after the word "of", insert "one".

On page 4, line 15, after the word "Commissioner", strike out "\$21,700,000" and insert "\$21,630,000".

On page 5, after line 20, strike out: "For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Secret Service, including purchase (not to exceed one hundred and seventy-one for police type use which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, of which one hundred and twenty-nine are for replacement only), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by title 5, United States Code, section 3109, and purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; \$19,300,000."

And, in lieu thereof, insert: "For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Secret Service, including purchase (not to exceed one hundred and seventy-one for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, of which one hundred and twenty-nine are for replacement only), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, hire of aircraft, services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms, and, in addition, to other duties now provided by law the protection of persons who are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time as being major presidential or vice-presidential candidates who should receive such protection (unless the candidate has declined such protection), after consultation with an advisory committee consisting of the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and one additional member selected by the members of such committee; \$21,300,000, of which \$400,000 shall be immediately available.

"Hereafter, when requested by the Director of the Secret Service, Federal departments and agencies, unless such authority be revoked by the President, shall assist the Secret Service in the performance of its protective duties under section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, and the preceding paragraph."

On page 7, line 9, after the word "facilities", strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$800,000".

On page 9, line 7, after "3109", strike out "\$34,000,000" and insert "\$35,000,000".

On page 16, line 16, after "(78 Stat. 615)", strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$250,000".

On page 17, line 6, after the word "vehicles", strike out "\$225,000" and insert "\$643,000"; and, in the same line, after the word "until", strike out "June 30, 1970" and insert "July 31, 1970".

On page 17, after line 17, strike out: "Sec. 502. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in the aggregate expenditure of Federal funds by all agencies provided for herein beyond \$7,461,423,000, including the expenditure of postal receipts."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:
 "SEC. 502. Section 5(b) of the Act entitled 'An Act creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography', approved October 3, 1967 (Public Law 90-100), is amended by striking out 'January 31, 1970' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 31, 1970.'"

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall later move that the committee amendment beginning on line 19 of page 9 and ending on line 3 of page 10 and the committee amendment beginning on line 6 and ending on line 7 of page 10 be rejected. I will explain the bill and will then make my motion to strike this language and the reason why the committee believes it advisable to speed the passage of the pending measure without going to conference at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state them individually.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has authorized me to present to the Senate its report on the pending bill, H.R. 16489, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal year 1969.

Senators will find on their desks printed copies of the bill and the committee report, together with copies of the hearings, and I will now present to the Senate a brief summary of what is contained in the bill in the way of increases and decreases.

The bill which is recommended to the Senate provides new budget obligational authority in the amount of \$1,781,053,000. This amount consists of definite appropriations in the amount of \$1,030,877,000 and indefinite appropriations in the amount of \$750,176,000. The grand total of titles I, III, and IV—new budget obligational authority—and title II—authorizations out of the postal fund—is in the amount of \$8,158,877,000. This amount is an increase of \$3,253,000 over the House allowance, \$613,236,000 over the 1968 appropriation and \$178,832,000 under the estimates for fiscal 1969.

In connection with the Post Office Department only one change was made from the House bill as regards additional funds. The committee increased the item, "Research, development, and engineering," by \$1 million, thus allowing a total of \$35 million for the Bureau of Research and Engineering. The committee felt that this will help to advance and accelerate the research and development programs now being undertaken by that Bureau.

This is perhaps the only way in which we can move forward to deliver more mail with less cost and less manpower. Our committee was very strongly of the opinion that this was the best way in which to arrive at long-range economies in handling this fast and ever-growing load on the post office system.

The overall postal department allowance provides for approximately 20,300 additional new employees for 1969 over 1968 to cope with the ever-increasing mail volume estimated to be around 84 billion pieces in 1969. The committee has included language in the bill to provide the department with a 5-percent transfer authority between appropriations.

This is done at the informal request of the House. We hope to have it accepted by the House without conference. I will offer an amendment to strike this section from the bill.

No changes were made to the House bill under title III of the bill. Items under this title deal in the main with the Executive Office of the President.

These items were carefully studied and heard, and we believe the cost is at a bedrock bottom.

Under title IV—Independent agencies—the committee recommends an increase of \$125,000 for the Administrative Conference of the United States. This will give the Conference their full budget request of \$250,000 which had been reduced by half by the House. The committee was informed that the Conference is now fully organized and ready to undertake its assigned duties.

Another addition, under this title, to the House bill, was made to the New Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. The committee has restored \$418,000 cut by the House and, as recommended, the bill contains the budget estimate of \$643,000 for this Commission. The head of this Commission has now been appointed and he needs the funds to move ahead on contracting for research on special problems and to organize and fully staff the Commission. Because there has been a delay of over 6 months in the establishment of the Commission, the committee has also added language which would extend the life of the Commission to July 31, 1970.

Under title I—Treasury Department—the committee has recommended three relatively small cuts under the Budget estimates and under the appropriations voted by the House. Twenty thousand dollars was cut from the Office of the Secretary, thus allowing \$7,668,000 for activities under this head for 1969. As explained in the report this cut is made to strike out funds for the two fellowships requested. While the committee does not oppose the fellowship program, it was felt that in this year of stringent budgeting this item could be put over for another year. The same reasoning applied to a cut of \$70,000 in the \$21,700,000 voted by the House for salaries and expenses for the Internal Revenue Service. Let me emphasize that this is not a cut in either the compliance activities or the revenue accounting and processing item. Under the House bill and the bill before the Senate, approximately 1,550 additional new employees have been funded for 1969 over 1968. The slight reduction imposed represents a cut of 10 positions in the Washington headquarters which after the cut results in their having 30 more positions than in 1968.

The final cut was made to the request for funds for the construction of outdoor firing ranges at Beltsville, Md. The budget estimate of \$1 million was reduced \$200,000 by the committee thus allowing a total of \$800,000 for this purpose. These will be very modern and have the capability of training our law-enforcement agencies, not only the Secret Service, but also the Capitol Police, the immigration inspectors, and many other Government law-enforcement agencies, as well.

While it is believed that construction of outdoor firing ranges should go forward to accommodate the Secret Service and all other Treasury Department law-enforcement agencies with modern, up-to-date facilities, it was the sense of the committee that \$800,000 was sufficient to commence construction of the project.

The last item deals with section 502 of the bill as passed the House. This section contained language imposing an overall expenditure limitation of not to exceed \$7,461,423,000. The Senate committee has deleted this language in its entirety. Witnesses testified that the language could be characterized either as being meaningless on the one hand or unworkable on the other.

Mr. President, this is a brief summary of what is contained in the bill. A more detailed explanation will be found in the committee report which is on the desks of the Senators. In presenting this report I wish to thank the members of the subcommittee who attended the meetings and rendered able assistance in the formulation of this bill—particularly, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, who was most helpful in writing up this bill, as well as the ranking minority member, Senator CASE. The subcommittee and full committee unanimously agreed upon this bill when it was reported yesterday.

I now come to a most significant item in this bill. Approximately 2 weeks ago, the President discussed with me the possibility of extending Secret Service protection to the major presidential and vice-presidential candidates during this election year. I indicated to him my willingness to consider this item, out of order, and to talk to other members of my subcommittee about it. The President promptly made available to the subcommittee, the officials of the Treasury Department, and the head of the Secret Service, to explain this provision thoroughly.

On May 27, the subcommittee met in executive session to consider this matter and to take testimony from these officials. After hearing the testimony, it was decided to include language to authorize this protection and to provide the additional funds to the Secret Service in the amount of \$2 million for this purpose.

The language in the bill has been cleared with the appropriate members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, the House Appropriations Committee, as well as the leaders of both Houses. No objection has been raised to making this language a part of the current appropriation bill.

Mr. President, it is most important and urgent, in the operation of the U.S. Secret Service, that its appropriation be increased from \$19,300,000 to \$21,300,000, of which \$400,000 shall be immediately available.

I may say that \$500,000 of this appropriation is also to be held back in contingency reserve, to be used as necessary; because the work that the Secret Service and other Government agencies must achieve and the time and hours and expenses they must incur are unascertainable on a definite basis at this time, because it embraces work that has never been done before.

However, in the light of the tragic events of the past week, we should realize that this is of greatest and utmost urgency, because it threatens the very keystone of our governmental structure, and that is the proper selection, by democratic means—and that means exposure to all the citizens of the United States, if possible—of the person of the candidate. These tragic events have shown that this is a hazardous undertaking today, and we must not ignore our responsibilities for the men who offer themselves for these major positions.

The committee recommends that the Secret Service be specifically authorized, in addition to its other duties now provided by law, to protect major presidential or vice-presidential candidates. No words can express our shock at the tragic death of our colleague, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. This senseless act of violence makes it clear to the committee—and to every American—that it is in the public interest to provide protection to major candidates who are daily exposed to the hazards and risks of national political campaigns.

May I say, as I read the newspapers carefully with respect to this tragedy, that it might not have been prevented, but there would have been a great chance that his security would be enormously increased had the provisions of the bill we are now considering provided Senator KENNEDY with the services not only of the Secret Service but also, as the bill provides, the helping hand to the Secret Service of the narcotics agents, the FBI, the immigration inspectors, and other law-enforcement branches.

As I read the accounts, the tragedy occurred in the exit going through the hallway to the kitchen. I know the Secret Service and the FBI well enough that if that was the planned exit for the Senator, there would have been surveillance of that particular point. In many instances, with mob scenes, there is no way in which that safety can be assured, but danger can be materially lessened by the presence on duty of these men and, if necessary, the presence on duty of military detachments; because this lessens to a great degree—it will not prevent, but will lessen—the exposure to abnormal dangers that this week has shown that the men who campaign for high office may be subject to.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, let me say that I join with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] in his views, as he has expressed them, as he expressed them in the committee. I believe this is a most salutary provision, and it is just heart-breaking that we should not have thought of it sooner. I thoroughly agree with the Senator because I, too, have some experience with these security procedures, having been attorney general of my own State.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator that it is inconceivable that Senator KENNEDY would even have been led through such a passage, with the ad-

vance routing which the Secret Service always works out. So I thoroughly agree.

Now, we had two problems in committee. I believe we have dealt with them both decently, and I would not dream of interrupting the Senator—

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield, because I desire to clear up this matter. I believe it is an important point in the discussion. I believe we have achieved an end and guarantee the methods sought to achieve that end by the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Two points arose that have troubled us, Mr. President. The first point was already incorporated in the provision which Senator MONRONEY had presented, and that was the question of who is a major candidate and is he a candidate before he is a nominee—that is, designated by a convention.

The understanding of the legislative history should be clear that by the use of the words "major presidential candidate" we mean one who has not yet been nominated by his party convention, and we mean one who the decider—in this particular instance, as carried in the provision—in consultation—and the consultation is extremely important—with the leadership in the House and Senate, will have decided that so-and-so is a major presidential candidate. He might even be a sectional candidate.

We spoke of former Governor Wallace in that regard. He, too, could be within that definition of a major presidential candidate.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. And there may be other major candidates before we move forward with the final election, if they have some degree of interstate prominence as shown by opinion polls or in some other way. I would feel certain they could have this protection.

I do not think we dare reach down to people who run for publicity only, as in the cases of some of those who have appeared before various committees demanding equal time on network programs because major candidates were so provided.

This is not an unworkable problem nor is it an unsolvable problem. We have protected the selection by guaranteeing that there will be a nonpartisan commission of the highest level that could make the final decision after the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the titular head of the Secret Service.

(At this point, Mr. MCGOVERN assumed the chair.)

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It is very important that this matter be made clear, because the language which is contained at page 6, line 15, and thereafter indicates rather general language which would seem to give the complete determination of the question to the Secretary of the Treasury. However, I am satisfied, having locked the matter in with the legislative history which the Senator from Oklahoma and I are now making, and considering the sensitivity and seriousness of the matter, that it will be administered in that way.

I notice the Senator used the word "commission." That is what we have in mind, although the legislation at page 6 on line 19 uses the term "advisory committee."

I am satisfied, considering the sensitivity and solemnity of what is being done, and with this legislative history, that it will be administered as the Senator and I and the committee have in mind.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure the Senator is correct. I am sure the language on page 6, line 15 to line 19 where it provides, "the protection of persons who are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time as being major presidential or vice presidential candidates who should receive such protection—unless the candidate has declined such protection—after consultation with an advisory committee" will be applicable after consultation with an advisory committee, and this shows the intent of the law that they are to have a great part in designating the persons who will have protection.

Certainly, I feel they will lean on the side of security. Certainly, in the case which the Senator mentioned, the former Governor of Alabama would be entitled to such protection. The other area was by polls, or publicity, or by general judgment of people who have lived in the field of presidential elections for a long time.

I believe we have done about as well as we could do. Time is fleeting. We felt this matter had to be underway, and tomorrow is too late. Last week would have been most helpful but we did have time to work out, after we had executive hearings, the settlement of committee jurisdiction which the distinguished Senator, who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, knows is a tremendous hurdle. After time in consultation we cleared this matter with the chairmen of the Committee on the Judiciary of both Houses and their members.

We cleared the matter in many other ways and we carefully considered the testimony.

I hope it will be understood that we did have executive sessions because the publicity on lack of protection for these men who are not guarded by the Secret Service caused in itself a tragedy. We have been working quietly and both the minority and the majority side cooperated in presenting this bill today.

We have stricken out some things we would have liked to have in the measure, because the House of Representatives might have held it up and made it necessary to go to conference. We recognize the emergency and we feel, in striking the amendment which the committee added, we will have acceptance by the House, thereby making it unnecessary to go through another period of delay.

I would like to see this bill passed by the Senate today, agreed to by the House, and signed by the President this evening. I know the President wants to get that done, too.

Mr. JAVITS. There was one other consideration in our minds which has not been fully expressed. When a candidate is a Governor, generally, he has the protection of his State police organization.

When he is not a Governor he does not have even that but depends on his private resources and his own organization.

So many of us thought that Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, who suffered so tragically, allowed himself to be exposed too much, but this is now tragic history and we are trying to prevent for the future what the tragic history of the past has taught us.

However, the candidate who is not a Governor will have a form of safeguard which is not only in his interest but also in the national interest.

I wish to ask the Senator if he would not agree with me, and it should be a part of the legislative history, that we do not look with favor on the "daring do" of declining this protection, and we also fervently hope that every candidate will accept it as being in the national interest if he aspires to be President of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. I could not agree more. I would say, indeed so. The Senator is absolutely right.

In my judgment, having participated in many presidential campaigns by presidential candidates, those who would not accept protection, or vice-presidential candidates who would not accept protection would be questioned on their judgment to occupy the highest office in the world.

For that reason, I think it would be a matter that would be accepted by his party; and if he were an independent, by those men who advise him, and perhaps some men who might want this "daring-do" spirit which the Senator has suggested, might be unduly exposing themselves when they do not have to.

Mr. JAVITS. I thought it essential that we at least indicate our feeling on the subject.

The final question which concerned me, and which proved to be of concern to other Members also, is the rather broad grant of authority to the Director of the Secret Service.

It will be noted at page 7, lines 1 through 6, that the Director of the Secret Service has the authority, and the word used is "shall" to require other Federal departments and agencies, which would naturally include the national defense forces of the United States, to "assist the Secret Service in the performance of its protective duties."

While we recognize the protective duties are limited to protect major presidential candidates chosen by a combined form of authority which the Senator from Oklahoma has described, we did realize, when dealing with such a sensitive matter—and this is a vast grant of power—the Director of the Secret Service could technically justify an enormous control over the Armed Forces and other sensitive agencies and departments of the United States.

On the other hand, we wanted to be very careful that there was the assistance which these other agencies and departments could bring.

The Senator from Oklahoma has properly described that, so that, as a result, we are including the words "unless such authority be revoked by the President of the United States"—that is in lines 2 and

3. I suggested—and the committee adopted—language relating to assistance by other agencies to the Secret Service which provides that the Director of the Secret Service should have the power to obtain this assistance, "unless such authority be revoked by the President of the United States." It seems to me altogether proper that the President should possess residual power to modify or revoke authority granted to the Director of the Secret Service, if there is good and sufficient cause to do so.

However, I did not, and I do not intend the language to have the effect of involving the President of the United States in the daily operating decisions of the Secret Service in carrying out this particular authority. I realize that the assistance of other Federal departments and agencies should be on a continuous basis. I know that emergency situations—such as the terrible tragedy we have just had—require prompt action at the operating level. Under any circumstances, the Director of the Secret Service should not feel obligated to obtain advance clearance from the President before requesting assistance. He should protect those persons for whom the Secret Service has protective responsibility with the full cooperation of other agencies of the Government.

The purpose of my language which is incorporated in the bill—with full cooperation and the desire of the Senator from Oklahoma, because there is no adversary attitude here at all—is to provide a means for periodic review by the President of the manner in which this authority has been exercised to guard against any abuse or usurpation of responsibility. The decisions themselves should be made by the career official having this responsibility—that is, the Secret Service Director. It is much more preferable that this authority—in which all Americans of all parties have a stake—be exercised at the operating level rather than by the President or by a presidentially appointed official.

On this basis, I feel my language will in no way inhibit the Secret Service and other Federal agencies from the effective performance of these critical duties.

I would most respectfully ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he concurs with this understanding and interpretation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am happy to concur with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and with the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who participated in helping to make this paragraph effective yet safe in its purposes.

The reason the original draft of the bill turned over to the Director of the Secret Service the right to invoke aid from other Government law-enforcement agencies, including the military, was to relieve the President of any responsibility or liability for too much, too little, or no protection at all of presidential or vice-presidential candidates of other parties. We all know the scurrilous attacks which have been made in the past, oftentimes on events that were inevitable, which sought to blame the President of the United States. We want-

ed this under a career civil service officer, to manage the protection of Presidents, Vice Presidents, and other persons entitled to protection and the candidates for President and Vice President, so that no one could charge that one political faith or another was receiving better protection.

The Senator now comes in with an amendment that gives us, shall we say, the best of both worlds. We have civil service protection and we have operation on a day-by-day scheduling, and the men needed, at times, when needed. But we provide against any excess abuse of power or, in that matter, an excessive negligence of security, by permitting the Chief Officer of the United States to reclaim or restrain or advise when the overall picture is unsatisfactory.

It would be unthinkable for us to put the President in the position of chief of the FBI or chief of the Secret Service. I think we get the best of both worlds in this. I think it would be most effective. I am grateful to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Colorado for their great contribution in this matter.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say in that regard that when I broached the idea to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], he immediately saw the point and worked out the language which is here contained. He found the same receptivity from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], my colleague on the committee, and from the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] himself, who went to great pains to help us. We knew this could brook no delay and we had to work it out. I thank my colleague from Colorado very deeply for his graciousness in every way in working out the language, and even in yielding to me to propose the basic language which he had himself been instrumental in working out.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if my understanding is correct that a vice-presidential candidate, as used in this legislation, means one who has been nominated for the position of Vice President?

Mr. MONRONEY. This protects both the candidate who has been nominated, and before the nomination. If he is an announced vice-presidential candidate of stature of more than local interest, he would be entitled to request it. If found to be a major candidate by the Secretary of the Treasury and this committee, he would be entitled to have the same degree of protection. If he is not campaigning, I would say he would have little chance of getting it because who knows, we might have 100 vice-presidential candidates in this Chamber and one never knows when the lightning might strike, but this would not be a burden at all unless they were accepted the same as a presidential candidate seriously interested and actively campaigning for that particular office—there are only two offices, of course, President and Vice President.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. If an individual is an active candidate for the position of Vice President, he would then

come under the terms of this legislation; is that not correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. If he were a major candidate, yes. The committee would try to rule out the insignificant. He does not have to be active but he would have to be an announced candidate and he would have to be recognized by the Secretary of the Treasury and the bipartisan committee which we have set up as being a major vice-presidential candidate.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator's reply clarifies the point I was interested in. As I see it, then, a major candidate for Vice President, seeking the nomination, would be covered under this legislation the same as a major candidate seeking the presidential nomination?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in this connection, I commend the President of the United States for his prompt action early Wednesday morning in directing that a protective U.S. Secret Service detail be placed with each presidential candidate and his family and that the FBI assist with supplying manpower if necessary to supplement the Secret Service details. While there was no specific authorization for this action, this was no time to ponder legalities. It is, however, exceedingly important that the Congress support the President's action by providing a legal foundation for this continuing protection.

The bill provides authority for protection of persons who are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as being major presidential and vice-presidential candidates after consultation with an advisory committee consisting of the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives and one additional member selected by the members of such committees. It is contemplated that protection will be provided for all major candidates for President until after the selection of nominees at the major political conventions. The major nominees for President and Vice President will then be protected until election of the successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President.

This bill also gives us the opportunity to remedy a serious deficiency in existing law. It provides that, when requested by the Director of the Secret Service, other Federal departments and agencies shall assist the Secret Service in the performance of its statutory protective duties and those additional duties established by this bill.

The protection of the President of the United States and the other persons entitled to protection is a governmentwide responsibility. While primary responsibility rests with the U.S. Secret Service, the personnel and facilities of every agency must be available.

The Government became painfully aware of the need for improving this coordination after the assassination of President Kennedy. The Warren Commission stressed the absolute necessity of continuous assistance to the Secret

Service in the exercise of its protective duties.

The personnel and facilities of Federal departments and agencies are made available as requested by the Secret Service. However, no legislative basis exists for the provision of this assistance. This lack of specific statutory authority has been an impediment to the making of more formal arrangements with various departments for continuing and permanent assistance.

This omission has become of such concern to me that I asked my staff to study this problem and give me background information on the need for better governmentwide coordination. Let me give you the results of that study.

Protective functions for our Presidents have grown increasingly difficult through the years so that many agencies must provide assistance to the Secret Service.

We live in a shrinking globe of rapidly expanding travel by those who serve and have served us as Presidents of our country. The job of protecting them has become far more difficult.

The Warren Commission summarized the problem in this language:

Whatever their purpose, Presidential journeys have greatly enlarged and complicated the task of protecting the President. The Secret Service and Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies which cooperate with it, have been confronted in recent years with increasingly difficult problems, created by the greater exposure of the President during his travels and the greater diversity of the audiences he must face in a world torn by conflicting ideologies. (p. 427) (Emphasis added.)

Clearly, the frequency of presidential travel will not abate. And turmoil—both abroad and at home—will place maximum demands on protective and security forces.

Moreover, the number of persons to be protected has also increased.

Congress has provided specific statutory authority to the Secret Service to protect the President and his family, the President-elect, and the Vice President at his request.

Congress has extended protection to others next in line of succession to the Presidency, the Vice-President-elect, and a former President for a reasonable period after he leaves office.

Congress has extended the protection to include a former President and his wife during his lifetime, and the widow and minor children of a former President for a period of 4 years after he leaves or dies in office.

Congress has extended the period of protection for Mrs. John F. Kennedy and her children through 1969.

Now this bill extends needed protection to major presidential and vice-presidential candidates during the presidential campaign.

Of course, we want to provide adequate protection to our Presidents and those other persons whose contribution to this Nation has been so substantial. But it has become increasingly clear that the increasing complexities of providing this protection requires the resources of many agencies.

II

The Warren Commission concluded that there had been inadequate liaison between the Secret Service and other Government agencies in the performance of protective duties.

The Warren Commission conducted the most exhaustive investigation in our history on the problems of presidential protection. One of its primary missions was to determine any means by which the quality of that protection could be improved.

The Commission left no doubt as to its views. At page 459 of its report, we find this conclusion:

The protection of the President is in a real sense a Government-wide responsibility which must necessarily be assumed by the Department of State, the FBI, the CIA, and the military intelligence agencies as well as the Secret Service . . .

The Commission is convinced of the necessity of better coordination and direction of the activities of all existing agencies of government which are in a position to, and do, furnish information and services related to the security of the President . . .

The Warren Commission felt so strongly about the Government-wide nature of protective duties that it proposed a more formal coordinating mechanism. Thus, the Commission's recommendations included the following:

1. A committee of Cabinet members including the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, or the National Security Council, should be assigned the responsibility of reviewing and overseeing the protective activities of the Secret Service and the other Federal agencies that assist in safeguarding the President. Once given this responsibility, such a committee would insure that the maximum resources of the Federal Government are fully engaged in the task for protecting the President, and would provide guidance in defining the general nature of domestic and foreign dangers to Presidential security.

8. Even with an increase in Secret Service personnel, the protection of the President will continue to require the resources and cooperation of many Federal agencies. The Commission recommends that these agencies, specifically the FBI, continue the practice as it has developed, particularly since the assassination, of assisting the Secret Service upon request by providing personnel or other aid, and that there be a closer association and liaison between the Secret Service and all Federal agencies.

III

The President's Committee on the Warren Report determined that there must be continuing assistance to the Secret Service in its performance of protective duties.

On September 27, 1964, President Johnson designated the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, the Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the Director of the CIA, John McCone, and the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, McGeorge Bundy, to act as a committee to study the Warren Commission Report and make recommendations concerning Presidential protective functions.

When the Committee reported, it expressed this view:

Because our country is so large and complex, no one organization can, by itself, hope

to provide protection for the Presidents. Protection must be a cooperative effort among Federal, State and local law enforcement and intelligence agencies.

The Committee concurred with the Warren Commission that better liaison between the Secret Service and other departments and agencies was needed. It recommended the negotiation of written agreements formalizing agency responsibilities.

iv

In the absence of express legislative authority, personnel of other Federal departments and agencies could be held personally liable for acts performed in assisting the Secret Service.

The right of Federal employees other than Secret Service agents to participate in the protection of the President has already been subjected to legal challenge. In *Scherer v. Brennan*, 375 F. 2d 609 (7th Circuit 1967), agents of the alcohol and tobacco tax division of the Internal Revenue Service were sued for damages as a result of their assisting the Secret Service with presidential protective duties.

Relying on evidence that the Secretary of the Treasury had authorized other agencies of the Treasury Department to assist the Secret Service in carrying out its protective assignments, the court held in that particular case that the Internal Revenue agents were immune from suit because their actions were within the scope of their official duties.

As indicated in the Scherer decision, the Secretary of the Treasury has requested other Treasury enforcement agencies to assist the Secret Service in the performance of its protective functions under the authority contained in Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950, which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to delegate his functions to any officer or employee of the Treasury Department. Reorganization Plan No. 26, however, does not authorize delegations by the Secretary of the Treasury to outside departments and agencies.

This immunity may not extend protection to employees of other departments and agencies. Indeed, the court's findings may by inference limit immunity from prosecution to Treasury department employees.

v

The present practice is for other Federal departments and agencies to assist the Secret Service. However, lack of specific authority inhibits formal agreements needed to insure continuous and permanent cooperation.

Of course, all Federal agencies have customarily provided assistance to the Secret Service. Indeed, it is inconceivable that any department would neglect or refuse to cooperate in a matter relating to Presidential protection.

However, the assistance to the Secret Service contemplated by the Warren Commission and the President's Committee is not merely informal, intermittent coordination. Instead, it is a continuing understanding. The Commission said:

The Service should negotiate a memorandum of understanding with each agency

that has been assisting it and from which it can expect to need help in the future.

Despite a general willingness to assist, departments are naturally reluctant to formalize an understanding for which there is no express authority. The language of this bill would provide that authority.

The request for assistance would come from the Director of the Secret Service. It is most desirable that this request come from a career official with the operating responsibility. The President is given stand-by power to revoke this authority in the rare and unlikely event that the authority was seriously abused or the responsibility was arrogantly usurped. I hope and I doubt that this residual power would ever need to be exercised.

We must not delay in providing the basis for this governmentwide coordination and cooperation. It should be noted that the President's action of yesterday included a call for FBI assistance to the Secret Service. In future years, the authority should never be lacking for the Secret Service to call upon the personnel and facilities of any Federal agency for intelligence gathering, medical, transportation, communications, or such other assistance as the Service may need to protect the Presidents.

Mr. President, the Senate is considering this measure at a time when each of us grieves at the tragic death of a man who would have been covered by its provisions. Each of us laments—and yet realizes fully well—the need for this authority.

Mr. President, we need to protect our Presidents. We need to protect other men who will be facing the dangers of maniacs, excitable individuals, who are stirred by violence, many organized by people whose loyalty to the United States and its ideals is questionable. Yet our leaders from both parties, or even three parties, will have to face multitudes who are aroused and inflamed by spectacular scenes, perhaps of rioting in the streets and fires; aroused, inflamed, and perhaps unbalanced by the harangues of the demagogues, who seem to be entitled—although U.S. Senators are not—to nationwide television, if they are giving trouble enough to the peace and tranquility of the United States.

Mr. President, this is a time for action. When the debate is finished, I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. It contains important provisions that may save the life of a future President or a future Vice President. The time is later than we think.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have listened to the discourse and conversation about the bill. I attended, I think, every session of the hearings held on the bill. I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma on the fine work he has done.

I wish to clear up one matter, because statements have been made over the news media today about the action taken here concerning the Secret Service. Speaking for myself, the first time any request was conveyed to me about the matter was at the executive session of the committee on May 27, when Secretary Fowler appeared, and the committee took imme-

diately thereafter. I assured the President on two different occasions of my complete cooperation and help in the matter.

This is a relatively good bill. We have made some good cuts. The House has previously made some drastic cuts in the bill. I sincerely hope that the bill will be passed speedily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment that has not been considered will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 9, line 19, after the word "Provided", insert "That not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation available to the Post Office Department for the current fiscal year may be transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other such appropriation or appropriations; but no appropriation shall thereby be increased by more than 5 per centum and the appropriation 'Administration and Regional Operation' shall not be increased by more than \$1,000,000 as a result of such transfers."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the 5-percent transferability.

The Senate has maintained the position that more flexibility should be allowed the Postmaster General, to enable him to transfer up to 5 percent, wherever the heavy weight of the work or the overload of the Department occurs. This is mainly because he cannot determine exactly the number of pieces of mail that will be handled—whether it be 83 billion or 84 billion pieces. However, the House feels strongly about this. As I said earlier, I am hopeful that we can avoid going to conference and can send the bill to the President for signature tonight. Therefore, I move that the language be stricken. Although the language is a committee amendment, I urge, in the light of the current emergency, that the amendment be rejected by the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly concur in the request. I think we should take the action suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 19.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment that has not been considered will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 6, after the word "transferred", insert "in addition to the appropriation transfers otherwise authorized in this Act and".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, line 6.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On page 12, under the heading "Postal Public Buildings," I notice an item for \$50 million. I understand that this item is for expenses necessary in connection with site acquisition, design, construction, and acquisition of postal buildings.

I realize that this is the same amount as was appropriated last year and that

It is also about \$38 million below the budget request. Nevertheless, while the bill has been before the House and the Senate, it has practically been agreed that a \$6 billion cut in spending will be made next year. I am wondering if this is not a place where we can start to cut by postponing the construction of some new post office buildings. I realize that when a building has been burned it is not possible to postpone the construction of a new building. Even though the construction that is proposed may be meritorious, is this the time to begin a program for the construction of new post office buildings, when we are going to have to make some reductions otherwise.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator will look on page 16 of the report, he will see that the budget estimate, in what was supposed to have been a tight budget, was \$88,252,000. The House of Representatives cut that amount to \$50 million, which was a cut of \$38,252,000. The Post Office Department appealed that cut, and we maintained and sustained the \$38 million reduction. So the amount has already been cut far below the budget request; and I think the Senator will find this is about a minimum figure, if we are to be able to move. This amount is for the entire Nation. The most effective way to increase efficiency is through adequate buildings and the elimination of overcrowded, antiquated postal work rooms.

I think we have to plan ahead. No industry in the world, including A.T. & T., Chrysler, or Ford, would think of not having some kind of a program. We have cut the request by more than 33½ percent. I do not think there are any other accounts which have been cut below the budget to that extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator speaks of the figure having been cut by 33½ percent, but they still end up with what they got last year. Technically, the administration could have asked for \$150 million, and we could have cut it two-thirds with the same result. The point is, it is still the amount received last year.

There is a question in the minds of many of us. Can we continue to build all these new buildings at a time when we are financing a full-scale war?

Since this 1969 budget was submitted, the Senate has approved a proposal which would reduce expenditures in fiscal 1969 by \$6 billion. This is now in conference, awaiting action next week by the House of Representatives. This proposal would also reduce the obligational authority requested in this so-called "tight" budget for fiscal 1969 by \$10 billion.

If we are going to make any such reduction we will have to establish a set of priorities somewhere. If Congress does not establish the priorities, if we do not make some effort to do it ourselves, then we are turning all authority over to the President. I believe this is one item we could strike out at this time and still have a good bill left.

On behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, beginning with line 1, strike out all down to and including line 19.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is simply to eliminate this section which would provide \$50 million for the construction and planning of new post offices.

I am not debating the merits of any one of the proposed post offices. If a post office building is burned then it has to be replaced, but replacing buildings in areas where we can have another year of service, at least, out of the present facilities is another matter. I see no useful purpose to be served by trying to be selective. Perhaps if we had had more time on this bill we could be more selective and strike out certain projects. But we do not have time to evaluate them; and I believe, in the interests of speedy action on the bill, the Senate might very well agree to this amendment.

I say to the Senator from Oklahoma that that does not mean we will not get speedy action if the amendment is not accepted. As far as I am concerned, we can limit the debate on this amendment to a very short period, because it is just a simple matter of procedure: Do we or do we not want to hold up construction of some of these new post office buildings at this particular time?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Delaware. Did he mean to strike out the title of this portion of the bill? His amendment would do it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was seeking to strike the section. It should be through line 17.

Mr. ALLOTT. We do get to keep the title, then?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will let the Senator keep that much, yes.

I ask that my amendment be modified to make it read "down to and including line 17."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Delaware in offering this amendment, for the same reasons he has stated. For the last 2 or 3 months, we have had continuing debate upon the fiscal and monetary problems of this country. We recall the heated debate over the gold cover. It was agreed then that it was necessary that action be taken, but that no permanent effect on our fiscal or monetary situation would be achieved unless Congress itself, as well as the administration—and I must speak for Congress—show the will and resolution to take the necessary action, both as to taxes and to the reduction of expenditures.

We followed the gold cover bill with a tax bill. Due largely to the efforts of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senate agreed to the version of the bill which they had presented in the Committee on Finance. Now, after weeks of discussion, the Senate bill has been approved, by the Committee on

Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the President of the United States has indicated his approval.

But the bill, if finally approved by the House, and by the President, will not become effective unless the reduction of \$6 billion in expenditures is made by the Congress.

I serve on the Committee on Public Works. We have the preliminary function of approving through authorization bills many physical improvements in the country—highways, Corps of Engineers projects, and public buildings.

We are at war, a costly war, and there are many human needs in this country. There are problems and needs of much greater priority than public works. A short time ago, when there came to our committee a request for the authorization of more than \$600 million of new buildings for the benefit of many agencies of the United States, I voted against it, and suggested that work on those buildings could at least be deferred for a year or 2 years, until we could manage, or begin to manage the cost of the war in Vietnam and our domestic war on poverty. We cannot do much unless one can get our fiscal house in order.

My reason for cosponsoring the amendment then, is similar to that which I voiced in the Committee on Public Works: that I believe we can defer buildings.

This calls for some personal sacrifices on our part, because our States receive advantages from public works projects. We help secure the projects, and they are helpful. But I believe we can make no significant attack upon the problem of deficits, balance of payments, and the monetary problems of our country unless we are willing to make sacrifices ourselves, bearing on our own States. None of us can cut a program which deals with another Senator's State and, when it comes to our own, say, "No; we will have to vote for this, because it will affect a public work or public building in my State." I believe we have to make the cuts across the board.

This item, while it is not a large item in relation to the billions provided in the bill, is a good test of our willingness to give effect to the priorities which are much more important, and our willingness to cut across the board, projects without affecting our interests, and our own States.

So I raise my voice in support of this effort of the Senator from Delaware, consistent with his continuing efforts, but more important than ever this year, to defer—which is about all it would amount to—an expenditure of \$50 million on post office buildings.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his support.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be under the control of the senior Senator from Delaware and 5 minutes to be under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I, too, am in favor of economy. I, too, am anx-

ious to keep the budget balanced. I do not believe any committee has done as much to balance its own budget as has the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

We brought in \$1 billion worth of new revenue on the carriage of postage alone by raising the inadequate rates and improving service at the same time. There is \$1 billion there.

However, we keep talking about building. We are not talking about major construction here. We are talking about the site acquisitions and design money mostly under the amount provided in the House measure. With the exception of two projects, there is not a nickel in here for buildings. The \$38 million that they appealed to have put back in would have taken care of that. We cut it out.

We will spend \$50 million mostly to acquire sites and for design. Does anybody think that real estate will be cheaper a year from now? The figures show that the cost of real estate is escalating 5 percent a year. The sites that we must have for post offices are highly desirable.

We must be selective. We cannot build the type of post office we want very easily.

Does anyone think there will not be an increase in the volume of postage carried each year? The amount of postage being carried is escalating. We have an estimated deficiency of 5.3 million square feet between existing and operational requirements. We will have to handle an increase of 13.4 billion pieces of mail after move-in date.

This is to obtain the sites cheaper than we can get them for next year and meet the designs necessary in order to permit the replacement of some 18 existing split operations with centralized facilities in one post office and replace current facilities that are between 26 and 83 years old.

Mr. President, I yield such time as he may need to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, the most informed man on our committee on these matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am reminded when I listen to the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware of the old saying of the school teacher:

I gazed and stared in wonder direct that one small head could contain all he knew.

I am sympathetic with many of the ideas of the Senator from Delaware and in particular with respect to economy. However, let me say that our committee has worked hard and long, and I only wish that sometime before an appropriations committee has spent weeks and months in working on a bill, the Senator would give us advice of a different type than a last-minute attempt to cut a bill.

We never heard a word from him during the months that the bill was under consideration by the committee.

The Senator from Oklahoma has expressed it very well. There is no major construction in here despite what was said.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] sincerely says, and I believe,

that we have all got to give up. This is true.

If we look at page 410 of the hearings, we will not find any items there for Colorado or Oklahoma.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. There is none for New Jersey.

Mr. ALLOTT. And there are none for New Jersey. We do have to take care of the mail, and the increased revenue has gone a long way toward this.

I hope that the amendment is rejected. I do not think there is justification for it. It is not a question of extravagance on the part of the committee.

We have to do our job, and we do it on the basis of much testimony and much hard work.

This is the best opinion and estimate of the committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee—although, for the purposes of the pending bill, the Senator from Colorado has been carrying the laboring or—I want to say that the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Colorado are absolutely right. There is no major construction here. There is money for site, design, and supervision of existing construction.

We cannot without, I think, great loss to the operation cut any more than the House and the Senate committees have recommended.

I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

I would like very much to be able to vote for the amendment myself because the Senator from Delaware provides a very useful spur for economy in important ways. I think I must say, however, that this time it would be a mistake to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I read what is provided in the bill.

On page 12, it reads:

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary in connection with site acquisition, design, construction, and acquisition of postal buildings pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), as amended, \$50,000,000, . . .

This does not say anything about financing existing post offices. It is true that the committee has done a fair job in cutting back some of these other appropriations below the budget request. I point out, however, another weakness in the pending bill. The bill does not make any provision, as I understand it, for the increase in salaries which automatically goes into effect the first of July. That increase in salaries will require supplemental appropriations.

So, to that extent, when we speak of a reduction below the budget request, it certainly is not a true picture. That amount is going to have to be funded unless the committee plans to postpone the increase, and I would question that.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, any funding would be before the Appropriations Committee with respect to every department. I do not think we want particularly to infer that the Post Office Department is trying to hide anything from the Senator from Delaware.

We will still be below the going cost. Any additional increase would require supplemental appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point. Most of the reductions made by the committee will be covered later by supplementals.

The argument is made here that if we do not acquire these sites now it will cost more to do so later. That is a poor argument.

The reason that we have 5-percent inflation is because the Government of the United States continues to spend money like a drunken sailor. It will not balance the budget. We are operating today at a deficit of approximately \$2 billion a month.

If we proceed on that basis we might just as well tell everybody in America to stop buying Government bonds and to stop putting money in savings banks and instead to put it in other equities because the American dollar will be valueless tomorrow.

The Senator's wife could use this same argument for a new hat or a new dress.

Mr. President, the American dollar will be valueless tomorrow only because Congress will have failed to discharge its responsibility to cut back on some of this spending. There is nothing new in the approach to postpone such new construction projects.

In World War II we had a moratorium by an agreement between the Executive and the Congress on the construction of new public works projects unless they were certified as absolutely essential to the national interest.

At the outbreak of the Korean war President Truman issued an Executive order freezing public works projects unless they were certified as essential to the national defense.

I have repeatedly requested that such an order be issued by the executive branch following the outbreak of the war in Vietnam. It has not been forthcoming.

Since the President would not take this action I have suggested on repeated occasions in Congress that such an order should be written into law.

Today, this is what this amendment proposes. It would place a moratorium on the erection of new post office buildings until such time as we have the money to pay for them or the war in Vietnam is over.

Why should we not be specific and outline where these cuts be made? Or are we going to insist on voting for all of these proposals and then pass the buck to the White House, asking the President to make the cuts? We, too, have a responsibility.

Mr. President, in the conference committee report on the tax bill which will be before the Senate in the next few weeks—

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yielded myself 3 of my 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used all his 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 minute to conclude.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished Senator allow me to ask for 1 minute, also?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the question here is, Do we want to make these reductions in Congress or do we want to pass the full responsibility to the White House? By this amendment we would be saving \$50 million in fiscal 1969.

It is said that this bill provides only \$1.7 billion. When this bill is passed we will be approving \$20-some-odd billion, \$14.5 billion which we cannot touch by reduction, since it is needed to pay the interest on the national debt. This is automatically approved and must be paid.

We would likewise be authorizing the use of \$6.377 billion of revenue that is anticipated from the postal receipts.

So what we are asking for is a reduction in the appropriation for the Post Office Department of \$50 million on expenditures or a reduction of \$50 million in a bill which all together provides for expenditures of \$22 billion to \$23 billion.

One reason why interest rates are continually spiraling upward is the fact that the Government of the United States is draining the money market, trying to borrow the money to finance the deficits it is creating.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, not many Members of the Senate are present in the Chamber at the moment, but I believe we all should be aware, and all Members of the Senate who have to vote on the amendment should be aware, of what the adoption of this amendment would mean.

Many of us have been very concerned about the situation that was discussed earlier in this matter, with relation to the Secret Service people. The President has taken on behalf of himself an action to protect those people who are now running for office. His action is not covered by law, and we have done everything we can to cover his action by law.

If this amendment is adopted, it would simply mean that this matter would go to conference and that this bill would not go to the President's desk this afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will yield on the time of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has no time remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. On the condition that we, on this side, have 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The point I desire to make is that there are six other Senate amendments already approved in this bill. These are in addition to this amendment. There is no reason why we cannot act on it today.

This bill was reported only last night. The committee report was not here until an hour or 2 ago. We are operating under a highly unusual procedure by allowing this matter to be acted upon today before Members have had an opportunity to study the reports.

We are not trying to delay action on the Secret Service matter. I have supported that provision. We gave unanimous consent to consideration of this bill so that it could be acted upon. We certainly do not have to approve an extra \$50 million for new construction sites in order to get action today. To say that the approval of this amendment would delay action on the proposal to protect presidential candidates is an idle threat.

Furthermore, the President, by Executive order issued yesterday, has already given instructions to the Secret Service to give protection to all presidential candidates and their families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Senator from Colorado has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I repeat my statement. If this provision is eliminated from the bill, it will go to conference, and the bill will not go to the President's desk today. I say that unequivocally. It will not go to the President's desk today.

If the Senator from Delaware is advocating that we downgrade and do away with the postal service, let him do it. This service is constantly increasing by 5 percent a year, and we have to make plans—just ordinary plans. This is not a boondoggle. It is not a pork barrel. It is not a building program. It is making plans for sites and acquisitions to keep up with the increasing load, with the exception of two construction projects.

I urge the Senate to reject the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], is absent because of the tragic death of his brother.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the

Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], would each vote "Nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Boggs	Griffin	Pearson
Brooke	Hansen	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hatfield	Ribicoff
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cooper	Mansfield	Thurmond
Cotton	Mondale	Tower
Curtis	Morton	Tydings
Dirksen	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Nelson	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Hayden	Mundt
Allott	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bartlett	Hill	Pastore
Bennett	Holland	Pell
Brewster	Hruska	Percy
Burdick	Jackson	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Randolph
Cannon	Long, La.	Smith
Carlson	Magnuson	Spong
Case	McClellan	Stennis
Clark	McGee	Symington
Ellender	McGovern	Talmadge
Fong	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough
Harris	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Moss	

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Fulbright	Long, Mo.
Baker	Gore	McCarthy
Bayh	Hollings	Miller
Bible	Inouye	Montoya
Dodd	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Dominick	Kennedy, Mass.	Smathers
Eastland	Kuchel	Sparkman
Ervin	Lausche	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and my distinguished colleagues in supporting the language of this bill to provide badly needed authority to the Secret Service and other Federal agencies in the performance of Presidential protective duties.

When I came to this body 11 years ago, I did not realize that we would face the day when protection of presidential candidates had become a necessity. I pray the tragic forces which require us to take this action may soon vanish from America. But the President wisely determined that not another day should pass without protection for candidates for our Nation's highest office. Now we must provide the funds and legal foundation for his action.

We must also recognize the truth that the protection of our President has become a Government-wide responsibility. The Secret Service alone cannot do the job. The Warren Commission in the tragic aftermath of President Kennedy's assassination told us emphatically that more and better coordination was needed—that the Secret Service must utilize all the resources of the Federal Government in the proper exercise of protective duties.

The language of this bill fills the gap. It provides that assistance shall be provided by any agency upon the request of the Director of the Secret Service. He can act quickly and decisively in time of emergency or unusual need. Even in normal times, he can establish the type of continuing liaison which is necessary to provide maximum security.

I take note of the fact that this protection will also be available to three Americans for whom this Nation has great and lasting affection—President Eisenhower, President Truman, and Mrs. John F. Kennedy. This is as it should be. I know that every Member of this body—and every American—would want these persons to have every protection a grateful Government can provide.

I deplore the tragic circumstances which have called these needs to our attention. But they should inspire us to move promptly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I support the action the Senate considers today in this tragic and sobering time to remedy the gaps in existing authority for the protection of our Presidents.

We deplore the circumstances which compel the extension of protection to major presidential candidates. But we cannot ignore the ugly violence that surrounds us. Those who offer themselves for our Nation's highest office must not be required to offer their life in the process—as one has this very day. They must be able to present their case to the electorate with all the safety it is possible to provide.

Perhaps it will not be enough protection. But we dare not give them any less.

We must also close a loophole which has existed far too long. While it is the practice of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to provide assistance to the Secret Service, no

legislative basis exists for this practice. This statutory omission has already resulted in one lawsuit against a Government employee who was assisting the Secret Service in presidential protection. It impedes the kind of regular, continuous, coordination the job demands. The language of this bill would make it clear that there was authority—indeed, an obligation—on the part of other agencies to provide assistance as requested by the Director of the Secret Service.

Let me also call attention to the fact that others than our current President require protection. President Eisenhower—who is presently undergoing medical treatment—President Truman, and that gallant lady, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, are entitled to every protection which this Government has to offer. And now we see the pressing need to extend protection to those who present their candidacy for President.

I hope the day will never come when the safety of our Presidents is jeopardized by absence of medical assistance, inadequate communications, lack of transportation facilities, or any other governmental resource needed by the Secret Service to provide maximum security for these persons.

The report of the Warren Commission and the President's task force on that report chaired by Secretary Douglas Dillon found that complete and continuous coordination of all Federal agencies was needed to provide this protection.

We owe our Presidents—and those who aspire to that great office—every possible help. This bill will move us forward in meeting that obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is: Shall the bill pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent because of the tragic death of his brother.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator

from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Aiken	Hart	Muskie
Allott	Hartke	Nelson
Bartlett	Hatfield	Pastore
Bennett	Hayden	Pearson
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Pell
Brewster	Hill	Percy
Brooke	Holland	Prouty
Burdick	Hruska	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Carlson	Long, La.	Smathers
Case	Magnuson	Smith
Church	Mansfield	Spong
Clark	McClellan	Stennis
Cooper	McGee	Symington
Cotton	McGovern	Talmadge
Curtis	McIntyre	Thurmond
Dirksen	Metcalf	Tower
Ellender	Mondale	Tydings
Fannin	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Morse	Williams, Del.
Griffin	Morton	Yarborough
Gruening	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hansen	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Harris	Murphy	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—22

Anderson	Fulbright	Long, Mo.
Baker	Gore	McCarthy
Bayh	Hollings	Miller
Bible	Inouye	Montoya
Dodd	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Dominick	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Eastland	Kuchel	
Ervin	Lausche	

So the bill (H.R. 16489) was passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CASE, Mr.

MUNDT, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the very able chairman of the Treasury-Post Office and Executive Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, has again demonstrated his outstanding ability by bringing to the Senate a measure given overwhelming—indeed, unanimous—approval. He performed the task with characteristic persuasiveness, with great dedication.

Joining Senator MONRONEY in steering the bill quickly and expertly through the subcommittee and committee and then on the floor was the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. His willing and helpful assistance was indispensable to the achievement of such a magnificent success.

This measure, of course, contained the authorization for Secret Service protection of presidential and vice presidential candidates. Senator MONRONEY, Senator ALLOTT, and the other members of the subcommittee and committee are to be praised for their cooperation in bringing about swift and immediate action to give the Secret Service this necessary legal basis.

The Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], New York [Mr. JAVITS], and others gave us the benefit of their highly thoughtful views and are to be commended for their participation.

The entire Senate is to be commended for the manner in which the bill was swiftly, but thoughtfully, acted upon.

SPECIAL DRAWING RIGHTS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1152, H.R. 16911.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 16911, to provide for U.S. participation in the facility based on special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1164), explaining the purposes and the background of the bill as well as the operation of the special drawing rights plan reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously.

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

PURPOSE

Section 5 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act requires that neither the President nor any person or agency shall, on behalf of the United States, accept any amendment of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) without prior approval of Congress. H.R. 16911 gives the President authority to accept the pending single—though extensive—amendment to the articles of the IMF (a) establishing a facility based

on Special Drawing Rights in the Fund, and (b) giving effect to certain modifications in the existing rules and practices of the Fund. The bill also authorizes U.S. participation in the Special Drawing Account to be established by the amendment within the IMF. Furthermore, H.R. 16911 makes provision for the United States to accept the obligations that result from such participation in the Special Account.

BACKGROUND

As a great trading nation, the United States has a particular stake in the efficient operation of the international monetary system. Our imports and exports together total some \$60 billion—more than any other country's—and account for 15 percent of the world total. American business over the years has acquired in excess of \$55 billion in overseas investments. In large measure such figures representing a great expansion of world trade and investment, have been a testimonial to the system established at Bretton Woods in 1945. The growth of monetary reserves until quite recently has been adequate to finance the needs of an expanding world economy.

However, to an increasing extent dollar reserves have been the principal source of reserve growth, while gold and foreign exchange other than dollars have contributed less significantly to such growth. From the beginning of 1950 through 1967 international dollar reserves increased by about \$15 billion, and other foreign exchange reserves by roughly \$3 billion. While in the period 1950 to 1964, inclusive, gold reserves increased by about \$8 billion to a total of \$43 billion, in recent years gold has made no contribution to reserve growth. During the 3 years 1964–66 there was virtually no increase in the gold stocks; in 1967 gold reserves fell by about \$1.6 billion.

A situation was created in which (a) gold could not be relied upon for needed increases in reserve growth, (b) the United States could not continue to contribute to such reserve growth through further heavy balance-of-payments deficits, and (c) any effort to try to deal with the problem by raising the price of gold was opposed by strong majority sentiment internationally, basically for the reasons maintained by William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Federal Reserve Board, in a speech printed on pages 62–67 of the committee hearing record. In such a situation and without a means by which monetary reserves can grow with the growth of the world economy, nations may be expected to take restrictive measures to gain reserves primarily by reducing the reserve position of other countries. They would raise interest rates and apply restraints of various kinds on capital movements or upon the movement of goods. Other countries would respond with similar defensive measures leading to a cumulative escalation of restrictions on international trade, adversely affecting both domestic growth and the world economy.

Over the last several years it became increasingly clear that a fundamental disequilibrium threatened the monetary system, and that a new reserve asset—a supplement to gold and foreign exchange—was needed to sustain international liquidity. Special Drawing Rights (SDR) within the IMF will provide that method whereby reserves can increase to meet the requirements of the world economy. Preliminary agreement on the SDR facility promises to remove a shadow hanging over the monetary system owing to the lack of assurance of adequate reserve growth in the future. It thus contributes to the maintenance of long-term stability in the official gold price. SDR acquisitions will provide a means by which the United States will be able to rebuild its reserve position once the heavy payments drain has been halted.

The prospective ability of nations to

add to reserves through SDR's also was an important contribution to the success of the recent Washington meeting of the London gold pool countries. Because of the drain on monetary gold stocks caused by excessive speculation in gold, those countries on March 17 generally agreed not to sell gold to the private market, nor did they believe it necessary to buy from the market in view of the anticipated establishment of the SDR facility.

The agreement on Special Drawing Rights has been carefully worked out over a 5-year period. The years 1963–65 were devoted to preliminary technical studies by the "Group of Ten" industrial countries¹ and the IMF. After those studies were concluded in the summer of 1965, President Johnson authorized Secretary Fowler to initiate government-to-government negotiations. Three years of intensive and complicated discussions followed. In 1966 agreement on basic points was achieved in the Group of Ten. In a second stage of negotiations, highlighted by four joint meetings between the Executive Directors of the IMF and the Deputies of the Group of Ten, an Outline Plan for SDR's was drafted; this was approved by the Board of Governors of the Fund at the September 1967 annual IMF meeting in Rio de Janeiro.

Finally, the detailed amendment to the articles of agreement of the Fund implementing the SDR facility was negotiated by the IMF Executive Directors over the subsequent 6 months, culminating in the Stockholm meeting which gave tentative approval to the completed scheme.

Throughout the 3 years of negotiations, committees and individual Members of Congress were kept informed of progress in the talks and were consulted on the development of the U.S. position. In this last regard, the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee proposed guidelines for international monetary reform in 1965 and again in 1967. The congressional support for these negotiations has been strongly nonpartisan. From 1965 through 1968, both the majority and minority of the Joint Economic Committee agreed—in their reports on the President's Annual Economic Report—on the importance of achieving a plan for the creation of a new international monetary reserve asset.

OPERATION OF THE SDR PLAN

Special Drawing Rights will have the same characteristic that makes any form of money usable as a medium of exchange and a valuable asset; namely, the agreement of participating national governments that this special type of international legal tender is acceptable in settlement of transactions among themselves. In this respect, SDR's are little different from gold, dollars or other convertible foreign exchange and will be used in much the same manner with respect to international transactions. However, SDR's will not be issued as paper money and will not be issued to private individuals or companies. They will be book entries in special accounts of the International Monetary Fund. Each of the 107 members of the IMF will have a separate account for its allocations and other acquisitions of SDR's, much as an individual has a checking account in a bank. SDR's will be denominated in units of account equal to \$1 in gold at the official price and will have a gold value guarantee, but such units will not be directly redeemable in gold.

Creation of an issue of Special Drawing Rights involves a process in which the IMF Managing Director will generally be responsible for initiating a proposal to that effect. Before making such a proposal, however, the Managing Director must satisfy himself through extensive consultations that there is a definite requirement for supplemental re-

¹ Belgium, Canada, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States.

serves which would be consistent with a number of special criteria. He would also make a recommendation which would cover a 5-year period of annual creation and allocation of SDR's. Such a proposal, after being accepted by majority vote of the IMF Executive Directors, would only take effect if approved by 85 percent of the weighted votes of the Fund Governors. Distribution of the SDR's would then be made on the basis of each Fund member's percentage of the overall current quotas within the IMF, and on condition that a particular member did not vote for the decision and notified the Fund that it did not wish an allocation. On this basis the United States which has 24.45 percent of the total Fund quotas (and 21.8 percent of the voting power), would receive about 245 million SDR's in any annual creation of one billion by the IMF if all members were participants—or 1,225 million SDR's over the 5-year period.

SDR's mainly will be employed within the monetary system for the same purpose and in the same way as gold; that is, by selling them to obtain convertible currencies in order to maintain the value of a member's currency exchange rate. In such a process the country using its SDR's normally because of payments difficulties, will ask the Fund to designate a recipient member (one normally with strong payments and reserve positions), and to debit its SDR account and credit the SDR account of the nation which is making convertible currency available. However, there is also another way of employing SDR's which does not involve the designation process. A member can make an arrangement to use its SDR's to purchase its own currency from another country holding it in surplus, provided the latter agrees to the arrangement. This would permit the United States, for example, to acquire dollars held by a foreign country by using Special Drawing Right units, in much the same way as it uses gold or convertible foreign currencies.

Because the Managing Director of the IMF has played a key role in the SDR negotiations, and will continue to occupy a central position, his views are of particular weight in describing how the new system would operate. Thus his concrete example of how SDR transactions might take place, although already widely quoted, is worth reproducing once again at this point:

"Let us suppose that, at some time in the future, drawing rights equivalent to a total of \$1 billion a year are created by vote of the Board of Governors. If we assume that a given country A has a quota amounting to 1 percent of total Fund quotas, the Fund will accordingly credit to country A in the special drawing account an amount of SDR's equal to \$10 million. Country A could add these to its reserves as it would be entitled to use them without question in case of need.

"Suppose, now, that country A does want to use them. In order to do so, it would have to convert them into a usable currency. It would therefore ask the Fund into what currencies it could convert an amount of SDR's equivalent to, say, \$5 million. The Fund would at any given time have a list of participating Fund members whose balance-of-payments and reserve positions were regarded as reasonably satisfactory. From this list the Fund would select appropriate countries to be designated. Since the amount involved in my illustration is small, we may reasonably assume that the Fund would select, say, two countries: Germany and Italy, for instance. In this event, the Fund would notify Germany and Italy that it was crediting their special drawing account with the equivalent of \$2.5 million each in SDR's and that they should place to the credit of country A in the books of their central banks a corresponding amount of deutsche marks and lire (or any other convertible currencies that Germany or Italy may own). At the same time the

Fund would debit the special reserve account of country A an amount of SDR's equivalent to \$5 million.

"As a result of these transactions, \$5 million of SDR's in country A's reserves would be replaced by \$5 million of currencies which it could then spend; and the reserves of Germany and Italy would increase, at least initially, by \$2.5 million each owing to the receipt of additional SDR's.

"Country A would be charged a moderate rate of interest (perhaps 1½ percent) on the SDR's which it had used; and Germany and Italy would be paid interest at the same rate. The value of the additional SDR's held by Germany and Italy, like the value of those allocated to them by the Fund, would be guaranteed in terms of gold.

"As long as country A used less than 70 percent of the SDR's which had been allocated to it by the Fund (and in my illustration it would be using only 50 percent), no repayment (or reconstitution) would have to take place. In due time, as its payments position strengthened again, it would no doubt be called on itself to provide currency in return for SDR's and so would tend to restore its holdings of SDR's. But if over a period of time its average utilization of all the SDR's which had been allocated to it by the Fund did exceed 70 percent, the excess would have to be repaid.

"I might mention, to round off my illustration, that Germany and Italy would be obligated to receive additional SDR's—including the \$2.5 million equivalent in my example—only up to a point where they were holding twice the amount allocated to them by the Fund."

To put the SDR plan described above into effect three steps must be taken by IMF member countries. In the first place, the amendment to the articles of agreement must be approved by Governors exercising a majority of the total voting power in the Fund (this step has been accomplished). Secondly, the amendment must then be accepted by at least 65 IMF members exercising a minimum of 80 percent of the total voting power. Finally, IMF members with 75 percent of the total quotas must deposit instruments with the Fund signifying that they have complied with all the requirements of their domestic laws and can carry out the obligations of participation in the SDR facility.

The Special Drawing Rights plan has no expiration date but there are certain safeguards and limitations relating to U.S. participation. Most important, decisions to create SDR reserves cannot be taken if the United States is opposed. Moreover, section 6 of the bill, described in more detail below, puts a limit on U.S. participation without further authority from Congress. This limit is reached when allocations of SDR's to the United States are equal to the U.S. quota in the Fund, which currently is \$5,160 million. Such an allocation figure should not be confused with the obligation of members of the plan—when in strong payments and reserve status—to purchase SDR's from other countries to the limit of three times the member's quota. It should also be noted that the United States and other members can withdraw from the Special Drawing Account by submitting notice to the Fund. The withdrawal is effective upon Fund receipt of the notice.

COMMITTEE ACTION

In a message to the Congress of April 30, 1968, entitled "Strengthening the International Monetary System," the President strongly supported the current proposal and urged early action. On May 2 there was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give effect to the President's recommendation. An NAC special report favoring such action was received by the committee on the same date from Secretary Fowler in his

capacity as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies. On May 2, 1968, Senator Fulbright, by request, introduced S. 3423, an identical bill to H.R. 16911, to provide for U.S. participation in the facility based on Special Drawing Rights. However, the House of Representatives passed its companion bill on May 10, 1968, and H.R. 16911 was thereupon referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

The committee held a public hearing on H.R. 16911 on May 13, receiving supporting testimony during the morning from Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, who was accompanied by Mr. J. Dewey Daane, member of the Federal Reserve Board, Frederic L. Deming, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, and William Dale, U.S. Executive Director in the IMF. During the afternoon session Mr. W. B. Hicks, representing the Liberty Lobby, and Mr. George A. Eddy, a private citizen, spoke in opposition to the bill. The hearing record was kept open for a week in order to receive written testimony from those who might have different views from those expressed at the formal hearing.

H.R. 16911 was placed on the committee agenda for action at a meeting on May 24, and again on May 27. At the executive session on the latter date the committee, without objection, ordered the bill reported favorably without amendment.

During the discussion within the committee, members emphatically voiced their continuing concern with the persistent balance-of-payments deficit position of the United States, and particularly with reference to the costs of the war in Vietnam. They noted that H.R. 16911 was not a measure which in itself would bring about improvement in the U.S. balance of payments, although there might be beneficial indirect effects at a later date. They strongly urged greater discipline and urgency on the part of the administration in dealing with the payments deficits. At the same time, they gave equally strong support to the view that the Special Drawing Rights plan should be implemented without delay.

(The following sections of this report are of a more technical and detailed character, and are not necessary to a general understanding of the SDR plan.)

CHANGES IN PRESENT IMF RULES AND PRACTICES

The amendment to the Fund articles, in addition to establishing the Special Drawing Rights facility, also makes a number of changes in the existing rules and practices of the Fund. Several of the changes represent codifications of existing practice or provide for technical improvements in the Fund's operations. In this category are improvements in the legal status of the gold tranche, payments of interest on super gold tranche positions, modification in the rules on repayments and service charges, and the reaffirmation of the temporary character of the use of the Fund's resources.

Another category involves changes in voting majorities. The amendment provides that an 85-percent majority will apply to general increases in quotas and conditions associated with paying quota increases, uniform proportionate changes in par values, and waiver of maintenance of value of the Fund's assets in the event of such a change. In addition, a Board of Governors Committee on Interpretation has been established to hear appeals from decisions of the Executive Directors on interpretation of the Fund articles. Decisions of the Committee can be overruled by an 85-percent vote of the full Board of Governors.

The modifications in the provisions on uniform proportionate changes in par values are a useful development. They give the United States, and the EEC countries acting together, a veto on a change in the price of gold. By making it more difficult to accom-

publish such a change it demonstrates the intention of the members of the Fund to maintain the present price of gold at \$35 an ounce.

The other changes in voting majorities, particularly with respect to quota increases, reflect the desire of the EEC countries to strengthen their voice in the Fund. The 85-percent voting majority requirement for certain major decisions would give the EEC countries, with over 16 percent of the total vote, a veto power over these decisions, provided they act together. The participation of most of the major surplus countries of Europe is essential for the successful operation of the Fund. The recognition of their increased economic strength in the new voting majority requirement is a reflection of the reality of the need for their participation in important decisions.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE LEGISLATION

In order to participate in the Special Drawing Account, the United States must deposit an instrument with the Fund stating that it undertakes all of the commitments of a participant in the Special Drawing Account in accordance with its law and that it has taken all steps necessary to enable it to carry out all of these undertakings. (To make the facility operational, such instruments must be deposited by members with 75 percent of the total Fund quotas.)

The primary commitment is the ability to accept Special Drawing Rights from other participants and pay a convertible currency in return—for the United States this would be dollars. Participants must have authority to accept Special Drawing Rights in amounts equal to three times their net cumulative allocations (art. XXV, sec. 4). The United States must also be prepared to pay charges on its use of its allocations of Special Drawing Rights (arts. XXVI, XXX, and XXXI), and pay such assessments as the Fund may make as the U.S. pro rata share of the administrative expenses of running the Special Drawing Account (art. XXVI, sec. 4).

Section 3 of H.R. 16911 authorizes the assumption of these responsibilities. It provides that Special Drawing Rights allocated to, or acquired by, the United States will be deposited in and administered as part of the resources of the Exchange Stabilization Fund established by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended (31 U.S.C. 822a).

Section 3(b) of the bill also allocates the proceeds of the use of Special Drawing Rights to the Exchange Stabilization Fund. Accordingly, this section imposes a corresponding responsibility on the Exchange Stabilization Fund to provide dollars against Special Drawing Rights when they are presented to the United States for acceptance. The commitment to provide currency against Special Drawing Rights is the touchstone of what makes Special Drawing Rights a valuable reserve asset. The United States must have domestic procedures that will give unquestioned assurance of our ability to meet this commitment.

Purchases of gold are similar in nature to purchases of Special Drawing Rights. When the United States buys gold, it pays dollars in return. Thus, in a sense, our acceptance procedures for gold are the same as those for Special Drawing Rights—the payment of dollars against the receipt of an asset. For gold, the domestic arrangements that assure that the United States can always supply dollars is the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue gold certificates, against an equal amount of gold holdings, to the Federal Reserve Banks in return for dollars (sec. 14, Gold Reserve Act, as amended, 31 U.S.C. 405b). When gold is sold, the resulting dollars are used to redeem the gold certificates which had previously been issued against the gold that was sold.

Section 4 of the bill utilizes a similar procedure by giving the Secretary of the Treasury authority to issue Special Drawing

Right certificates to the Federal Reserve banks in amounts equal to any Special Drawing Rights held by the United States. The Federal Reserve banks would credit the account of the Exchange Stabilization Fund with a dollar deposit in an amount equal to the value of the Special Drawing Right certificate. Special Drawing Right certificates would be issued and remain outstanding only for the purposes of financing the acquisition of Special Drawing Rights or financing exchange stabilization operations. Under this provision, dollar balances obtained by the Exchange Stabilization Fund through the issuance of Special Drawing Right certificates to the Federal Reserve banks could not be used for domestic purposes such as deposits in commercial banks or acquisition in the open market of U.S. Government obligations.

Section 4(a) provides that the amount of Special Drawing Right certificates issued and outstanding shall at no time exceed the value of the Special Drawing Rights held against the Special Drawing Right certificates. Thus, dollars resulting from the sale of Special Drawing Rights against which a certificate had been issued would be used under section 4(b) to redeem an equivalent amount of Special Drawing Right certificates.

The above financing method provides absolute assurance that the United States can meet its acceptance commitment.

Although acceptance commitments must be honored in order to make the Special Drawing Right facility work, they are not a burden on the United States. Acceptance of Special Drawing Rights against dollars involves an exchange of assets. In return for one asset—dollars—the United States will obtain a highly valuable international reserve asset—Special Drawing Rights—that it can use to meet problems arising from a balance-of-payments deficit or a decline in reserves. Because these transactions are exchanges of assets, they will have no effect on budget receipts or expenditures. Similarly, U.S. participation in the Special Drawing Account will involve no increase in new obligational authority.

Section 5 makes a number of amendments in the Federal Reserve Act to allow the Federal Reserve banks to hold Special Drawing Right certificates.

Subsection 5(a) amends the third sentence of the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 412), to allow the deposit of Special Drawing Right certificates as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The first sentence of the fifth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 415), is further amended by subsection 5(b) to allow Federal Reserve banks to reduce their liability for outstanding Federal Reserve notes by depositing Special Drawing Right certificates with the Federal Reserve agent.

Subsection (c) amends the seventh paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 417), by providing that Special Drawing Right certificates, like gold certificates, shall be held in the joint custody of the Federal Reserve agent and the Federal Reserve banks.

Subsection (d) amends the 15th paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 467), by allowing Special Drawing Right certificates, like gold certificates to be deposited with the Treasury.

The Exchange Stabilization Fund, in subsection 3(b), is given the responsibility for paying charges on use of U.S. net cumulative allocations, and assessments pursuant to article XXVI, section 4, Article XXVI, section 3, provides that the rate of charges on Special Drawing Rights will be 1½ percent, although this rate may be changed within the limits of 1 to 2 percent, by simple majority, and can be moved outside these limits if a wider range is decided on for remuneration

on super gold tranche positions under article V, section 9, as amended by the proposed amendment. Assessments may be made pro rata in proportion to net cumulative allocations to pay the administrative expenses of the Special Drawing Account. In most cases, charges and assessments are payable in Special Drawing Rights, although in certain circumstances charges in connection with liquidation might have to be paid in currency. Normally, it would be expected that the Exchange Stabilization Fund would reserve some of its holdings of Special Drawing Rights to pay charges and assessments.

Subsection 3(b) also provides that payments of interest to the United States on holdings of Special Drawing Rights in excess of U.S. net cumulative allocations would be deposited in and administered as part of the Exchange Stabilization Fund. The interest rate will be the same as the rate of charges described above. Interest earnings while the United States is holding Special Drawing Rights in excess of net cumulative allocations (which are paid in Special Drawing Rights) will provide a source of funds for paying charges when the United States is using its net cumulative allocations.

Article XXVII(b) provides that no tax of any kind shall be levied on Special Drawing Rights or on operations or transactions in Special Drawing Rights. The privileges and immunities of the Fund were given force and effect in the United States under section 11 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286h). Section 7 of the bill would follow this precedent by giving article XXVII(b) full force and effect in the United States, its territories and possessions upon U.S. participation in the Special Drawing Account.

Paragraph 3 of part I of the Executive Director's report to the Board of Governors of April 1968, notes (p. 6) two ways in which participants can meet their acceptance obligations: (1) By obtaining authority to accept the rights and responsibilities that go with Special Drawing Rights allocations up to a minimum amount of 50 percent of their quotas, and (2) by treating Special Drawing Rights in the same way as official holdings of gold and foreign exchange, which are usually subject to no legal ceiling, thus obviating any need for further legislative action. Section 6 would authorize U.S. participation in allocations up to an amount equal to the U.S. Fund quota of \$5,160 million and the U.S. Governor could not vote for allocations to the United States exceeding this amount. By placing a ceiling on the amount of Special Drawing Rights that may be allocated to the United States, provision is made for a congressional review of the experience with the Special Drawing Rights. But, by giving an authorization that is larger than the minimum suggested by the Fund, the United States would be indicating a more positive attitude toward Special Drawing Rights as a reserve asset than would be the case if the minimum acceptable participation authority were adopted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to give my full support to the pending bill, H.R. 16911, which provides for U.S. participation in the facility based on special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund and for other purposes. This measure was approved without objection and without amendment by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on Monday, May 27. It passed the House of Representatives on May 10 by a vote of 236 in favor and only 15 opposed following unanimous approval by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

There are only two ways of describing the nature and effects of the plan to create special drawing rights within the

IMF: one way is painfully short and oversimplified, the other is just as painfully lengthy and complicated. I am choosing to err on the side of brevity because more than ample descriptive material is provided by the printed hearings and the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations which are on Senators' desks.

Quite simply, the decision to create special drawing rights was taken by the international community of nations in response to a situation in which they faced the likelihood that there would be a shortage of international reserves. This could lead to a reduction in world trade with consequent repercussions on the domestic economies of most IMF members. For under current conditions of inadequate growth in reserves of both gold and foreign exchange, an effort by one country to correct its balance-of-payments deficit and replenish its reserve position must result in drawing down the reserves of one or more other countries. This condition can only lead to what is usually described as beggar-my-neighbor economic and financial policies.

To be explicit, this situation arises if the United States takes the needed strenuous measures to reduce its payments deficits, since at present this means drawing down the surpluses of the other industrialized nations, largely those of Europe.

By virtue of the projected plan to create special drawing rights within the International Monetary Fund, completely additional reserves will be deliberately created and distributed among participants in the scheme in agreed proportions. These so-called SDR's will exist only on paper—from whence comes the nickname of "paper gold"—but each unit will have a value equivalent to one dollar's worth of gold. They will be deposit entries on the books of the Fund which will be issued only to governments and exchanged only among governments which participate. The "backing" of the SDR's rests entirely on the solemn commitments of the participants to accept them, and on their knowledge that they can be transferred in return for convertible currency. However, the obligation to accept SDR's in exchange for convertible currency is entirely dependent upon the acceptor having a strong payments or reserve position. It normally will be up to the IMF to determine the countries to be chosen to receive SDR's which a country in deficit position might wish to exchange for other reserves.

In participating in this SDR plan the Fund countries will be creating a highly flexible and expandable reserve system which will be at the service of the participating countries—in contradiction from the current position in which countries are at the mercy of a rigid and restrictive gold exchange system. At the same time, such a high degree of unanimity is required in order to create an allocation of SDR's—normally on an annual basis for a 5-year period—that any inflationary threat or comparable difficulty is avoided.

The plan to create special drawing rights in itself is not designed to bring relief to the U.S. adverse balance-of-payments position. Indeed, so long as we continue to run our current rate of deficit

it is unlikely that the Fund members will agree to vote in favor of an allocation of SDR's. On the other hand, when we do start achieving real success with our efforts to remedy the payments problem, we and other nations will have the assurance that our program will not result in damage to the payments and reserve positions of the countries now in surplus. It is hard to overestimate the stimulus to international trade which is likely to result from the confidence created by such a plan to maintain adequate liquidity on a global basis.

During the 89th Congress, the Committee on Foreign Relations in its report No. 196 of May 1965 stated its recognition:

That the Fund over a period of nearly 20 years has been a vitally important source of monetary strength and leadership, and that it continues to be an indispensable instrument contributing to the economic growth and health of its member nations.

The committee then went on to recommend that the International Monetary Fund and particularly the other industrialized countries, in addition to the United States, should take an urgent approach to the requirement for an improved new international monetary system. Moreover, it was stated forcefully that strenuous efforts should be made to overcome the balance-of-payments deficits being experienced by the United States. The measure before us today to a large extent responds to the sound advice offered by the Foreign Relations Committee 3 years ago.

I must add that this is a measure which has secured a remarkable degree of strong and bipartisan support both within the Congress and within the business and financial community in this country. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to act favorably on H.R. 16911.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I strongly support H.R. 16911 as one of the most significant and far-reaching legislative proposals for the United States and for the free world which we have had before us in many years. It is important that Congress at this session authorize the President to accept the amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund and to participate in the new facility for special drawing rights. Events in recent months have demonstrated clearly the necessity of the long and arduous international negotiations which have culminated so successfully in the special drawing rights plan. The United States has played a leading part in these negotiations and their success justifies a conviction that the international monetary system can be strengthened for the years ahead through multilateral cooperation and action, by building upon the fundamental principles which we have supported since the end of the Second World War. Expert testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, has repeatedly emphasized the need for reforming our international monetary system. The same evidence has been presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am the ranking majority member.

Approval of the special drawing rights amendment now would help greatly in cutting down the risks of instability. Fail-

ure to act now would seriously disturb the international monetary system and have sharp and adverse effects upon financial markets throughout the free world. The world needs assurance now that a supplementary international reserve asset will be created. Without special drawing rights there is a danger that reserves cannot expand sufficiently to permit the sound growth of international trade and investment which has contributed so greatly to rising standards of living throughout the world in the past 20 years.

International reserves now consist largely of gold and foreign exchange, including substantial amounts of dollars, but the free world's reserve needs can no longer be satisfied by reliance primarily on these assets. Over the past 2 years there has been no addition to world monetary gold holdings. Industrial uses, hoarding, and speculative demands have taken all the world's production. And in the 4 months preceding the decision on March 17 on the part of the authorities of the gold pool countries to stop selling gold to the free market, it is estimated that world monetary gold reserves fell by about \$3 billion. Our dependence upon gold as an element of growth in the monetary system had in fact been diminishing, before March 17. Since that decision, further additions of gold to the world's monetary reserves are not part of plans and expectations for the future. The plan for special drawing rights makes it feasible not to rely on new gold as a part of future additions to global reserves.

The major element of growth in international reserves in recent years has been the U.S. dollar. Foreign countries now hold \$18 billion in their reserves representing about 25 percent of total world reserves. However, the growth of world reserves has been closely linked to deficits in the U.S. balance of payments, which have weakened the international position of the dollar. The United States must get its international accounts into balance and curtail sharply the net outflow of dollars to the rest of the world. The plan for special drawing rights has been designed specifically to assure that the world's need for reserve growth will be met adequately, and in a manner which will strengthen the monetary system, when the pressure of deficits on the dollar is reduced.

Special drawing rights will be created by conscious, deliberate and collective decisions of the participating members of the International Monetary Fund, and the arrangement is open to all members of the Fund. The procedures will assure wide support for their creation, with final responsibility for decisions resting in the Board of Governors of the Fund. Special drawing rights will be accepted, held, and used only by monetary authorities, who will be committed to pay convertible currency in exchange for them in transactions on official account. This commitment to accept them in return for convertible currency provides the assurance that they will be a valuable reserve asset usable without question when needed.

The special drawing rights plan is not a plan to solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problems. Nor will it solve all in-

ternational monetary problems. It points to the way in which the international monetary system can further develop, within which the dollar—strengthened as it must be through our efforts to achieve equilibrium in our external payments—can continue to perform a leading role as a reserve and transactions currency.

Special drawing rights are to be essentially book entries in the special drawing account of the Fund, and transfers will ordinarily be made by debiting the special drawing account of the user and crediting that of the receiver, as the latter country pays convertible currency to the country using special drawing rights. SDR will be denominated in units of account equivalent to the gold value of the dollar, and holdings of special drawing rights in amounts greater than those allocated to a country will bear interest at a rate of 1½ percent per annum. By comparison, gold is a dormant asset, earns no interest, and is expensive to hold. Dollars, on the other hand, earn at present far more than 1½ percent. The special drawing right, thus, is not—and is not meant to be—precisely the same as either gold or the dollar. It is a new asset designed to be able to stand on its own feet as a first-class reserve asset alongside gold and dollars.

Participants are committed to accept special drawing rights in transfers from others up to an amount double their cumulative allocations, so that total holdings of countries in strong payments positions may reach 300 percent of their allocations. And if they so desire they may also accept more than these amounts.

A few basic principles have been agreed upon under which the Fund will guide the transfer of special drawing rights from countries needing to use reserves to those with strong balance of payments or reserve positions. Countries needing to use reserves can at any point make use of any amount of the special drawing rights they hold. Over a 5-year period, however, a participant's average use of special drawing rights may not exceed 70 percent of its average allocations. This requirement for "reconstitution" is not onerous and represents a reasonable guideline for use of the new reserve asset, particularly in the early years of operations.

Very importantly, special drawing rights will provide the United States with an opportunity to rebuild our reserve position which has been weakened as the result of our balance-of-payments deficits. On the basis of present quotas in the International Monetary Fund, the United States would receive about 25 percent of each allocation of special drawing rights. They will be usable very much in the manner of traditional reserve assets in transfers between monetary authorities. The United States will use them in much the same way we use gold, though the hope of U.S. policy is that distributions of special drawing rights can be retained so as gradually to increase the level of U.S. reserves.

The legislation authorizes the United States to participate in this new facility, acting through the Exchange Stabilization Fund of the U.S. Treasury, the

instrument through which we conduct gold transactions with foreign monetary authorities. Domestic financing would be provided by operations between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve in a manner analogous to the financing of gold movements. The legislation authorizes the U.S. Governor of the Fund to participate in decisions to create special drawing rights up to the point where allocations to the United States would reach the equivalent of \$5,160 million, the present amount of our Fund quota. This authority is adequate to enable the United States to participate fully in this new facility, while it preserves the principle of later congressional review at such time as larger authority needs to be sought.

The amendment to the articles of agreement also makes certain modifications of the provisions under which the Fund has operated over the past 21 years. Three such changes are relatively significant. First, decisions by the Fund involving a general increase in quotas—for financial participation in the Fund's regular operations—are to be raised from 80 percent of the weighted vote to 85 percent. This change would mean that the EEC countries, if they acted together, as well as the United States, could prevent a general increase in quotas. This recognizes the greater economic strength and importance of the European Economic Community as well as its greater responsibility for the smooth functioning of the international monetary system. Second, a decision of the Fund to effect a uniform proportionate change in par values—that is to say, a change in the price of gold—would in the future require a majority of 85 percent, instead of the present simple majority. This is a welcome development since it makes more difficult a change in the price of gold. Third, a new procedure is to be introduced in the method by which the Fund makes formal interpretations of its own constitutional provisions. This is to be done by a committee of the Fund's governors, which will review interpretations decided upon by the executive directors of the Fund, and whose decisions will be final unless overturned by an 85 percent weighted vote of the full Board of Governors.

The proposed amendment, the first changes to be made in the articles of agreement since the Fund's inception, is strongly in the interest of the United States. Its acceptance now is the single most important step that can be taken to adapt the international monetary system to changing conditions and to strengthen it for the years ahead. It is important that the United States demonstrate its leadership by accepting the amendment and by certifying its readiness to participate in the Fund's special drawing rights facility. I therefore urge prompt passage of S. 3423.

Mr. President, some questions regarding special drawing rights have been raised, in a recent article in *Fortune*, by Mr. Eugene Birnbaum, now with the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and formerly an economist with the International Monetary Fund and the Department of Commerce. Mr. Birnbaum objects to the special drawing rights

amendment on several counts, and charges that the special drawing right "will shift monetary power still further toward Europe and away from the United States." He suggests instead a system of automatic drawing rights on the International Monetary Fund, along the lines originally envisaged at Bretton Woods, coupled with the abandonment of the present form of gold convertibility in favor of a system of supporting the dollar by borrowing foreign currencies through the Fund. Threats of discrimination in trade would be made against countries that refuse to lend their currency to the Fund for this purpose, under the so-called "scarce currency clause" in the Fund articles. He even hints at the possibility of an increase in the price of gold through a uniform change in par values in the Fund. Finally, he would do away with all the selective measures taken by the United States since 1959 to correct its balance-of-payments position, apparently relying entirely upon discrimination against surplus countries for any adjustment of international imbalances.

Mr. Birnbaum's suggestions lie in the realm of fantasy rather than real practical application. During the course of 20 years experience, the Fund has moved away from the concept of an automatic right to draw foreign currency to finance a deficit. It has limited automaticity to the first "tranche"—a segment of drawing rights equal to 25 percent of quota. Subsequent drawings on the Fund by a deficit country fall in the "conditional tranches," which means that the Fund reviews the policies being followed by the drawing country with a view to agreeing with the country on a program of policies designed to eliminate the balance-of-payments deficit. These conditional and non-automatic credit facilities have become widely accepted by the Fund membership as a constructive contribution to maintaining the stability and effective functioning of the system of par values. The special drawing rights amendment recognizes the general support for this policy and establishes a legal basis for the distinction between automatic drawing rights and conditional credit facilities.

The amendment thus clearly establishes two different functions for the Fund. One, a new function, is to provide drawing rights that can be used without question when a country needs to use reserves, and that therefore may be included in a country's reserves. The second and older function, now to be given specific and clear legal status, could continue to provide additional credit facilities, in conjunction with assistance to countries in formulating effective programs and policies to correct balance-of-payments deficits. Having both these functions equips the Fund to perform a more useful service to the world than would be the case under the single automatic drawing system favored by Mr. Birnbaum.

Moreover, it would be quite unrealistic to attempt to turn back the clock and overthrow the evolution of 20 years of experience in developing Fund policies with respect to the use of Fund resources.

There would be no support whatever for such a course on the part of European members of the Fund, and it is by no means certain that the Birnbaum proposal would find favor even among the developing countries.

Mr. Birnbaum's emphasis on the use of the "scarce currency" clause to threaten surplus countries with trade discrimination appears to be his main reliance in trying to reduce the "monetary power" of the European surplus countries, relative to the United States. When the United States was in an extremely strong position for a few years after the Second World War, the scarce currency clause was not invoked, although there was a good deal of trade discrimination practiced against the United States by countries that were short of dollars. With the ending of the dollar shortage, this discrimination against the United States on currency grounds has largely faded away, being replaced by other trade problems associated with the European Common Market and other factors.

There is therefore no precedent in the Fund for application of the scarce currency clause. It is, however, reasonably clear that an attempt to apply the scarce currency clause in the Fund would lead to difficult and controversial discussions in the Fund Board. If any decision authorizing discrimination against the European surplus countries were to be pushed, against strong resistance by the European countries, the result could be seriously damaging to the Fund's ability to function as a useful international institution. Application of sanctions in the form of trade discrimination tends to be regarded as a form of economic warfare, and would require a very high preponderance of support in the Fund to have any chance of success. Even under such unlikely conditions of a very high majority support, retaliatory trade measures and withdrawal of cooperation in Fund credit operations might well occur on the part of any country subjected to such trade discrimination. For these reasons the use of this clause may not be an effective means of inducing countries to lend their currencies to the Fund for the purpose of financing a U.S. deficit, as implied in the Birnbaum thesis.

While it is desirable to urge and encourage the surplus countries to assume a larger share of the responsibility for adjusting international imbalance, there would be no acceptance of the Birnbaum thesis that the United States should undertake no selective measures to bring its balance of payments into adjustment. These selective measures are necessary, even with the adoption of fiscal and monetary policies that will provide the fundamental basis for correction of the persistent deficit in our balance of payments. There is no useful basis for international cooperation in the implied Birnbaum suggestion that the United States should be able to invest freely abroad without concern as to the amount of dollars paid out to the rest of the world, and finance a resulting persistent deficit by endless drawings of foreign currencies from the Fund.

Mr. President, in view of the coming vote on H.R. 16911, a bill regarding U.S. participation in special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund, I draw to the attention of the Senate a very vigorous article by Dr. E. M. Bernstein in Wednesday's Washington Post, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

The Joint Economic Committee has rightly given strong endorsement to the SDR plan. Dr. Bernstein has been a long protagonist of international monetary reform, and testified in favor of SDR's before Mr. REVUSS' subcommittee on November 22, 1967. The concluding section of Dr. Bernstein's newspaper article is a neat rationale for the SDR plan.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 5, 1968]

WORLD MONETARY SYSTEM SEEN NEEDING
SDR's

(By Edward M. Bernstein)

(NOTE.—Dr. Bernstein was one of the key figures at the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference. He was the first research director of the IMF, is a consultant to the Treasury, and widely renowned as an expert on international finance. He presently heads EMB, Ltd. research economists in Washington.)

It is the history of institutions that each generation uses them in the light of its needs. That is entirely proper. Of course, there are dissenters calling on the world to return to the true faith, undiluted by new heresies. Mr. Eugene Birnbaum, once a member of the research staff of the International Monetary Fund, has assumed this role. He says, that the temple of the Lord built at Bretton Woods is being defiled. Our salvation is to go back to the faith of the founding fathers. Unfortunately, his interpretation of Bretton Woods would be completely strange to the founding fathers.

Mr. Birnbaum believes that the Fund was intended to participate in the settlement of all balance of payments deficits and surpluses, with deficit countries drawing from the Fund the currencies of the surplus countries. Drawings by deficit countries on the Fund, he says, were intended to be automatic within the quota limitations.

AUTOMATICITY AGREEMENT

In fact this is not so. The minutes of the meetings of the U.S. technical experts with those of other countries show that the only degree of automaticity the United States accepted was that a country should not be declared ineligible to use the resources of the Fund before it had received net credit of 25 per cent of its quota.

Beyond that, the United States suggested that the Fund could be allowed to enter into standby agreements with its members which would give them assured drawing rights of a stated amount. This idea was later adopted as a policy by the Fund and is now one of its standard techniques for drawings.

Automaticity of drawing rights to the full extent of a member's quota would be impossible. One of the exercises undertaken by the U.S. technical experts was to measure the liquidity of the Fund—that is, its capacity to provide resources for drawings. The liquidity was measured by the amount of gold and dollars held by the Fund as a ratio of the drawing rights of all members except the United States. A ratio of about 50 per cent was regarded as reasonable, precisely because drawings on the Fund were not automatic. Otherwise, the Fund would have had to have a liquidity ratio of nearly 100 per cent during the early postwar years.

LACK OF LIQUIDITY

It was long apparent that the liquidity of the Fund would not be sufficient in the event of a crisis. At a seminar at Harvard in October 1958, I said: "It is desirable, and even necessary, that the Fund have assured access to additional resources to deal with any contingency that may arise . . ."

In January 1962, at the urging of Treasury Secretary Dillon, the Fund entered into the General Arrangements to Borrow (GAB) with ten countries (the Group of Ten) under which they undertook to lend the Fund a total of up to \$6 billion if this became necessary to deal with a crisis in the international monetary system.

Mr. Birnbaum regards the Group of Ten as "an exclusive club for high-income countries, leaving the Fund with its bail-out operations for the weak sisters." In fact, the GAB is designed to make it possible for the Fund to finance massive borrowings by members with large quotas, so that its business would not be confined to bailing out the smaller countries. Without the GAB, the Fund could not have helped Britain to the extent it did during the sterling crisis.

Mr. Birnbaum holds that the United States should have financed more of its deficit by drawings on the Fund. The United States has been doing that for some years. What Mr. Birnbaum has in mind is large-scale purchases of European currencies to finance the major part of the U.S. deficit. Obviously, this would have required activation of all the borrowing power of the Fund under the GAB, and even then the Fund could have financed only a small part of the U.S. deficit of the past 10 years. More important, the United States would long ago have had to repay the Fund and this it could only have done by using its gold reserves.

Mr. Birnbaum seems to think that after the United States had used up its quota to finance its deficit (and exhausted the Fund's holdings of European currencies), the Fund would have been willing to declare a scarcity of these currencies. Mr. Birnbaum does not understand the scarce currency provisions of the Fund Agreement.

FUND PROCEDURES

It is naive to think that the Fund would declare 10 European currencies scarce because the United States has a persistent deficit in its balance of payments. Before any currency is declared scarce, the Fund must make a report and that report could not be favorable to a country whose imports increased by 45 per cent between 1964 and 1967. The Fund would be more likely to recommend higher taxes and control of capital outflow by the United States than to declare the currencies of all the surplus countries scarce.

The truth is that drawings on the Fund can be used only to meet temporary deficits that can be reversed in two or three years. Reserve credit alone, even very large credits from the Fund, cannot provide the confidence that is essential for a system of fixed gold parities. The availability of reserve credit gives assurance that a country can meet temporary payments difficulties. However, the use of reserve credit creates an obligation to repay in a more or less limited time, and countries will be reluctant to depend too much on reserve credit. For these reasons it is important for countries to have their own monetary reserves; and it is important to have an adequate growth of monetary reserves.

That is the purpose of the Special Drawing Rights. These are fiduciary reserves and they involve a transfer of real resources for SDRs that must ultimately be reversed or reimbursed in some other way. But they are not the result of credit operations and they do not create an obligation for repayment by a specific date. Even the provision for reconstituting 30 per cent of the allocations of SDRs is basically for the purpose of compel-

ling the use of other reserves along with SDRs.

FINAL RESERVE ASSET

The fact is that SDRs are a final reserve asset which no foreign exchange, not even the dollar, can be. In this respect the SDRs resemble gold and that is why there is nothing wrong in calling them paper gold.

Responsible officials have repeatedly said that the SDR's cannot relieve us of the burden of restoring our balance of payments or of the necessity of following policies that are essential for monetary stability.

"The SDR experiment is detrimental, Mr. Birnbaum says, "because it will shift international monetary power even more toward Europe." Power in the monetary sphere is the consequence of the payments position of a country, of its reserves and of its economic wealth and economic strength. You cannot create power by an international agreement; you can only assign responsibility.

One of the weaknesses of the international monetary system is that the surplus countries of continental Europe have not accepted financial responsibility to match their financial power. The Amendment to the Fund Agreement gives them more responsibility than they had, but not more than they should have.

If all of the Common Market countries were to vote as a bloc they could veto an increase in Fund quota. As a practical matter they always could make any increases in quotas ineffective by merely refusing to accept an increase in their own quotas—a provision of the Bretton Woods Agreement. Without more of their currencies, an increase in quotas would be meaningless because the Fund would not be able to finance larger drawings.

The international monetary system has gone through an evolution that has now made it possible to provide adequate reserves for the world economy without being affected by the uncertainties of gold production, gold hoarding, and gold speculation. The SDRs are an essential step in this evolution. I am confident that they will provide more reserves, and in the form of true reserve assets, than could possibly have been provided in the form of reserve credit through increases in Fund quotas. Our immediate objective should be to activate the SDRs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I want to record my vigorous and wholehearted support for the pending bill to provide for U.S. participation in the facility based on special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund. In my opinion, passage of this legislation is essential to the orderly expansion of world trade, to the economic growth of the participating nations and to the stability of the dollar. Indeed, the only reservation I have is that the plan to create SDR's essentially is a conservative measure which falls short of what I believe should be achieved in improving the world monetary system and providing sufficient international liquidity.

At the same time, I have nothing but praise for those American officials who participated in the joint effort to negotiate a scheme almost certainly as ambitious as any plan could be which had to be made acceptable to a minimum of 65 member-nations in the IMF. Treasury Secretary Fowler and Federal Reserve Chairman Martin head the list of those who have represented the United States in a very long and arduous negotiating process. But special mention should also be made of Under Secretary of the Treasury Frederick Deming, Federal Reserve Governor J. Dewey Daane and the

U.S. Executive Director in the Fund, William Dale; these gentlemen carried out in an exemplary way for many months the daily task of hammering out answers to a host of tough questions. Beyond that, additional confidence in the handling of these negotiations was generated in our country by the formation in July 1965 of the Advisory Committee on International Monetary Arrangements under the chairmanship of former Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, and with the participation of eight of the most prominent economists and financiers in American life. And let us not forget that this plan represents roughly 5 years of intensive thought and effort by a great number of experts from other countries, as well as the United States.

A second point I wish to make concerns the unusually extensive and profound interest shown by the U.S. Congress in this subject, dating back to the first moves to reform the monetary system. I have long taken a close personal interest in these matters, both as the former chairman of the International Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and currently as a member of the Economic and Social Policy and the International Organization Affairs Subcommittees of the Foreign Relations Committee. Indeed, when the Congress acted in 1965 to accept increased quotas in the IMF I took the occasion to add supplemental views to emphasize my agreement with the Committee report and to go further, stating as forcefully as I could the need to push urgently for a strengthening of the international monetary system.

We certainly were not alone in our advocacy of this cause in the Congress—quite the contrary. The House Banking and Currency Committee in April of 1965 was urging the administration in the same direction. Most important, the Joint Economic Committee—with a special contribution being made by its Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments—in August of the same year set forth guidelines which were employed in helping develop the U.S. position in the negotiations for the SDR plan. Contact has been maintained with such congressional units and individuals at various times during the lengthy talks, and particularly before the outline plan was approved at the Rio de Janeiro meeting last September.

Throughout this whole process the attitude on all sides has been one of non-partisanship. This was illustrated in the House by the overwhelmingly favorable vote of 236 to 15 on the pending bill. Here in the Senate it is highly significant that the first testimony favorable to H.R. 16911 printed in the Foreign Relations Committee hearing record came from Senator BENNETT, of Utah, ranking Republican member of the Banking and Currency Committee. And I should add my appreciation of the fact that the chairman of that committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, is also the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee; this continues the fortunate association between the two committees formerly maintained by the junior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I believe the only measurable opposition to this bill comes from those who have a financial or ideological stake in trying to reestablish the once paramount position of gold in the world monetary system. We surely had our fill of such advice back in the Great Depression, and will not again turn to the alchemists for guidance.

In keeping with the bipartisan spirit which has marked the progress of H.R. 16911 to date, I will close by quoting some of the remarks of former Treasury Secretary Dillon, who stated:

I have no hesitation in saying that the agreement that has been reached on Special Drawing Rights is a monumental step forward of the greatest significance. It removes a serious threat to the Free World's ability to continue the remarkable prosperity of the last twenty years. . . .

With the establishment of SDR's the Free World will no longer be dependent on insufficient supplies of newly mined gold and haphazard deficits in the U.S. balance of payments for the needed growth in reserves. It will now be possible to manage the required growth in world reserves in an orderly and sensible fashion by international decisions supported by . . . nearly all major countries. . . .

. . . Our own future is inextricably bound up with the health of the world's economy. Since the continued economic growth of the Free World is dependent upon the successful conclusion of the SDR arrangement, its prompt ratification is directly in our own interest, in the interest of all the people of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as one who has fought for many years for international monetary reform as a ranking Republican member of the Joint Economic Committee and as a member of the U.S. delegation when the IMF Board approved the SDR agreement in September 1967 in Rio de Janeiro. I am pleased to support enactment of this bill which would provide for U.S. participation in the facility based on special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund.

While the SDR's may not be the perfect solution for the ills of the system it represents the first concrete step toward the establishment of a system which is based on a rational, systematic creation of international reserves. The world economy has suffered from the existing system long after it became obvious that existing reserves were not going to be adequate especially the gold component.

I do not think it is necessary for me to summarize my position on the question of international monetary reform here. That is a matter of record. The devaluation of the pound, the gold rush and questions with regards to the confidence in the dollar abroad have clearly shown that the international monetary system had to be reformed.

It is essential that the SDR's be activated at the earliest opportunity so that expanding economic growth may be accommodated around the world and to prevent protectionist and restrictive measures that could come from any future shortage of international reserves.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has reported the special drawing rights proposal without opposition. Since this committee has the responsibility of dealing with international political developments and since

the SDR's may fall into such a category, I will honor the committee's decision by voting favorably. However, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and the International Finance Subcommittee, I must record the reservation which I have regarding the so-called paper gold and the present dilemma confronting the dollar and the world monetary system.

Developments over the last 7 or 8 months have made it painfully clear that the U.S. dollar and the global monetary system are in their deepest crisis since the early thirties.

Since the British pound sterling devaluation in November 1967, confidence in the dollar has been severely shaken. It was expected that the sterling devaluation would temporarily upset the world's exchanges, but few expected that the devaluation would create such violent reactions against the dollar—disrupting the very foundation of the world monetary system.

The great debate as to how the world's monetary system should be repaired somehow seems to be overlooking the basic underlying causes of the system's difficulties.

It is most interesting to observe the collective reactions of our country's official financial experts to this present situation. Instead of casting blame on a record of reckless fiscal and monetary practices, we find a growing desire to doubt the system itself. I must challenge such attempts to misplace the responsibility.

I believe the gold standard has proven to be the strongest and most equitable international monetary system in the history of the world. Unfortunately, because this country's monetary managers have disregarded built-in disciplines of the system, we now find ourselves in a critical financial situation.

The acceleration of the dollar's immediate difficulties began during 1964 when the administration attempted to turn a booming economy into what some observers now term as a "super boom." The 1964 tax cut, coupled with relatively easy credit practices, placed an undue strain on the economy.

Three subsequent moves from early 1965 until the pound devaluation in November of 1967 exerted tremendous pressures on the dollar and the international monetary system.

First. In 1965, with Vietnam war costs rapidly escalating, the administration chose to expand rather than to curtail its domestic spending. Cash outlays increased at an annual rate of over \$45 billion—domestic spending accounting for roughly 50 percent of the enormous increases.

Second. Federal deficits contributed \$20 billion more to an already boiling economy setting off the worst round of price inflation experienced in years.

Finally. In 1967, the Nation underwent a credit expansion resulting in an increase of 15 percent in the Nation's money and credit supply.

These accelerating inflationary pressures at home have triggered alarming difficulties in our balance of payments. The self-reinforcing wage and price

spiral automatically discourages exports and increases imports.

In the past, foreign financial circles were hesitant to question the stability of the dollar as long as we managed to maintain a surplus status in the U.S. trade balances. However, the United States has experienced a sharp deterioration in this particular account which began gradually during the later part of 1964. In that year, this Nation's trade surplus reached almost \$7 billion, the highest level since 1947. But, from 1964 to 1967, U.S. exports expanded by a modest 14 percent while U.S. imports skyrocketed 37 percent—the commercial trade surplus fell to less than \$4.5 billion.

Furthermore, in the first quarter of this year, imports ran at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of \$32 billion, and annual exports at a rate of \$31 billion—only a \$1 billion surplus. Also it must be pointed out that during March of this year this country experienced a trade deficit, not surplus, of \$157.7 million—the first month trade deficit in 5 years.

Recently, Barron's, the highly respected national business and financial newspaper, carried an article projecting a 1968 "commercial" trade deficit for the United States in excess of \$1 billion.

Barron's went on to say:

Such a development would come as a considerable shock to the international financial community whose confidence in the dollar has been supported by the fact that the U.S. has consistently shown export surpluses.

By overheating an already booming economy, the dollar is being hurt in two ways—imports are sucked in at a tremendous clip while higher prices are causing losses of markets for U.S. exports.

Devaluation of the pound acted as the catalyst that finally set off an explosive round of worldwide monetary speculation. The events that followed have been hectic to say the least.

The United States and the various gold pool countries provided over \$3 billion in gold to meet the demands. In the process, Congress was called upon to pass legislation to remove the 25-percent gold backing of the dollar—this move, according to the Treasury Department, would demonstrate to the world that the United States was prepared to defend the dollar to its last ounce of metal reserves, thereby discouraging further speculation. This measure did barely pass in both Houses of Congress—but within hours after passage, the "gold rush" had become so frantic that the President of the United States was compelled to call the British Prime Minister and ask him to suspend trading in the London Gold Market for an indefinite period until the crisis could be resolved.

That weekend the finance ministers of the various European nations flew into Washington to discuss the critical situation with Treasury Secretary Fowler and other monetary officials. The meeting resulted in the creation of the "two-tiered" gold system whereby the present gold price of \$35 an ounce would be maintained by all nations in their official dealings with each other; but with a free gold

market also permitted for all other transactions in gold.

Meanwhile, the U.S. gold reserves have continued to decline. Since the establishment of the two-priced system in mid-March, we have lost another quarter of a billion dollars worth of gold.

Secretary of the Treasury Fowler recently advised us that the two-tiered system would last for decades. Under Secretary Frederick Deming outdid Fowler by predicting that it would last "till hell freezes over." I beg to differ with the Secretary and the Under Secretary—never has the world's monetary system been so exposed. Never before has there been a barometer of our actions so open to the public—so reactive to the forces of the marketplace.

It seems obvious to most veteran financial observers that as the free market price of gold rises, dollar convertibility becomes questionable. And as the price of the free market gold rises, the confidence in the dollar as a unit falls.

Drastic pressure was placed on the dollar as the free gold price reached the \$40 level—with many economists believing that a \$45 price would bring about a forced dollar devaluation. Negative developments in the war, further rioting in our cities, unfavorable news in U.S. fiscal circles—virtually any bad news could set off another flurry of speculation that would drive the "free" market price to and past the \$45 danger level.

Another factor that threatens to disrupt the two-priced system is South Africa's policy of not selling its gold production on the "free" market. The South Africans supply almost 80 percent of the non-Communist world's demand for gold. Many believe it is only a matter of weeks before the "free" market will be unable to meet both the industrial and speculative demands for gold. I have been advised that South Africa will be able to continue this policy for at least 5 months before substantially suffering in their balance of payments.

The proposed creation of a new reserve asset called "special drawing rights" or "paper gold" received renewed interest at a meeting of financial ministers in Stockholm shortly after the March gold panic.

Special drawing rights are proposed as a vehicle to increase world liquidity for the purpose of expanding international trade and ultimately reduce the need for gold in the global monetary system. The SDR's or "paper gold" now seem to be presented at times as a blank check with which nations may meet their commitments. The implication has been that the SDR's will circulate as freely as gold. The fact is, central banks are willing to accumulate gold in unlimited quantities, whereas they insist on the right to limit their commitment to accept "paper gold." The agreement imposes a limit of twice the amount of their initial allocation. In other words, if a country is allocated \$50 million in "paper gold" by the International Monetary Fund, it need not accept more "paper gold" from other nations in excess of \$100 million.

Consider the amount the SDR's represent. The United States will be entitled to 24.6 percent of the total International Monetary Fund quota. If, as expected, \$1 billion is authorized for the fund, then the United States will have roughly \$245 million worth of "paper gold." If the decision were to activate \$2 billion in SDR's, then the United States would have approximately \$490 million in "paper gold." Neither figure is sufficient when viewed in the environment of a commercial balance-of-payments deficit of \$157.7 million which the United States experienced during March alone.

Another consideration is the timing for the introduction of the special drawing rights—activation would result only after the United States and the United Kingdom have firmly established equilibrium in balance of payments and/or when a de facto condition of world illiquidity is imminent. Concerning the first qualification, we have already considered the U.S. dilemma in this area of balance of payments. Regarding the second SDR condition, a lack of liquidity, I believe the real problem is a lack of confidence in the reserve currency units, the pound and the dollar. This situation will not be altered by the introduction of special drawing rights.

Those who have placed a great deal of confidence in the special drawing rights may be in for a sizable disappointment. The new medium of exchange has received considerable praise by its proponents but more especially by the U.S. Treasury Department. But, lest we forget, no monetary instrument is any stronger than the currency it represents.

The SDR's are tied to gold, expressed in terms of gold, and will only be issued to the various members of the IMF in relation to the amount of gold they have previously deposited with the IMF.

Fortune magazine states in its June issue that we can supplement gold as an international reserve asset, but we cannot supplant it. The structure of the present international monetary system is built upon gold—gold is mentioned explicitly in 10 of the 20 International Monetary Fund's articles of agreement, and in three of the five appended schedules to that agreement.

To say the least we have a long and tedious period ahead before the special drawing rights even begin to function as initially planned. Already the United States has had to make a major concession to the Common Market countries allowing them a powerful veto right over ordinary International Monetary Fund quota increases. This development has shifted world monetary power still further toward Europe and away from the United States.

I am afraid that we have engaged in the game of semantics to create a status quo at the expense of fundamental backing.

In conclusion, Mr. President, mistakes, then, have led to the present situation; lack of understanding has given it greater proportions; and avoidance of responsibility is resulting in crisis. The true question is whether or not responsible men will accept their obligations, define the problem, and come to action; or whether they will be forced to crisis ac-

tion from the exposure to undue pressure of the two-priced gold system and its effects on confidence in the dollar. We will fail if we do not have the courage to accept responsibility. We will succeed if we understand what results inaction brings. Proposals such as the special drawing rights are in no way a substitute for effective monetary and fiscal policies. We can no longer substitute words for action. Any action that attempts to buy time must pay something for that time. The payment is deterioration of the system's basic fundamentals. Will the problem be settled in the marketplace or will the administration attempt to accomplish an organized and understood solution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 16911) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1119, H.R. 15856. I do this so that the bill may be the pending business on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15856) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

- (1) Apollo, \$2,025,000,000;
- (2) Apollo applications, \$350,000,000;
- (3) Advanced missions, \$2,500,000;
- (4) Physics and astronomy, \$136,900,000;
- (5) Lunar and planetary exploration, \$92,300,000;
- (6) Bioscience, \$39,300,000;
- (7) Space applications, \$98,700,000;
- (8) Launch vehicle procurement, \$117,700,000;
- (9) Sustaining university program, \$9,000,000;
- (10) Space vehicle systems, \$31,800,000;
- (11) Electronics systems, \$35,500,000;
- (12) Human factor systems, \$19,700,000;
- (13) Basic research, \$21,000,000;
- (14) Space power and electric propulsion systems, \$42,300,000;
- (15) Nuclear rockets, \$55,000,000;
- (16) Chemical propulsion, \$30,200,000;
- (17) Aeronautical vehicles, \$74,900,000;
- (18) Tracking and data acquisition, \$289,800,000;
- (19) Technology utilization, \$3,800,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisitions, as follows:

- (1) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, \$386,000;
- (2) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, Florida, \$12,109,000;
- (3) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, \$1,500,000;
- (4) Michoud Assembly Facility, New Orleans and Slidell, Louisiana, \$400,000;
- (5) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, \$500,000;
- (6) Various locations, \$23,705,000;
- (7) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, \$1,000,000.

(c) For "Administrative operations," \$635,560,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Administrative operations" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed \$35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$100,000.

Sec. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" ap-

proprations, and, when so transferred, together with \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (7) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee, unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 5. (a) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for the payment of any salary of an individual convicted by any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction of—

- (1) inciting a riot or civil disorder;
- (2) organizing, promoting, encouraging, or participating in a riot or civil disorder;
- (3) aiding or abetting any person in committing any offense specified in clause (1) or (2); or
- (4) any offense determined by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and

Space Administration to have been committed in furtherance of, or while participating in, a riot or civil disorder; if the offense for which he is convicted is a felony. Any such individual holding a position in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the date his conviction becomes final shall be removed from such position.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "felony" means any offense for which imprisonment is authorized for a term exceeding one year.

(c) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to acts referred to in clauses (1)-(4) which are committed after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 7. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1969."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no debate or discussion on the NASA authorization bill, which is now the pending business, until Monday next.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1968

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 on Monday next, June 10.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On June 4, 1968:

S. 126. An act for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez;

S. 561. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Cape Hatteras National Seashore;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy;

S. 2409. An act for the relief of the estate of Josiah K. Lilly; and

S.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary funding of the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund.

On June 5, 1968:

S. 233. An act for the relief of Chester E. Davis; and

S. 1052. An act for the relief of Nicholas S. Cvetan, U.S. Air Force (retired).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, reporting, pursuant to law a violation which involved the appropriation

3660160 medical care, VA, for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report to the Congress on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF PROPOSED AIR NATIONAL GUARD FACILITIES PROJECTS

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF SUBMARINE "CAM- BRILLA" TO U.S. SUBMARINE VETERANS WORLD WAR II-TEXAS, INC.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of the proposed transfer by the Navy of the submarine *Cabrilla* (AGSS0288) to the U.S. Submarine Veterans World War II-Texas, Inc. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1967-March 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the opportunity to improve U.S. balance of payments through an increased agricultural barter program, Department of Agriculture, Department of State, Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Budget, dated May 29, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need to increase competition in procurements of anthracite coal by the U.S. Army for use in Europe, dated June 4, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE SEMINOLE TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Seminole Tribe of Oklahoma in dockets Nos. 150 and 248 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of pro-

posed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference and classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (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.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND TRAINING, INC.

A letter from the Executive Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc., the second annual report of the Joint Commission, covering the period April 1, 1967 through March 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, Madera County, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to the liberalization of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, Yolo County, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to the liberalization of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

The resolution of Clifford Yerks, Jr., of New York, N.Y., praying for the enactment of House bill 11308, relating to the National Endowment for the Arts; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Virginia Grand Lodge of the Order of Sons of Italy in

America, relating to Presidential appointments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 16674. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1166).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3590. A bill to provide permanent legislation for maintaining farm income, stabilizing prices, and assuring adequate supplies of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to compensate dealers for the amount of Federal excise tax paid on gasoline lost by leakage or spillage; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3592. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ali A. K. Mebed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 3593. A bill to designate the Mount Baldy Wilderness, the Pine Mountain Wilderness, and the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness within certain national forests in the State of Arizona; and

S. 3594. A bill to designate certain lands in the Island Bay, Cedar Keys, Passage Key National Wildlife Refuges in Florida, the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge in Georgia, and certain lands in the Petrified Forest National Park in Arizona as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 3595. A bill for the relief of Miguel Apaza; and

S. 3596. A bill for the relief of Lawrence W. Brink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3597. A bill for the relief of Yip Muk Kan, Chung Sit Chow, Pong Chun Siu, and Chan Siu Sin;

S. 3598. A bill for the relief of Stefanos Kampas; and

S. 3599. A bill for the relief of Dr. Camilo C. Balacuit, Jr., and his wife, Norma P. Balacuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3600. A bill to repeal the laws authorizing limitation of shipowners' liability for personal injury or death;

S. 3601. A bill to amend the last sentence of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes;

S. 3602. A bill to limit the liability of shipowners, and for other purposes; and

S. 3603. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the first three above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 3590—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO BE KNOWN AS THE "AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1968"—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which extends the 1965 Food and Agriculture Act for 4 years except that title I, which authorizes a class I base plan for milk is extended on a permanent basis. The bill also includes title II of S. 2973, the so-called Farm Bargaining Act. A number of very minor changes are made in the 1965 act.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry also wishes to announce that hearings will be held on the Proposed Agricultural Act of 1968 beginning June 24, 1968.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a short explanation of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 3590) to provide permanent legislation for maintaining farm income, stabilizing prices, and assuring adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanation, presented by Mr. ELLENDER, is as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—STAFF EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1968

This bill would—

(1) extend the authority for Class I milk base plans permanently;

(2) extend the other provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 for four years, with minor amendments;

(3) amend the marketing order law in a number of respects, including provision for collective bargaining.

DEVELOPMENT OF BILL

The Committee held hearings on April 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 24 on the Farm Program and Farm Bargaining. All witnesses who desired to be heard, including the Department of Agriculture, were heard. All proposals were considered carefully and the proposed Agricultural Act of 1968 was developed from those which appeared to have general support and constitute substantial improvement of the program.

TITLE-BY-TITLE OUTLINE

Title I extends authority for Class I milk base plans without change.

Title II extends the current feed grain program; permits payments in cash, as well as kind, and provides for cancellation of payment in kind certificates held by Commodity Credit Corporation on September 30, 1968.

Title III extends the current cotton program (including authority for transfer of allotments), but amends it—

(1) to permit farms that participate in the diversion program but plant no cotton to divert up to 35 percent of their original allotments and lease the balance;

(2) to permit transfer of that part of the allotment apportioned to the farm from the national acreage reserve;

(3) to repeal the requirement for filing allotment transfers between June 1 and December 31;

(4) to give the Secretary discretion as to the amount of export market acreage within the 250,000 acre maximum (rather than

have it fixed by statute in relation to carry-over reduction); and

(5) to permit a producer having export market acreage to export other cotton in lieu of that grown on his farm.

Title IV extends the current wheat program with the following changes:

(1) To conform to the method of computing county projected yields, farm projected yields would be computed on a five-year (instead of three-year) base.

(2) The cost of certificates to processors could be increased above 75 cents by the amount by which the parity price increased over the parity price as of July 1, 1969.

(3) The support price announced as early as May 1 would not be subject to change because of difference between the actual July 1 parity price and that estimated by the Secretary.

Title V extends the National Wool Act of 1954 without change.

Title VI extends the *Cropland Adjustment Program* with changes—

(1) permitting payment of expenses to members of the Advisory Board on Wildlife; and

(2) permitting the Secretary unilaterally and after ample public notice to terminate future cropland adjustment contracts when such action is in the public interest.

Title VII extends the provision requiring a rice diversion program whenever the national acreage allotment is less than that for 1965.

Title VIII contains miscellaneous provisions—

(1) extending authority to lease tobacco allotments;

(2) restricting the reduction in State or county projected yields from year to year to not more than 5 percent; and

(3) extending the current exemption of peanuts for boiling from marketing quotas.

Title IX makes a number of amendments of the marketing order law. It is identical to title II of S. 2973, except for division into sections, insertion of section headings, and exception of cotton, wheat, corn, grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, rice, forest products, soybeans, tobacco, and peanuts, and their products from collective bargaining provisions. It would—

(1) extend marketing order authority to any agricultural commodity or product thereof (except a canned or frozen product), and exempt any commodity or product from current exceptions and processor or other approval requirements, if the Secretary determines by referendum that a majority of the affected producers approve such extension;

(2) provide that where a milk marketing order provides a "method for fixing" minimum prices, that method will be by collective bargaining;

(3) provide for regulation of commodities other than milk by "species, or other classification" as well as "grade, size, or quality";

(4) authorize orders for commodities other than milk providing for establishing by collective bargaining minimum prices, terms and conditions (including above-parity prices);

(5) provide for producer allotments;

(6) provide for producer advisory committees; and

(7) provide for assessments against producers in the case of orders providing for bargaining or producer allotments.

S. 3593 AND S. 3594—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS RELATING TO WILDERNESS LEGISLATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills recommended to Congress by President Johnson to designate eight new areas as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

One of these bills would designate the Mount Baldy Wilderness, the Pine Mountain Wilderness, and the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness in certain national forests in the State of Arizona.

The other proposal would designate certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in Island Bay, Cedar Keys, and Passage Key National Wildlife Refuges in Florida, the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge in Georgia, and the Petrified Forest National Park, as part of the wilderness system.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 3593. A bill to designate the Mount Baldy Wilderness, the Pine Mountain Wilderness, and the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness within certain National Forests in the State of Arizona; and

S. 3594. A bill to designate certain lands in the Island Bay, Cedar Keys, Passage Key National Wildlife Refuges in Florida, the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge in Georgia, and certain lands in the Petrified Forest National Park in Arizona as wilderness.

S. 3600—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO REPEAL LAWS AUTHORIZING LIMITATION OF SHIPOWNERS' LIABILITY FOR PERSONAL INJURY OR DEATH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Transportation, a bill to repeal the laws authorizing limitation of shipowners' liability for personal injury or death.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the letter to the Vice President from the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Transportation transmitting his proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 3600) to repeal the laws authorizing limitation of shipowners' liability for personal injury or death, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1967.
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: We submit for the consideration of the Congress, a bill "To repeal the laws authorizing limitation of shipowners' liability for personal injury or death."

Under existing law shipowners can limit their liability for injury or death to passengers, crew members and other persons or for loss of or damage to cargo if the act causing such injury, death, loss or damage occurred without the privity or knowledge of the owner. The amount to which such owners can limit their liability under existing law

is the value of the vessel after the incident plus pending revenue, but if in the case of a seagoing vessel the portion of this amount applicable to personal injury and death losses is less than 60 dollars per ton of the ship's tonnage, such portion must be increased to equal 60 dollars per ton of the ship's tonnage.

The attached draft bill would repeal the provisions of existing law which permit shipowners to limit their liability for the death and injury of passengers, crew members and other persons, while leaving in effect the existing liability limits for loss or damage to cargo. This will remove existing inequities and bring maritime liability into the mainstream of the prevailing liability policies of the United States.

Specifically, the draft bill would delete subsection 183(b) of title 46, United States Code, which is the subsection providing the 60 dollar per ton limit of liability of the owner of a seagoing vessel for personal injury or death. Subsection 183(a) would be amended to provide that the general limitation provisions apply only in the case of damage to or loss of cargo. Subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 183 would be deleted since they refer exclusively to the limitation for personal injury and death in subsection 183(b), which is to be deleted.

Subsection 183(f) presently qualifies the meaning of "sea-going vessel" as it is used in sections 183(b), 183(c), 183(d), 183(e), and 183 b. Since section 183 (b)-(e) would be deleted by this draft bill, the substance of section 183(f) would be transferred to section 183 b, to which exclusively it would apply, and is denominated section 183 b (d).

Finally, 46 U.S.C. 189, which provides for a proration of liability among several owners of a vessel, would be amended to reflect that an individual shipowner's liability with respect to injury or loss of life would be unlimited.

During the 19th Century, the maritime industry was still a hazardous one and had become extremely competitive. As a fledgling industry most operations were marginal and the loss of one vessel without some low liability limit could very well spell ruin for most shipowners. At that time, insurance as a means of spreading the risk had not developed sufficiently to meet the then existing hazards. As a result, many maritime nations permitted a vessel owner to limit his liability to his investment in a particular vessel and voyage. American courts refused to permit comparable limitations in the absence of a statute. These rulings were felt to place the American vessel owner at a disadvantage compared to his foreign counterpart. This situation prompted Congressional action in 1851.

The 1851 legislation limited the vessel owner's liability for all damage, including personal injuries and death, to the value of the vessel after the incident plus any freight that was pending. The economic loss of passengers was not really taken into consideration in this legislation, the purpose of which was to provide economic protection to the maritime industry.

It was not until 1934 and the S.S. MORRO CASTLE disaster that the patent inequities and harshness of the original limitation was brought to the public's attention. In that disaster, the vessel was gutted by fire and 134 people were killed. The vessel owner established a limitation of \$20,000 the value of the burned hull. Had the hull been a total loss, the vessel owner would have been absolved from all liability at the expense of the injured and surviving dependents of those killed. Congress reacted to this situation by enacting the 1935 amendments to the limitation legislation in order to provide for a more equitable balancing of passenger-industry interests.

The 1935 amendments, among other things, provided for a minimum liability equal to \$60.00 per ton multiplied by the ton-

nage of the vessel. While the statute applied to "any seagoing vessel," the 1936 amendments, among other things, specified that "any seagoing vessel" did not "include pleasure yachts, tugs, towboats, towing vessels, tank vessels, fishing vessels or their tenders, self-propelled lighters, nondescript self-propelled vessels, canal boats, scows, car floats, barges, lighters, or nondescript non-self-propelled vessels, even though the same may be seagoing vessels within the meaning of such term as used in section 188" of title 46. Section 188 was enacted in 1886 and extended the coverage of the original limitation statute to inland waters.

The 1935 amendments applicable to personal injuries provided little additional protection. If a vessel of 5,000 tons were totally destroyed and 100 passengers were killed and injured, there would be only \$300,000 available to meet the resulting claims, or an average of \$3,000 per person, under existing law.

In 1965, this fact situation materialized with the sinking of the *Yarmouth Castle*. As of April 1, 1966, there were approximately ten million dollars in filed claims, which have increased to approximately sixty million dollars in 1967. While the ultimate recovery is usually lower than that contained in the initial filing, the figures illustrate the disparity between the economic and emotional loss resulting from a maritime catastrophe and the maximum limit of the shipowner's liability.

Such results are impossible to justify especially since the past rationale for a limitation, a fledgling maritime industry and a developing insurance industry, no longer exists. The maritime industry today is well established. It is also a less hazardous industry and insurance can be effectively utilized to spread the risks which remain.

Unlimited liability usually applies to pleasure craft owners because these owners are on board and control the operations of their vessels. However, certain courts have devised a very narrow concept of control and have applied the limitation to pleasure craft accidents. In the latter instances or where the owner is not aboard, the value of the vessel after the incident has been applied as the maximum limit of the owner's liability.

This application of the limitation legislation is primarily the result of its piecemeal development. In 1886, as previously mentioned, the original legislation was extended to inland shipping as well as seagoing vessels. The 1936 amendments, however, providing for the \$60 per ton minimum fund were specifically limited to "seagoing vessels," which by the same amendment excluded many types of craft. As a result, the excluded vessels remained subject to the original limitation which was the value of the vessel after the incident. What originally had some rational foundation when applied to commercial enterprises during their formative years can now be an opportunity to avoid responsibility when applied to pleasure craft. Our increasing concern is accentuated by the high accident rate for pleasure craft. For example, in 1966 over 4.3 thousand boating accidents resulted in 1,318 deaths and 1,555 injuries.

The proposed legislation would do away with these anomalies and would bring maritime liability more in line with the existing public policy relating to personal injuries. For example, a minority of the states have statutory wrongful death limitations. Recent years have seen the repeal of such statutes in some states and the courts are moving in the direction of restrictive application of these statutes. The existing federal wrongful death statutes contain no limitations and are premised upon proving one's actual damage. Personal injuries and death, with the exception of international air accidents, are subject to no limitation. By virtue of an agreement modifying the widely adopted Warsaw Convention of 1929, international air

carriers are the only carriers other than maritime carriers privileged to limit their liability. That limit, however, is relatively high compared to maritime limits (\$75,000 per person, or \$58,000 exclusive of legal fees and costs), and the air carriers' liability is absolute. This is a far cry from the maritime situation where the passenger must still prove negligence in order to recover.

In addition, the existing limitation is inconsistent, in one sense, with the financial responsibility laws applicable to American and foreign ocean passenger carriers. In 1966, P.L. 89-777 was enacted which provides that any passenger carrier embarking passengers at United States ports and having accommodations for fifty or more passengers must establish its financial responsibility in the following amounts: \$20,000 for each passenger accommodation up to and including five hundred; plus \$15,000 for each additional passenger accommodation between five hundred and one and one thousand; plus \$10,000 for each additional passenger accommodation between one thousand and one and one thousand five hundred; plus \$5,000 for each passenger accommodation in excess of one thousand five hundred.

But with the presently applicable liability limits, the amount of financial responsibility may very well exceed a shipowner's liability. The proposed legislation would also have the effect of removing this inconsistency.

In view of the prevailing public policy regarding the liability of a common carrier to its passengers and the fact that the traditional reasons for a limitation are no longer present, the Departments of Commerce and Transportation recommend enactment of the proposed legislation here submitted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that submission of this proposed legislation is consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD,
Secretary of Transportation.
HOWARD J. SAMUELS,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

S. 3601—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND SECTION 201(b) OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIALISTS BY THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, a bill to amend the last sentence of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the letter from the Secretary of Commerce to the Vice President transmitting the proposed legislation and the accompanying statement of purposes and provisions which explains the changes this bill would make in existing law.

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

The bill (S. 3601) to amend the last sentence of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1968.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Submitted herewith are four copies of a draft bill "To amend the last sentence of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes." The accompanying statement of purposes and provisions explains the changes the draft bill would make in existing law and the need for enactment of the bill.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

C. R. SMITH,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSES AND PROVISIONS OF THE DRAFT BILL TO AMEND SECTION 201(b) OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

The last sentence of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provides that it shall be unlawful for any employee of the United States Maritime Commission to be in the employ of any other person, firm, or corporation, or to have any pecuniary relationship with any carrier by water, shipbuilder, contractor or other person with whom the United States Maritime Commission may do business.

Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 abolished the United States Maritime Commission, created the Federal Maritime Board, created the Maritime Administration as an agency within the Department of Commerce, divided the promotional responsibilities of the former United States Maritime Commission between the Federal Maritime Board and the Department of Commerce and gave the regulatory responsibilities of the former United States Maritime Commission to the Federal Maritime Board. Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 provided that the last sentence of section 201(b) should apply to the officers and employees of the Federal Maritime Board and of the Maritime Administration.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 abolished the Federal Maritime Board, created the Federal Maritime Commission, gave the promotional functions of the former Federal Maritime Board to the Department of Commerce and gave the regulatory functions of the former Federal Maritime Board to the Federal Maritime Commission. Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 applied to last sentence of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to the officers and employees of the Maritime Administration and of the Federal Maritime Commission.

The provisions of the last sentence of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, are more stringent than the conflict of interest statute which is applicable to officers and employees of the Executive Branch in general (chapter 11, title 18 U.S.C.), and this additional stringency in some cases interferes with the efficient operation of the Maritime Administration. Under the restrictions of the last sentence of section 201(b), the Maritime Administration is unable to obtain temporary, part-time, or intermittent services of specialists presently employed in the maritime industry or employed by other firms with whom the Maritime Administration may do business. In addition under the restrictions of section 201(b), Maritime Administration is unable through temporary employment in the maritime industry to obtain highly desirable maritime knowledge and experience that would be directly related to their official duties. Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code does not prohibit such employment.

Legislative relief is needed to permit the Maritime Administration to obtain the serv-

ices of specialists when needed, and to permit selected Maritime Administration employees to obtain greater or additional experience in the Maritime field and thus to update and improve their knowledge, ability and qualifications. Specific examples of the problems raised by the last sentence of Section 201(b) and the need for additional outside experience are set forth below:

a. An individual is employed as a part-time law clerk in an admiralty law firm which represents shipping companies doing business with the Maritime Administration. His services were needed on a temporary part-time basis to teach a course in admiralty law at the Merchant Marine Academy. He was, of course, not willing to sever his connections with the admiralty law firm, his primary employer, to accept temporary intermittent employment. It was determined that his employment was prohibited under section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

b. An Associate Professor of the Department of Nautical Science, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, teaches navigation, astronomy and seamanship. He has a Chief Mate's license and last sailed in 1952. He recognizes the need to update his sea experience, most of which was obtained during and after World War II, and he applied for permission to sail as Chief Mate aboard subsidized ships for about nine months in 1964 in order to gain experience on modern ships on which new practices and equipment exist and, to raise his license. Had it been possible to approve his request, he would have been able to revise his course presentation and the additional service would have enabled this teacher to maintain and improve his qualifications in his specialized field. Additionally, the Master's license which he would have acquired would have raised the general level of technical qualifications of the Academy's Department of Nautical Science. This faculty member has a Master's degree. At the time the faculty member made his request, he did not have a commitment for employment with any steamship company. His request was for permission to seek such employment. However, there was no doubt that he would have been successful due to the shortage of licensed seagoing officers. Furthermore, it is sometimes desirable to hire younger members with lower licenses and advance them to higher ranking positions, as circumstances warrant, as their qualifications increase. The only way the desired sea service experience can be upgraded is to return to sea.

c. Another example is an Assistant Professor of Nautical Science who teaches Cargo Handling. He already has his Master's license. In 1963, he requested permission to seek employment in port, aboard vessels with the latest cargo handling devices. Had it been possible to approve this request, it would have enabled the Academy to have one officer with first hand experience in the new hydraulic hatches and it would have enabled the faculty member to become familiar with the latest practice and equipment in Cargo Handling, thereby increasing his value as a teacher of Cargo Handling. Even though this faculty member last sailed as recently as 1956, he believed that his experience was rapidly becoming stale. This was a correct evaluation and it applies even more so to the older officers and employees of the Academy, many of whom have not sailed for 20 years. There is no substitute for first hand, current experience and it is our opinion that certain officers and employees should be given the opportunity to return to sea periodically.

d. A Marine Surveyor, GS-11, in one of the Coast Districts was initially recruited as a Trainee in the college recruiting program. His sea career had advanced his licensed rating to First Assistant Engineer. In order to improve his technical knowledge and at the same time enable him to qualify for a Chief Engineer's license which would materially enhance his effectiveness in day-to-day contacts on the job, he requested one year's leave to accept a seagoing position with

a steamship company. This was denied since it was in violation of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act. The identical situation prevailed when a Ship Operations Assistant, GS-11, requested leave to accept a sea position to observe current cargo-loading methods with latest gear, shipboard sailing and working conditions, and at the same time to upgrade his license to Master. This, too, was denied.

e. Another employee who sought permission to return to sea to upgrade his experience was an Operations Specialist. His duties include: advice and assistance to vessel owners and operators in delivery and redelivery requirements; study, analysis and development of comparative cost data on various operations of subsidized lines; direction of the installation, maintenance and use of radiological monitoring equipment and ABC washdown gear; training of marine personnel in the operation of radar and gyrocompass equipment, etc. He was one of the first licensed volunteers (Deck Officer) for the NS SAVANNAH assignment. The employee is a graduate of the New York State Maritime Academy and served as an instructor there, as well as at Kings Point during World War II. He was a Naval Officer during this latter period. He has sailed under various ratings up to and including that of 2nd Mate and has been licensed by the Coast Guard as a Chief Mate since 1938. His shoreside experience includes employment as Marine, Port and Stevedore Superintendents, Assistant Wharf Superintendent, Marine Representative and Travelling Stevedore. Returning to sea, even briefly, would have aided this employee in his attempt to remain abreast of current developments in the merchant marine field. As Ship Operations Specialist, the need of staying current in this field is apparent, especially in this period when automation is scheduled, at least in part, on all newly constructed vessels.

f. In 1957 another faculty member, then a teacher of Advanced Steam Engineering with a Chief Engineer's license, desired to upgrade his experience on modern propulsion systems. This faculty member had previously obtained a Bachelor's degree in Mechanical Engineering from Cooper Union and desired to increase his practical knowledge of marine engineering. However, the restrictions of Section 201(b) prevented him from going to sea while on the rolls of the Academy. Therefore, as he was then on active administrative duty as an enrollee in the U.S. Maritime Service, he requested and obtained a release to inactive duty, the equivalent of separation, and accepted employment as a Marine Engineer with Sinclair Oil Company on its tankers. This experience helped him to become one of our best teachers of steam engineering. There is no doubt that the Academy and the Government gained by his action. However, this faculty member now has one year less creditable service, which will reduce his retirement benefits. Should an employee become disabled while not employed by the government, he would not be eligible for civil service disability retirement and in the event of his death his dependents would not be eligible for a survivor annuity.

The last sentence of section 201(b) applies to employees of the Federal Maritime Commission as well as to employees of the Maritime Administration. The draft bill would repeal it only insofar as Maritime Administration employees are concerned. It would still apply to employees of the Federal Maritime Commission.

S. 3602—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO SHIPOWNERS' LIABILITY FOR PERSONAL INJURY OR DEATH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Pacific American Steamship Association, for ap-

propriate reference, a bill to limit the liability of shipowners, and for other purposes.

This bill relates to the same subject matter as another bill I have introduced today at the request of the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Commerce. The measure which I am now introducing by request is identical to S. 2314 of the 87th Congress as ordered reported by the Committee on Commerce. In contrast to the bill introduced at the request of the administration this measure would not repeal limitation of liability, but would preserve limitation of shipowner liability but at a higher level of indemnification to cargo, passenger, and crew than obtains in the present law (46 U.S.C. 183, et seq.).

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

The bill (S. 3602) to limit the liability of shipowners, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATE RESOLUTION 300—RESOLUTION RELATING TO DEATH OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT F. KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 300) relating to the death of the Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY, late a Senator from the State of New York, which was considered and agreed to.

(See reference to the above resolution when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

SENATE RESOLUTION 301—RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR FUNERAL EXPENSES OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 301) to provide funds for funeral expenses of ROBERT F. KENNEDY, which was considered and agreed to.

(See reference to the above resolution when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 842

Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. CANON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 15856) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 843 THROUGH 845

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 15856, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 6, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1581. An act to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 584);

S. 2178. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois;

S. 2634. An act to amend section 867(a) of title 10, United States Code, in order to establish the Court of Military Appeals as the U.S. Court of Military Appeals under article I of the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2585. An act for the relief of Kap Rai Kim and Young Nam Kim;

S. 2884. An act to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; and

S. 3017. An act to change the provision with respect to the maximum rate of interest permitted on loans and mortgages insured under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

SUPPORT FOR THE EISENHOWER COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last night, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I met with President Johnson at the White House before his address to the Nation.

Senator DIRKSEN and I are in complete agreement that the single, bipartisan Commission appointed by the President is urgently needed and represents the best answer to this pressing national problem.

President Johnson is to be commended on the excellent makeup of this Commission.

This is a bipartisan Commission; a biracial Commission, and an interreligious Commission, composed of distinguished Americans who possess the best possible credentials for this important task.

The great tragedy that has befallen the Nation with the death of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY testifies to the urgent need to discover why sick souls in the dark corners of our society have taken from us some of our most vibrant, brilliant leaders. Senator KENNEDY, President Kennedy, Martin Luther King, three radiant lights that illuminated what was best in our country, and each extinguished in his prime of life by sick, irrational individuals.

President Johnson was right when he said last night that 200 million Americans did not kill ROBERT KENNEDY. I do not believe that we, the people, taken en masse, are anything less than law-abiding, concerned citizens.

Yet we have produced a society in which lawlessness and violence, inequities and injustice occur all too frequently.

It is simply not enough to shed tears over this brutal and senseless killing. Nor is it enough to admit that our society has helped to produce the kind of atmosphere in which these terrible assassinations occur.

We must come to grips with this problem. We must try to discover the answers to what produces the kind of senseless hatred that has struck down three of our greatest leaders.

This is the enormous task placed on the shoulders of the Eisenhower Commission. Its members are drawn from the fields of education, religion, writing, and public life, including Members and former Members of Congress. They include Dr. Milton Eisenhower, as Chairman; Archbishop Terence Cooke, of New York; former Ambassador Patricia Harris; Eric Hoffer; Albert Jenner; Senators HART and HRUSKA; Representatives HALE BOGGS and WILLIAM McCULLOCH; and Judge Leon Higginbotham.

These brilliant minds will focus on the heart of our Nation's problem with violence and killing. We can expect no miracles from the Eisenhower Commission. But we do believe it will probe more deeply than ever before into the problem of violence in our society. We do believe it will help to point the way to corrective steps in the future.

That, in my judgment, is reason enough for hope—and for our prayers for its success.

READER'S DIGEST SUPPRESSES BOOK

Mr. HART. Mr. President, within the past 2 years there have been dozens of mergers in the book publishing industry. Small publishers have merged with large ones, large publishers have merged with magazine and broadcasting companies and companies dealing in printed communications have merged with large electronic companies and diversified manufacturing firms.

Almost without exception, each of the mergers is accompanied by the assurance that the merger will have "no effect on the acquired company's editorial policies." Occasionally it is suggested that the merger will give the publishing house the resources to be even more fearless and free in the projects it undertakes. Despite the tone of these press releases, the uneasy feeling that the independence of the acquired publishing house has been lessened—that it may on occasion be more of a house organ than a free voice—has remained in many minds.

Mr. President, the New York Times of June 2 carried an article entitled "Reader's Digest Suppresses Book: Work Critical of Advertising Dropped by Publishing Unit," written by Henry Raymond. The article reports that Reader's Digest, which recently purchased Funk & Wagnalls, a publishing house, ordered Funk & Wagnalls not to release a book critical of the advertising industry, even though the book already had been printed and, in fact, reviewed in the trade press. Reader's Digest management said the book was canceled because it did not jibe with company philosophy.

Obviously the fears of the fearful—and I include myself—are not without foundation.

Some may say I am still boxing shadows—that one dark spot does not mean the whole fruit is bad. That is true. However most must agree that the possibility

of judging subjects not on their literary value but in the light of the best image of a parent corporation is present in all such situations.

The fact that we can point to one example now where a book judged to be of value on one standard was quashed on the other does not mean it is the only time this has happened. After all, editorial decisions by nature are seldom exposed to public view.

The whole area is ticklish. But it seems to me that we should all share a concern that the increasing takeover of independent publishing houses by conglomerates may be eroding the independence of the press we value so highly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1968]
READER'S DIGEST SUPPRESSES BOOK—WORK CRITICAL OF ADVERTISING DROPPED BY PUBLISHING UNIT

(By Henry Raymond)

For the first time since their merger two and a half years ago, the Reader's Digest Association has ordered Funk & Wagnalls not to publish a book, even though it has already been publicized and 5,000 copies have been printed.

The book is "The Permissible Lie," a critical study of the advertising business, by Samm Sinclair Baker. It had been scheduled for publication Wednesday.

Mr. Baker, a former advertising executive and author of several books, said yesterday he was advised last week that the publishing plans had been canceled.

He said the corporate management of the Reader's Digest Association had overruled his editors at Funk & Wagnalls because it had found the book to be "contrary to the best interests" of its mass-circulation magazine, The Reader's Digest.

"I was told that The Reader's Digest believes that advertising is good for business and that business is good for the country," Mr. Baker added. "The implication was that it was almost an unpatriotic book."

PRECEDENT IS SEEN

Perry H. Knowlton, Mr. Baker's literary agent, said yesterday: "This cancellation, a few weeks before publication, is probably the first instance of such censorship in book publishing history."

Hobart Lewis, president of the Reader's Digest Association, said at his home in Pleasantville, N.Y., that the book was withdrawn because "it doesn't jibe with the philosophy of the Reader's Digest." He said he did not feel called upon to explain that philosophy.

But Mr. Lewis rejected any suggestion that the decision constituted literary censorship. He said that no attempt had been made to prevent Mr. Baker from giving the book to another publisher.

"We have not taken back the author's advance and we have given him the plates of the book," Mr. Lewis said. "I assume and hope he will publish it elsewhere. The book simply did not meet our standards and I reject any suggestion that this was censorship."

Mr. Knowlton, president of Collins-Knowlton-Wing, Inc., one of the country's leading literary agencies, said six other publishers had already expressed interest in the book and that he did not foresee any difficulty in getting it published.

THREAT TO INDEPENDENCE

"But that is hardly the point," he added. "This action would seem to me to jeopardize a

major argument in defense of the recent trend of publishing mergers—that the small publishing houses acquired by the big communications empires will retain their editorial independence."

Mr. Knowlton was alluding to repeated assurances by big corporations that they intended to respect the editorial autonomy of any independent publishing house they acquired. The most recent case was that of Time, Inc., when it purchased Little, Brown of Boston.

A case often cited in the book trade to illustrate continued editorial independence after a merger is the publication by Random House of Fred Friendly's "Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control," a critical book about the television industry. Random House is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Radio Corporation of America, which also owns the National Broadcasting Company.

The Reader's Digest Association acquired the 88-year-old Funk & Wagnalls Company in December, 1965, for an undisclosed sum. Since the merger, the reference book publishing company has expanded its non-fiction books to include such authors as Jim Bishop and Arthur Krock. It also publishes the Reader's Digest anthologies.

EMBARRASSING SURPRISE

The cancellation of Mr. Baker's book came as an embarrassing surprise to Funk & Wagnalls editors. One executive of the company conceded that attacks on the book by pre-publication reviews in several advertising trade journals played a role in the decision.

George Blagowidow, general manager of Funk & Wagnalls, said the reviews were "among the many elements that led to this decision."

Sherman Baker, a senior editor who was in charge of developing the company's non-fiction list until his retirement last year, called the cancellation of the book "a scandalous affair."

The author of "The Permissible Lie" now in his mid-60's, is a former president of Donahue & Coe, an advertising agency. His previous books include "Your Key to Creative Thinking" (Harper & Rowe); "Casebook of Successful Ideas for Advertising and Selling" (Doubleday), two books on gardening and two mystery novels. He lives in Mamaroneck, N.Y., with his wife, Natalie, an artist and teacher. Their son, S. Jeffrey Baker, is an editor at St. Martin's Press.

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, devastating major disasters have already struck widely scattered areas of the Nation this year. Many communities and families have suffered great losses because of tornados, hurricanes, and floods. One can predict with confidence that other similar tragedies will befall our people in the months and years ahead.

Fortunately, Congress nearly two decades ago acted to provide significant assistance to help restore public facilities and utilities which have been destroyed by major disasters. In the private sector, however, until 1966 Federal aid was extended only by special enactments from time to time for particular areas on a retroactive basis. In the latter years, Public Law 89-769 among other things made available long-term, low-interest loans for the repair and reconstruction of private homes and businesses which become damaged or demolished in major disasters.

Mr. President, I do not believe that this kind of aid is enough. During the hearings on the two disaster relief bills

which I introduced, too many examples of individuals incurring losses which have swept away their life savings and left them impoverished became evident for me to rest complacently in the belief that our task was finished. In the name of humanity I urge that we provide for our own fellow Americans who, through no fault of their own, have been subjected to totally unexpected and undeserved injuries and damages, the same kind of relief which the American people have extended time and again to disaster sufferers overseas.

A good example of the problem I am referring to was pointed out by the New York Times in two articles on June 2 and 3, describing the great losses incurred in recent flooding in New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from these two articles be printed in the RECORD. I call particular attention to the plight of several residents who have lost their homes, furnishings, and personal possessions and are confronted with overwhelming obstacles in seeking permanent aid. Note also that Mayor Edward Sisco, of Wayne, pointed out that most homeowners were not able to carry expensive riders on their insurance policies which would have provided coverage against floods.

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

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1968]
JOHNSON TO WEIGH JERSEY FLOOD AID—TELLS HUGHES PLEA WILL BE STUDIED—GOVERNOR FLIES OVER AREA AS RIVERS FALL

NEWARK, June 1.—President Johnson said today that he would give "careful consideration" to Gov. Richard J. Hughes' request for Federal aid to the six flood-ravaged counties of Northern New Jersey.

But homeowners in the region, who were pumping water out of basements and discarding soaked furniture today, complained loudly that they would never see any of the money.

Under existing law, Federal assistance is provided only to municipalities and businesses in the forms of grants and loans. There is no provision for aiding the owners of private homes.

"The individual homeowner just loses out on this," Governor Hughes said after a two-hour helicopter flight over the area, "and it is a tragic thing."

The Governor said that "unfortunately" the House of Representatives in Washington had not yet acted on a Senate-passed bill that would make aid available to people whose houses were damaged by disasters.

Mr. Hughes requested the Federal aid after flooding on the Passaic and Pompton Rivers forced 2,000 people to flee their homes. Six deaths, including those of five children, were attributed to the floods.

In a telegram to Governor Hughes, President Johnson said that "I'm distressed to hear of the flood emergency and hope that the situation will improve rapidly." The message was released by the State Commissioner for Conservation and Development, Robert A. Roe.

MANY RETURN TO HOMES

Evacuated families continued to return to their homes, some to begin the massive job of cleanup and repair, others simply to inspect the damage and reassure themselves that their houses were still intact.

Mrs. Barbara Fitzgerald stood in bare feet in the gymnasium of Wayne Valley High School, where she, her four children and her husband have been sleeping on cots for three

days. She had just returned from wading through knee-deep water to her house in Wayne.

"I don't know what we'll do," she said. "The floors are all buckled. The heating system's gone."

She said that clothing and furniture had been ruined when muddy water swirled into the ground floor of the building. Her husband, she said, earns only \$185 every two weeks.

"I think I'll write Governor Hughes and ask him how I'll pay for this," she added angrily.

In West Paterson, Mrs. Magdaline Verrilli stood like a ship captain on the front steps of her neat brick house, surrounded by water.

"We haven't left," she said proudly. Six streams of water from three pumps poured out of a basement door.

"Two thousand dollars damage," she shouted to an onlooker across the muddy gulf. "It was worse than this in '45 and they didn't do anything. They made a lot of promises then, too."

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1968]
FLOODS IN JERSEY COST \$140 MILLION—FEDERAL ESTIMATE COVERS SIX STRICKEN COUNTIES

TRENTON, June 3.—The Federal Government estimated today that floods had caused \$140-million worth of damage in six counties of northern New Jersey, according to the State Commissioner of Conservation and Development.

The Commissioner, Robert A. Roe, said the figure had been presented by the Federal Office of Emergency Planning and the Small Business Administration at a meeting here with state officials, but the Federal agencies made no statement on the proceeding.

The meeting, which Gov. Richard J. Hughes attended, was called by the White House after the Governor had requested that the President declare the region a disaster area so that grants and low-interest loans can be given to victims.

That request will be acted upon, Mr. Roe said, at a second meeting next Monday, after there is more detailed investigation by various Federal agencies in cooperation with their counterparts in the state.

The State Legislature, meanwhile, approved and sent to the Governor a \$5-million emergency-aid bill designed to repair public facilities, which Mr. Roe said accounted for \$10-million of the \$140-million estimate.

The remaining \$130-million in damage was suffered by private businesses and private homeowners. The figure includes only structural damage to houses, not items such as furniture and clothing.

RED CROSS PROVIDES FOOD

Mr. Roe said the Red Cross was providing food in stricken areas and was considering the possibility of distributing blankets and clothing to residents whose possessions were destroyed by muddy water.

The flood waters, which began with six to seven inches of rain last Wednesday, were considered the worst in the state since 1903. Two thousand people were evacuated, factories were closed and eight persons, including seven children, were killed.

Among the eight were two boys, one 12 years old and one 13, whose canoe went over a dam on the Pompton River Saturday evening. Search operations continued today without success, and they were presumed to have drowned.

Mr. Roe also said that he would soon present to towns in the region a proposal for a \$500-million flood-control program.

LOANS UP TO \$25,000

Homeowners may receive Federal aid if the President declares the region a disaster area. In that event, the Small Business Administration can provide loans up to \$25,000 for structural damage, at a rate of 3 per cent

for 30 years, and businesses would get \$100,000 loans under the same terms.

Otherwise, most homeowners have no way to collect for damages suffered during the flood. Most insurance policies in the region, according to Mayor Edward Sisco of Wayne, do not cover floods unless they have expensive riders which, he said, "most people in this area cannot afford."

Any grants from Washington for public utilities must be matched by the state or a local community.

PATRIOTISM STILL SEEN

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, patriotism has often been said to be out of order, or passé, in our present age. However, love of country has endured the attacks of critics down through the ages. Men often feel inspired to return respect, love, and devotion to a land which has nurtured and sheltered them, standing as a fortress between anarchy and individual liberty.

Recently I was greatly touched by the account printed in one of the Arizona papers, the Tucson Daily Citizen, concerning one man's personal efforts to honor his country on Memorial Day. Margaret Kuehlthau, staff writer for the Citizen, has chronicled the efforts of Mr. Herbert A. Samuels, 88, formerly of Chicago, now a resident of Tucson. Mr. Samuels became concerned as he saw display of the American colors falling into disuse on national holidays. He undertook to stimulate display of the American flag on proper holidays. Soon, several of his neighbors joined him in the effort, and the result is remarkable.

Mr. President, so that Mr. Samuels' efforts may receive wider circulation, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Tucson Daily Citizen, May 30, 1968]

TUCSONIAN PUSHES FLAG PROJECT AT 88
(By Margaret Kuehlthau)

Herbert A. Samuels, 88, is a man of action. Concerned because so few homes display the American flag on Memorial Day, he decided to do something about the situation—starting on the block where he lives.

Samuels, 4633 E. 17th St., purchased at cost 24 flags, size 3 x 5 feet, and sold them to his neighbors.

Then he enlisted the aid of Roswell Merrill; who lives directly across the street. Merrill attached to his neighbors' homes the brackets needed to hold the flags.

Today, thanks to the initiative of an 88-year-old man, flags were flying from almost all the homes in the block.

"It's the least we can do for our country and our servicemen," believes Samuels, a former Chicago court balliff who moved to Tucson 14 years ago.

"Whether it is selling the idea of flags to a neighborhood or driving to Chicago at the age of 90, it all comes to this—You have to have it in your heart to want to do these things."

Reading about current city riots brings back memories to Samuels who "did riot duty in Chicago in 1908, serving with a cavalry unit."

At the age of 19 in 1903, he joined "The Dandy First," the 131st Infantry, 33rd Division, in Illinois. At first, he was a color guard. Later he became a member of the First Illinois Cavalry which he described as "the first squadron of cavalry in this country."

"Up to that time I'd never been on a horse," he said. "But why walk when you can ride?"

He has deep sympathy, he says, for people fighting for their rights.

"When people are in trouble, don't beat them down. Lift them up," is the advice of the man who says he "is 88 years young—not 88 years old."

Right now he is counting the days until he reaches 90. To observe the occasion he plans to drive his automobile to Chicago.

"I'm so healthy no one would believe me

when I went to a doctor for a check-up when I first came to Tucson," he said. "I had to send back home for a birth certificate to prove I was 74 years old."

ECONOMIC INDICATORS POINT TO CONTINUED EASING OF PRESSURE FROM DEFENSE SECTOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the selected economic indicators for the defense sector in the first quarter of 1968 demonstrate a continued slackening in the pressure on the economy from this source.

Military prime contract awards in the first quarter were \$95 million, or 9.2 percent, below the level in the fourth quarter of 1967, continuing the decline in these contracts from the third quarter of 1967. The total drop since the third quarter was \$1.5 billion or 13.7 percent.

Gross obligations incurred fell by \$719 million, to a level 3.7 percent below that of the fourth quarter of 1967, the third straight quarterly decline; the total decrease in these obligations since the second quarter of 1967 was \$5.3 billion or about 22.2 percent.

Both prime contracts and gross obligations tend to be leading indicators of the impact of the defense sector on the rest of the economy, and the indicators demonstrate a continued contraction of this impact.

Net defense expenditures rose about 4.7 percent in the first quarter of 1968. These expenditures, however, tend to be a lagging indicator of the effect of defense spending on the economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the May report of the Department of Defense on selected economic indicators be printed in the RECORD.

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

SELECTED DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ECONOMIC INDICATORS

(Dollars in millions; manpower in thousands; quarters by calendar year)

	1966				1967				1968							
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	IV	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	I	Apr.
I. Military prime contract awards:																
Aircraft.....	\$1,945	\$2,989	\$2,696	\$2,262	\$2,102	\$3,049	\$2,513	\$1,249	\$578	\$805	\$2,632	\$442	\$530	\$574	\$1,546	\$834
Missile and space systems.....	1,040	987	1,314	861	1,230	1,166	1,580	323	429	316	1,068	348	470	393	1,211	327
Ships.....	355	491	876	239	679	407	417	153	147	110	410	109	79	236	424	79
Weapons and ammunition.....	555	1,486	692	940	818	1,769	1,104	454	451	439	1,344	226	416	383	1,025	423
Electronic and communications equipment.....	918	1,574	666	915	971	1,848	816	272	247	305	824	359	264	248	871	336
Other hard goods.....	843	1,842	660	1,029	915	1,564	785	252	153	248	653	246	348	306	900	314
Soft goods.....	709	922	1,078	989	638	652	1,056	175	118	198	491	437	140	202	779	219
Construction.....	207	392	198	150	232	626	232	56	44	113	213	61	53	67	181	39
All other.....	1,406	1,963	2,356	1,639	1,605	1,987	2,335	522	486	649	1,657	457	470	534	1,461	519
Total (excluding work outside United States).....	7,978	12,646	10,536	9,024	9,190	13,068	10,838	3,456	2,653	3,183	9,292	2,685	2,770	2,943	8,398	3,090
Total seasonally adjusted.....	8,703	10,144	10,716	10,149	10,171	10,867	10,961	3,665	3,308	3,479	10,413	2,887	3,445	3,124	9,456	3,488
Work outside United States.....	521	1,195	856	672	453	834	891	193	117	145	455	288	139	134	561	157
II. Gross obligations incurred:																
Operations.....	8,326	9,604	10,426	9,702	10,229	11,435	11,224	3,776	3,374	3,663	10,812	3,798	3,435	3,487	10,721
Procurement.....	4,374	8,539	5,368	5,276	5,113	8,948	6,154	2,699	1,717	1,876	6,292	1,784	1,865	2,003	5,652
Other.....	2,429	3,470	3,453	2,230	2,519	3,510	3,420	860	665	669	2,194	863	792	553	2,206
Total.....	15,129	21,613	19,247	17,208	17,861	23,893	20,798	7,335	5,755	6,208	19,298	6,445	6,092	6,043	18,579
III. Gross unpaid obligations outstanding:																
Operations.....	3,828	3,777	4,792	5,024	4,644	4,513	5,267	5,270	5,050	5,150	5,150	5,127	5,127	4,975	4,975
Procurement.....	18,023	22,119	22,736	23,173	22,780	25,248	24,925	25,423	24,982	24,856	24,856	24,197	24,024	24,127	24,127
Other.....	5,625	5,942	8,026	7,253	6,996	7,506	7,971	7,854	7,609	7,360	7,360	7,329	7,303	7,038	7,038
Total.....	27,476	31,838	35,554	35,450	34,420	37,267	38,163	38,547	37,641	37,366	37,366	36,653	36,454	36,140	36,140
IV. Net expenditures:																
Operations.....	7,689	9,076	8,968	9,087	10,002	10,731	10,001	3,641	3,456	3,397	10,494	3,550	3,273	3,416	10,239
Procurement.....	3,651	3,886	4,392	4,264	5,074	5,282	6,060	2,005	1,890	1,704	5,598	2,274	1,913	1,680	5,867
Other.....	2,757	2,647	2,484	3,092	3,160	2,001	3,047	790	847	724	2,363	1,153	1,032	1,025	3,210
Total.....	14,097	15,609	15,844	16,443	18,236	18,014	19,108	6,436	6,194	5,825	18,455	6,977	6,218	6,121	19,316

SELECTED DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ECONOMIC INDICATORS—Continued

[Dollars in millions; manpower in thousands; quarters by calendar year]

	1966				1967				Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	1968					
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV				Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	I	Apr.	
V. DOD personal compensation:																	
Military.....	\$3,181	\$3,249	\$3,551	\$3,606	\$3,624	\$3,646	\$3,842	\$1,264	\$1,297	\$1,411	\$3,972	\$1,338	\$1,339	\$1,338	\$4,014		
Civilian.....	1,937	2,015	2,105	2,135	2,170	2,248	2,271	773	772	787	2,332	828	774	773	2,375	1,774	
Total.....	5,118	5,264	5,656	5,741	5,794	5,894	6,113	2,037	2,069	2,198	6,304	2,166	2,113	2,111	6,389		
VI. Outstanding payments:																	
Advance payments.....	66	79	90	83	92	80	110				134				128		
Progress payments.....	4,402	4,346	4,750	5,461	5,981	6,765	7,179				7,491				7,681		
Total.....	4,468	4,425	4,840	5,544	6,073	6,845	7,289				7,625				7,809		
VII. Strength (manpower):																	
Military.....	2,969	3,094	3,229	3,334	3,371	3,377	3,412	3,416	3,412	3,398	3,398	3,427	3,440	3,467	3,467		
Civilian.....	1,088	1,138	1,184	1,230	1,268	1,303	1,274	1,277	1,277	1,271	1,271	1,267	1,265	1,266	1,266	1,267	

1 Preliminary.

Note: Open spaces for indicators other than No. VI indicate information not available at time of publication. Indicator No. VI information available only on a quarterly basis. Totals may not add due to rounding.

WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE ENDORSES WATER RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, at its May 1968, annual meeting, the Western Governors' Conference adopted a number of resolutions which should be of particular interest to Congress.

I have already called the attention of the Senate to the resolution on water quality standards which was adopted by that conference.

In addition, the conference adopted a resolution in support of S. 2919 as introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and as cosponsored by a number of western Senators. Excellent field hearings were held on this legislation this spring, and I am hopeful that similar hearings can be scheduled before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in Washington.

I invite the attention of the Senate to Resolution VIII of the Western Governors' Conference on the subject of water rights legislation and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

Further, the Western Governors' Conference adopted a resolution on mined land reclamation. This was also the subject of hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution also be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIII. WATER RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Whereas federal legislation has not yet been enacted for the protection of water rights acquired under state laws, nor to preserve the historic authority of the states to control the acquisition and administration of water rights within their respective borders; and

Whereas federal court decisions threatening such rights and undermining such authority continue in effect; and

Whereas extensive committee hearings have been held by the Congress during the last several years with respect to water rights legislation;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the 1968 Annual Meeting of the Western Governors' Conference in Honolulu, Hawaii urges the earliest possible enactment of legislation that (1) will state clearly that the federal government shall not be deemed to have acquired or reserved any water rights as a result of the reservation or withdrawal

of public land; (2) will require compliance with state water laws by all federal agencies, licensees, or project beneficiaries; and (3) will safeguard adequately all water rights established under state laws against the action of federal agencies and their licensees; and

Be it further resolved that the Western Governors' Conference supports S. 2919 as an appropriate and necessary first action to achieve the desired purpose of this resolution.

VII. MINED LAND RECLAMATION

Whereas the problem of mined land reclamation should be approached with full realization that where surface disturbance is unavoidable, mining operations must be conducted in such a manner as to provide adequate protection to the public and to other resource values on mineral lands; and

Whereas widely diverse topography, climate, economic conditions and esthetic standards require a precision of remedy which cannot be attained by uniform national regulations for mined land reclamation;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 1968 Annual Meeting of the Western Governors' Conference in Honolulu, Hawaii that:

1. Adequate state legislation be enacted for regulation of mined land reclamation;
2. The states be urged to ratify the Interstate Mining Compact; and
3. The Congress be urged to avoid uniform national regulations or preemption of state activities in the field of mined land reclamation.

L. S. AYRES & CO. PROGRAM TO IMPROVE RACE RELATIONS AND PROMOTE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to invite attention to a new seven-point program which has been instituted recently by the L. S. Ayres & Co., of Indianapolis, Ind., which is designed to improve race relations in the communities in which it operates and to promote equal opportunity for the employment and advancement of persons in lower-income and disadvantaged groups. The fact that this large enterprise, which owns facilities in a number of Indiana cities and hires hundreds of employees for positions of varied responsibilities and diverse skills, has voluntarily adopted this forward-looking policy is indeed encouraging.

L. S. Ayres & Co. is now actively seeking recruits for its staff in the core centers of poverty. It has eliminated pre-

employment testing of the "intelligence quotient" type which often in the past served to disqualify many persons lacking sufficient formal education and training. Special attention is now being paid to the hopes and aspirations of its employees, and a concentrated in-service training program is being offered through a contract with the board for fundamental education. Unfavorable police records in themselves no longer are enough to automatically bar a candidate from a position with L. S. Ayres & Co.; instead, the nature of the charge, whether it resulted in a conviction, and other mitigating circumstances are now being carefully evaluated. Effort has been made also to improve communications with the Negro community, and the company has started doing business with the members of the National Business League in Indianapolis.

The features of this program were well described in some detail by Daniel F. Evans, president of L. S. Ayres & Co., in an address to a group of Negro ministers. Because of the national significance of this precedent-setting action, and because others may wish to emulate it, I ask unanimous consent that the full report by Mr. Evans, along with a brief press release announcing the beginning of the new in-store educational program, be printed in the RECORD. It seems to me that the leaders of this highly imaginative and sensitive plan deserve to be congratulated for their pioneering efforts to advance race relationships and to institute more equitable personnel practices.

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

THE L. S. AYRES & CO. REPORT TO THE NEGRO MINISTERS BREAKFAST, APRIL 23, 1968

My associates and I are flattered by your attendance, for yours are the busy schedules of men under pressure. Today the role of leadership which has historically been yours is characterized by awesome tones. We sense some of the urgency which leads or pushes you each and every day. Perhaps it was this common empathy which prompted a few of you to ask, "What is Ayres doing?" We invited you to meet with us today in order that we might give you our report.

Let me first make some introductory remarks that are as important as anything else I may say. In the first place, we gratefully acknowledge your particular and vital role.

You are respected. You are responsible. You are in a position to communicate. You are educated. You are articulate. All of this means leadership, and we are mightily glad to see it in your hands.

In the second place we recognize the seriousness and the urgency of improving the fortunes of the Negro, and this of course includes the encouragement of good race relations in this metropolitan area. Nothing less than civilization as we know it is at stake. The root cause of the illness gripping our cities is not so much violence, as it is a streak of injustice that stains the American system. It is easy to become concerned about damaged property and loss of life, but as Margaret Mead says, we are raising a maimed generation. I do not know what the consequence of all this violence and death is on the lives of the young and the very young, nor do I understand this inclination to violence. I do know, however, that our company is searching for answers, not for targets of criticism or blame.

In the third place we want no praise for what we should be doing anyway. We are not in a boastful mood, rather we are in a humble mood. Finally whatever we do and whatever we stand for can be improved by your criticism. We want and need your guidance and suggestion. We expect to make mistakes, but we also expect to keep trying.

What then is our program.

Let me read to you a section of a talk I made last month to approximately 600 supervisors of our company. These men and women came from all over the state and from both our Ayres and Ayr-Way stores.

"The company is pledging an increasing share of its resources, its energy and its influence toward the improving of race relations within the cities where it has stores, and especially within Indianapolis. Throughout the company's history it has participated in programs designed to contribute to the community's well being. But as Mr. Ayres pointed out, 'Participation is not enough. Progress is not keeping pace with needs. Events are driving our races farther apart, and we need innovators and business leadership which is willing to do more than its share.'

"I believe that the past several months demonstrate that federal programs will not solve local problems and that local government needs sustained help from business and industry. In the short haul at least, each city will succeed or fail essentially on its own efforts."

We at Ayres feel a most pressing problem is the economic base of the Negro; and since we are in a position to do something about it, this becomes our particular contribution at this time.

Over the years we have been blessed with many loyal and sincere Negro employees. Some of these are salespeople, cashiers, seamstresses, markers, clericals, PBX operators, keypunch operators. However, too many remain on entry level jobs. Therefore, in our downtown store and our Hillside service center we are interviewing all entry level employees. Later this same thing will be done in all stores. The purpose is to inquire about the aspirations, the hopes, and perhaps the dreams of these people. We believe that this should be done as a dialogue, for working together we are in a better position to ascertain promotability and to help where special training is needed.

Secondly, our personnel specialists have been hiring new employees from the city's centers of poverty, that is the actual neighborhoods of hard core unemployment. So far we have found employment for about 50 men and women. A few have failed, but what is far more important, others have succeeded and are useful, productive employees.

Thirdly, we have eliminated the use of pre-employment testing. Here I am referring to the aptitude or IQ test. Of course if an

applicant claims to be a keypunch operator, she will obviously need to demonstrate certain skill, but tests as they were traditionally thought of have been abandoned. This then puts the burden on the first line supervisor who is obligated to help the new employee succeed or to patiently work with him in order that he may be able to recommend him for a job he can fill.

Recently one of our checking supervisors complained to me, "They send me someone who doesn't know what one sixth of a dozen is." My response was "Does he want to work? Is he at work on time each day?" This leads me to the fourth part of our program, training in fundamental education. Sometime ago I served as training director and at that time said, "Business can't be expected to teach English and arithmetic," but I was wrong. Now, through the Board For Fundamental Education, we are doing just that. Classes have started for twenty employees, both Negro and Caucasian, covering basic skills. It costs us \$300 per person, but we believe it will be well worth it, both in more productive employees and also, we think, happier citizens. We are the second business in the city to offer this training and the first in our industry in this area. We are anxious that it succeed.

Fifth, our customary attitude of reluctance concerning publicity is also undergoing change. You have pointed out to us a need for reporting to the Negro community those special things that are of interest to them.

You have also helped us to understand the need for visibility, that we may better convince the disappointed or the discouraged that jobs, promotable type jobs are available, and are obviously being filled by Negroes. We appreciated your help in teaching us this, for the value of this to your leadership, for instance, had not been understood by us. During the last few months for example we have made a number of appointments of qualified Negroes to important and visible jobs. These include a buyer, two assistant buyers, three departmental sales managers, an area supervisor in an Ayr-Way store, a deliveryman, a beauty operator, a salesman in women's shoes, an advertising artist, a model, a private secretary to a divisional executive, a number of cashiers at Ayr-Way stores, the coordinator of all Ayres' garden shops, and others less notable.

Sixth is another important change, for we have revised our thinking on police records. Traditionally, a record, any record barred a man or woman from employment. It now depends entirely on what the record says. Was there a conviction? What was the nature of the record involved? Judgment is now applied. This is not the easy way, but it is the fair way. Here, again, all experiences are not successful, but it does open new doors of hope for some.

Lastly, we have learned recently about the Indianapolis Chapter of the National Business League. We are making a start at doing business with its members. You are undoubtedly familiar with its purposes, which include the expansion and improvement of individual business, the assisting of Negroes in their consideration of opportunities which exist in the business field and bridging the gap between the disadvantaged and the affluent business community. It seems obvious that the immediate and helpful way to do this is for firms like ours simply to do business with members of this League. They prosper. They in turn create jobs, sometimes for the unemployable. Thus we communicate; we bridge the gap.

This then is our report. We thought we were doing well in the past. Today we are doing more, and we still don't seem to be doing enough. It is our hope that others will do likewise.

We must recognize that there may be gaps between policy and execution. We will make mistakes, and here is where we need you. If you know we are off base, tip us off. A

single comment by one of you opened our eyes to a situation that needed correction. Your help was appreciated.

Finally, let me candidly admit that progress is not inevitable, but if you and we insist on being the audience—then you will be the author and the actors. To our great fortune this is not a morally neutral community. There is a bias in favor of righteousness. You as ministers have helped create this bias. It is a constructive force that you can and do channel. We are convinced that righteousness will win over all.

All too often this is more often a matter of faith than of evidence. With your help and with the help of the members of your congregations and that of other well intentioned citizens, we hope to add to the evidence.

NEWS FROM L. S. AYRES & CO., OF INDIANA

Daniel F. Evans, President of L. S. Ayres and Company, announced today that the company has retained the services of the Board For Fundamental Education to provide an in-store program of additional education for Ayres and Ayr-Way employees. The first two classes of twenty employees started on Tuesday, April 23 in the Employees' Cafeteria. Sessions will be for two hours, three nights a week, over a twenty week period.

Assisting employees with limited formal education to improve their skills and become more readily promotable, is a new venture for Ayres. Major technological changes in retailing have brought about the need for increased academic skills in mathematics and communication. It is expected that this additional training will make the employees more efficient in their present jobs and more promotable to a higher category.

The Board For Fundamental Education, a privately endowed nationally recognized organization, will provide the instruction. They have had many years of experience in designing, instituting and conducting programs to benefit the undereducated. It is believed that Ayres is the first retail organization in this area to work with the Board to benefit their employees in this type of program.

CITIES INDICATE TRENDS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, often it is hard to put contemporary events correctly into proper perspective. We stand so close to some problems that we cannot see their real shape and impact because we are so affected by the current and immediate aspects of these events.

Mr. William R. Mathews, of the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., has, I believe, made some cogent and incisive observations on the current crisis in the cities. He points out that the incidence of violence is high in cities throughout the world. He further notes some of the problems that may overtake us if we do not increase our awareness as well as our intention to cope with them. These problems are not all related to poverty, but in some cases simply are the result of increasing numbers of people packed into smaller and smaller personal space.

Mr. President, because Congress is called upon to enact legislation that will affect these cities in the future, and so that Members of Congress may have the benefit of Mr. Mathews' editorial, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITIES WILL MAKE HISTORY

(By William R. Mathews)

As wars, revolutions, rebellions and riots break out in nearly every nook and corner in the world, it would be accurate to say that modern civilization is moving into an era of violence in these cities, which paralyzes nations themselves in their duty to maintain law and order. That this violence has originated in the cities throughout the world suggests that there must be an underlying common cause.

Go where you will, tensions are snapping; students riot with a nihilistic destructive fervor; labor leaders find it more and more difficult to restrain their members. So it is with cultural leaders who are now confronted with violent racial conflicts.

City, provincial and national governments everywhere are plagued with these demands for more of this, and more of that, now, not later. That these demands would take years to meet is completely ignored or angrily brushed aside by mobs. The great tragedy is that this failure to meet demands foments riotous destruction at a time when only vastly increased productivity power can bring about what the riot leaders ask.

As one who has seen most of the world during the past 20 years, I have seen this great movement take place. Everywhere it is marked by outstanding net increases in population growth, which more food and better health protection has promoted. This happens at a time when there is relatively little new land anywhere to farm, and also at a time when increasing mechanization of agriculture displaces a former peasantry, and sends those people into the cities.

France is a spectacular case of the displacement of its former peasantry by machinery. These people have swollen the population of every one of its larger cities as they have searched for a way to sustain themselves. This is happening in many of the great cities of the world, from Tehran, Madrid, Lisbon, Rome to Caracas, Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, Buenos Aires, Bogota, Lima, Mexico City and countless others. In some of these places the population of the countries is doubling every 20 years. Most of that increase goes into the cities.

Here in the United States we have seen this take place in a milder form. We have been most fortunate in our great land area and our natural resources. Our city, state and national governments have been able to handle the situation, despite the numerous riots, with commendable ability. In contrast, in the crowded areas of the world, the consumption of wealth by the increasing population exceeds its total production. Governments are desperate as they seek to alleviate this big problem in its many forms. As the population growth continues, the situation will get worse not better.

A new political note is being struck as the people in numerous countries call for a better form of government to take over from ones that failed to meet their demands. This is exactly what is happening in France today. The demands of the workers and students, with violence and sit-ins in the factories, are paralyzing France's productive power and its semi-parliamentary government. The workers are calling for a new form of government. It will probably evolve during the next few years. Such a government will find it will have to exercise autocratic power if it is to meet the demands of the people.

Even in Britain there is growing talk in responsible quarters of how the parliamentary system is becoming obsolete. The charge is that it has failed to answer that question of increasing national production sufficiently to pay for what it buys. The implication in this kind of talk is that there must be a new form of government that will do the necessary job, even though it may be an autocratic one yielding supreme powers.

In fact, there is some such talk going on in the United States among intellectuals, whose goal seems to be a government by the best minds that will have vast powers to plan and execute economic and political programs to meet the needs of our people. They plan to dispense with a Senate but to use a House of Representatives, all of whose members will be elected simultaneously with the president. State governments will become provinces and mere administrative agencies for the central government in Washington. Such is the thinking that the growth of cities everywhere has promoted.

The cities have become the dominating centers of political power because their masses can be organized as a political force more easily than the scattered people of the rural areas.

Life in the cities is quickly sensitive. When life and death are at stage, or merely threatened, some agency must act, because that most elemental motive of survival will, in desperation, cause many people to think and act alike. If a responsible agency does not exist, leaders will come forward to create one. The widely expanded role of government in social welfare reflects a response to meet this need.

The increasing complexity and widening scope of government activity thus represents to a large extent a reaction of the people of the cities to their ever-increasing interdependency. Standards of personal and political morality have been affected by this change. Much of the life of the cities is impersonal. Neighbors do not know neighbors, and there is little neighborhood responsibility. Churches play a lesser role compared to what they did in the past.

When people live several layers deep in apartment houses and housing projects, family life is affected. Recreation for children becomes a serious public duty that more and more the cities have to shoulder. It is more difficult to bring up a family in the city than in the rural areas, because children have greater difficulties and temptations to overcome.

It is much easier to hide among the masses of the city. The lazy can loaf with less chance of being detected. Criminals can ply their trade with greater ease, because it is easier to hide their identity. The corrupt can steal and dodge responsibility, while the immoral can cover up their derelictions with less chance of being discovered. The virtues of honesty, integrity, decency, self-reliance, industry and generosity suffer, and political conduct sinks to lower levels.

The future expansion of city life will intensify the quest for food, and for the many raw materials that are as vital to the industrial system of life of city people as food is for the alimentary system. We can thus foresee, growing out of the needs of this phase of modern life, more militant political movements of rapidly expanding proportions nearly everywhere in the world as well as in the United States.

What happens in France during the next three years can set an historical precedent.

AMERICAN RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES IS LONG OVERDUE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association is undeniably a legislative responsibility.

President Johnson, in his proclamation on the Human Rights Year, gave strong emphasis to the fact that ratification of these treaties has been delayed much too long. He stated:

The principles they embody are part of our national heritage. The rights and freedoms they proclaim are those which America defended . . . and fights to defend . . . around the world. It is my continuing hope that the United States Senate will ratify these conventions.

I also share the view of U.N. Ambassador and former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg that—

Each of these conventions coincides very closely with the expressed principles and values of the United States. . . . And each is concerned with the eradication of abuses that could and that have, at times, become sources of bitter differences among nations. . . .

Our delay in ratifying these treaties is a costly anachronism.

Open debate, followed by a vote, is our most desirable course of action.

I strongly support the immediate ratification of the remaining human rights conventions as a clear indication of this Nation's leadership in the field of human rights.

NEBRASKA RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Nebraska Rural Electric Association has sponsored a youth tour to Washington for a number of years. The group is made up of boys and girls who have been the winners of essay contests sponsored by their individual Nebraska rural power systems in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

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

Without objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM (By Kyle L. Sitzman, age, 17; grade 11; school: Culbertson High School; father's name: Edward H. Sitzman, Culbertson, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Southwest Public Power District, Fallsdale, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

One of the most exciting developments in Rural America was the advent of rural electricity. It was one of the truly miraculous ventures between the people and their local and national governments. If your memory reaches back to the beginning of this century you will recall having witnessed many changes and advances in society's way of life. You have seen electric transmission lines creep along the main highways and then the lanes and byways of the nation, until almost every home uses some form of electric power. Electricity has become the drillmaster of American life. Each man's haven has become a power source fed by the huge artery of lines. Each job or activity of the average householder has become linked to this source of power.

A flick of a switch lights the homes, pumps the water, helps with the daily household chores and powers much of the machinery for the barnyard chores. The inventors and engineers who have planned and directed this power development could be considered our benefactors. Our everyday life would be completely different without their foresight. Government policy, as well as private decision, has followed where great minds have led. Each individual district has its own particular story of advancement. They are all exciting pages on the sheets of progress in each and every community.

As in all developments, Mother Nature tries to hold the upper hand. Our communities have witnessed this when she has shown her mighty force. As the wonderful organization of the R.E.A. literally springs into action her show of strength is short lived. Well equipped crews do a splendid job whether it be an emergency or everyday work shifts. They give every outstanding and reliable service. Within the shortest period of time, under severe conditions, electric power is restored on the great network of lines.

Reliable service to all consumers at the lowest possible cost is R.E.A.'s consistent motto. We, as Americans, have come to realize that progress is a servant of our needs. Rural electrification has served our needs as well as being the biggest bargain the American people have ever received for an investment of their tax dollar.

The Rural family has banished the term "hick" from the American vocabulary. The once isolated farmer has all the conveniences of the world. Any appliance used by a city dweller is available to the rural consumer. The average teenager today, if whisked back through the pages of time, would be much more impressed by the great advances made through electrification. All of us would probably appreciate our everyday conveniences more. I, myself, am very thankful to the many people whose foresight and unselfish interests have brought us these achievements. To them we owe a debt of gratitude for they are the backbone of our conveniences, which we take for granted. May we have the outlook to continue and be the builders of tomorrow for yet greater and bigger things in the rural electrification program. Cooperation, service and an interest in the individual's welfare all add up to a bigger and better America through rural electrification.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Glenda Bartels, age, 16; grade, 11; school, Wauneta Public School, name of father, G. H. Bartels, Wauneta, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

Power is progress. The highly mechanized farm of today undoubtedly proves the truth of this statement. Electrical energy has lessened the burdens of the farmer and made farming a more profitable business. Milking machines, power tools, electric fences, heat lamps, grain dryers, and water pumps are only a few of the labor-saving devices that electricity has made possible.

The farmer's wife welcomes electricity with enthusiasm. Electric irons, refrigerators, hot and cold running water, and washers and dryers are the modern housewife's musts for managing a home. Daily tasks can be done in a fraction of the time that it took 30 years ago. Less time spent doing routine work gives the homemaker more time for creative work and relaxing recreation.

Yes, REA has accomplished a tremendous service, not only to the farmers, but to the entire national economy. Think of the millions of dollars poured into the nation's economy by Rural Electric Co-op construction and new rural consumers buying appliances and equipment to totally modernize their farms.

As we look back over the formative years of rural electric co-ops, we can easily see the vital social and economic changes which have come to 98% of the nation's farmers. A heavy, burdensome load has been shifted from the shoulders of the farmer and his family to the sturdy REA poles and glistening wires which transmit reliable power.

The trend toward few and larger farms is likely to continue—so the successful farmer must achieve maximum production at lower costs with the help of power equipment.

Rural Americans in this year of 1968 can see the wisdom in this statement by Franklin Delano Roosevelt: "Electricity is no longer a luxury, it is a definite necessity."

However, these things are all in the past. Let us think of our changing times. As we drive out of town, we find more than farms. Here we see motels, restaurants, and service stations. A little further we see a garage full of modern power equipment, a new freezer plant, and a cement block factory. Electricity in the rural area has made all this possible. It is lucky for these industries that the REA provided loans to serve rural areas—not just farms.

Truly, rural electric co-ops have long been waging their own "war on poverty" by helping create new industries which have provided thousands of jobs to the jobless.

The test of the future will be different from that of the past. In the 1930's and 1940's, the obstacles were many. The problem of building power lines over miles of country side was tremendous. There were legal barriers and always the fear that rural people would not use enough electricity to make it pay its way.

The objective of the REA program has been to achieve parity of electric service and cost between city and country. After 30 years of progress, this goal has not been attained. It is up to the new generation of members to accomplish this goal.

The impact of rural electrification in the country has altered the face of America and the future of the rural electrification program can't wait. It must continue to serve rural America and to do so means expanding so the lights will never go out in rural America.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO MY COMMUNITY

(By Steve Larson, age, 18; grade 12; school, Axtell High School; name of father, Ray Larson, Funk, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Grand Island, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

The REA has provided many new tools for the farmer and his wife. Electricity brings cheerful light to the home and barn on dark winter nights and mornings. The mercury vapor light provides greater security for the livestock against prowling animals.

The radio springs across plains, mountains and oceans with no need of wires to carry its messages. Now television and radar bring us an actual moving record in color of what is happening hundreds of miles away. The President can talk directly to the people whenever he wishes.

Nowhere has electricity been more useful than in the home. It has made the home a safer, cleaner, more pleasant place in which to live. Electric appliances have made it possible for the housewife to spend fewer hours on daily chores, and to enjoy more leisure.

Projecting this, an electric clothes dryer saves the average homemaker 20 eight-hour work days and 40 miles of walking in a year.

One man must work a little more than 13 hours to complete the amount of work which electrical energy can do in one kilowatt-hour. In recent years, prices per kilowatt-hour have declined, while other prices continue to rise.

Electricity can heat minerals up to 6,000 degrees F., and can run a freezing unit which creates a temperature of minus 60 degrees F.

We are living in an age of electric power. Imagine what would happen if suddenly there was no electric power. Commuters would stop running. Radios and television would be silent. Elevators and escalators would be stalled. At night, the great beacons and signs would be dim. There would be no light except for flickering flames of candles and oil lamps. Food would spoil in refrigerators and freezers. Machines in factories would stop turning. Looms would stop, shoes could

not be made and the doorbell would be silent.

Farmers are more assured of a crop when they have an electric irrigation pump to water the field when the crop gets dry. By using the electric dryer, the crop can be harvested much earlier and not risk losing it by a hard wind, or early heavy snow.

Nothing has made a bigger—or better difference in our lives than going total electric. I figure electricity is the hardest working and least expensive servant a person can obtain.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Joan Konen, age 16; grade 11; school, Roseland High School; name of father, George Konen, Roseland, Nebr., contestant sponsored by Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Grand Island, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

"The night the lights came on"—this moment held, and still holds, so much significance.

Yet to us, the younger generation, it is extremely hard to imagine the deep emotion felt by rural families at this time. Let us, then, go back and relive the creation and advancement of this majestic power.

In 1935, President Roosevelt ordered the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration, granting initiation of programs "with respect to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy in rural areas." Then, in 1936, the Rural Electrification Act was passed, authorizing the apportionment of loans among the states to finance these projects. The passage of this act cleared the road for action, and action came quickly.

Poles were set, and miles of wire was strung throughout the rural area. The powerful hand of REA slowly, but ever so confidently, lifted and eliminated the drudgery and despair from the farmer's life. Soon a dream became a reality. The flip of a switch and the farm home took on an entirely new look. Lights illuminated the yard, making possible longer working hours for the farmer. Electrically-operated tools were being developed, making his work much faster and easier. The spirits of the farmer heightened, for his life was no longer, and never would again be, similar to that of the early colonists. Rural Electrification enabled the farmer to break away from servitude to the soil, and, through radios and televisions, helped eliminate the isolation which so long had been a consequence of farm life.

The wonders of electricity, little by little, began to take over the chores. It could milk cows, pump water, warm pigs, hatch eggs, brood chicks, sharpen tools and drill holes. Electricity was a hired hand that paid for its own keep!

Inside the rural home, the outlook is every bit as bright. The present housewife enjoys countless labor-saving devices. Automatic washers and dryers, electric ranges, refrigerators, freezers, and water heaters have become "necessities" in every American home. So, also, are the vacuum sweepers, irons, electric mixers, blenders and various small kitchen appliances made possible by the low wages for which electricity is working.

Yes, REA is a real friend to every member of every family. Towards the world at large, it has certainly not failed to leave its print. It has instilled unutterable beauty. With its great power, it pumps our water and makes it available anywhere. It is with this additional water that country yards and beautiful gardens are formed. For myself and other teens it provides entertainment, and opportunity toward fulfillment. "It" is always there working the radios, telephones, stereos, movies, dance combos and bowling alleys to keep us entertained. Just think, without

electricity, what would there be to do on Saturday nights?

REA helps teens in other ways, too. It has brought new and challenging opportunities for jobs and careers in rural areas. Better educated than our fathers and mothers, we are preparing to break the barriers to progress in rural electrification with new tools, new technology and new techniques.

I am certain that, because of rural electrification, my own personal life, and America's future life will be much more productive and rewarding.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION TO OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Byron Yung, age 16; grade 10; school, Guide Rock High School; name of father, Russell Yung, Guide Rock, Nebr.; Contestant sponsored by South Central Public Power District, Nelson, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

Rural electrification is the most significant factor in the control of our environment. Electric feeders and water heaters aid the farmer in raising better quality cattle in less time and with less expense and work. Electric separators, coolers, and milkers help the dairy farmers run a more efficient dairy farm. Heat lamps run by electricity help the farmer lower the death rate of small pigs and chickens. These are just a few of the ways electricity has helped the farmer raise better livestock in less time and with less cost.

The production of crops has been affected in quite the same manner. Electric irrigation pumps provide all the water needed when the farmer's crops are starving for a drink of water. Grain dryers and electric irrigation pumps are responsible for better quality grains and increased production.

The farmer also uses electricity in welders and numerous power tools. These tools allow the farmer to make and repair equipment right on his own farm. This saves valuable time and money. Electric yardlights are not only a safety feature at night but can also be used by farmers to repair machinery.

Electricity inside the home has played even a greater part than outside. The housewife has so many labor-saving devices run by electricity so she can get her work done and have time left over to do as she wishes. Electric washers, dryers, and irons make washing and ironing days a lot shorter and easier. If she had to wash by hand, hang out the clothes, and then heat an old flat iron on a wood-burning stove to do her ironing her day would probably go into the night. Modern electric sewing machines have made sewing much easier and efficient. The housewife can now make almost any clothes she wants to in a reasonably short time. Electric stoves, frying pans, mixers, and toasters have helped the housewife prepare delicious tasting meals every time. Freezers and refrigerators allow the housewife to stock up on a sale at the store and to preserve food for long periods of time.

Electric lights in the home allow studying and reading to be done more easily and with less chance of damage to the eyes that results in reading in poor light.

Air conditioners and furnaces run by electricity make it possible to have your house at a comfortable temperature the year round. Television and radio not only supply entertainment to the whole family but they also keep the community well informed. Weather broadcasts on television and radio help the farmer decide what he should do about planting, cultivating, and harvesting crops.

With all the leisure time that is saved with rural electrification the people in the community have a chance to join several organizations. This builds a closer and better community. Rural electrification is a vital factor in making our environment more desirable.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD AT CHARLES TOWN, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Memorial Day, I had the privilege of speaking during the services held at the Edge Hill Cemetery in Charles Town, W. Va. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD my remarks on that occasion.

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

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, EDGE HILL CEMETERY, CHARLES TOWN, W. VA., MAY 30, 1968

We gather here to honor those who have died that America, and the idea of human freedom that it symbolizes, might live—to pay tribute, in short, to those who have given their lives for the American dream.

There are many families in our land from which, over the years, a loved one has been called to fight for freedom, and perhaps to die in that cause, and this day is set apart from all others for us to remember them with grateful hearts, rededicating ourselves to the principles for which they, in Lincoln's unforgettable phrase, gave "the last full measure of devotion."

It is fitting, as we honor them, that we ask ourselves these questions:

Are we willing to rededicate ourselves to the principles for which they died and to do what is necessary to preserve and strengthen America and the American dream for which they gave their lives—or are we going to allow our country, and its dream of liberty under law, to perish before our eyes because we are unwilling or unable to cope with the problems and the forces that beset us? Will we keep the faith?

In World War I, John McCrae, a Canadian doctor, thinking of the men who had fallen in Flanders fields, penned these well-known lines:

"We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe;
To you from falling hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

The words are as appropriate today as they were when they were written in the far less complicated days of 1918.

We look at our America today, and we are not reassured. Our country is wracked by a divisiveness it has not known since the dark days of the Civil War a century ago. Turmoil and dissension and subversive threats grip the Nation at home, and abroad we are caught up in a hot war and a cold war with the evil forces that would destroy freedom and the way of life that we have known.

And yet there is no unity among our people for either the external fight against aggression or the internal struggle against subversion.

How dismaying the dissension is to those who understand the lesson of history: that only the strong can be free, and that only a nation that is willing to fight for its ideas and ideals will survive.

Vietnam is only one more chapter in the long history of the American people's willingness to put their lives and their treasures on the line when necessary.

From San Juan Hill, from Belleau Wood, from the Normandy Beaches to Korea and South Vietnam, the story has been the same.

When nations or peoples have needed our help against aggression, when their fight was by extension our fight—as it has so often been, for no man and no nation can be an island unto itself—America has responded.

The shots that were fired for American freedom at Lexington and Concord have, indeed, been heard around the world. For out of the blessings of our freedom we have found the strength to protect freedom and to promote peace around the world. No nation in history has ever done so much for so many, so often, so unselfishly—in war and in peace. The Marshall Plan, for example, will forever stand as a monument to a nation that does not seek conquest, or plot aggression, or covet a foot of another nation's soil.

But what do we find in our country today? An ever-increasing number of American citizens who are dropouts from national responsibility, dropouts from the American dream, whose words and actions would sell their country short or sell it out.

I am constrained to say that they endanger our country from within far more than it is endangered from without. They are the mandarins of the "New Left," cloaking their sniper fire of destructiveness under the mantle of "dissent"—the radical professors who openly incite their students to rebellion; the activist clergy who have forsaken the pulpit for the political soapbox; the draft-card burners; the demonstrators; the marchers; the student insurrectionists; the perverters of the civil rights movement; the black power anarchists, exploited, or even directed, by the enemies of America, openly preaching revolution and openly proclaiming that America must be destroyed.

On this Memorial Day, I want to call for a return to the principles under which our country has attained its earlier greatness. Americans must speak out against those who defy authority and who defy their government, those who in the name of free speech and free assembly would deny free speech and free assembly to others, those who have distorted dissent to mock the very principles that allow dissent.

America is not sick. It is the malcontents who are sick. America has not failed. They have failed.

How insignificant they appear in comparison with those who have served their country, proud of its ideals, its traditions and its performance. How poorly they compare with the honored dead whose service and sacrifice we commemorate today.

I think that on this Memorial Day we could well pay tribute not only to the dead but also to the living, to the great majority of the American people who carry their share of the load, who till the soil, mine the coal, and build the towns and cities, and go forth to war—who are raising their families, paying their bills, going to church, and doing their jobs, without their hands stuck out waiting for somebody to give them something for nothing. These are the unsung heroes of our nation, the people who have built it and fought for it and preserved it and made it great.

I am thankful that the majority of American citizens have not grown too good or too "intellectual" to fight or work for their country, that they have not become too "sophisticated" to be patriotic, or too "liberal" to believe any longer in America. I am reassured by the fact that the serious students and the solid citizens of both races still outnumber the radicals, the draft dodgers, the law breakers, the do-gooders, the bleeding hearts, the addled egg-heads, and the just plain kooks.

If there has been a failure of our generation, it has been a failure to articulate the American dream, a failure to courageously

speak out against those who seek to destroy our American institutions, a failure to pass on to all our young people the pride that we have in our heritage and in this land and to instill in them a love and understanding of America.

I do not mean to suggest that all is perfect in our country. It is not. There is still much to be done to implement the American dream and to make it the living reality that all of us want it to be. But we have come a long way and great progress has been made.

Carl Shurz, a former United States Senator from Missouri, a widely-known statesman, editor and soldier, put it this way:

"Our country, right or wrong,
When right, to be kept right;
When wrong, to be put right."

That is the attitude that America needs today.

Let us then, on this Memorial Day 1968, rededicate ourselves to the American dream. Let it be a time to honor the living who serve, as well as a time to honor the dead. Let it be a time to heed the voices of those who have built America instead of those who would tear it down. Let it be a time for us to resolve that we will henceforth eschew all who would sell America short.

As we pay tribute to those who sleep in this hallowed ground, let us renew our faith in America, rejuvenating our belief in the virtues that have made our land the great land that it is, looking always to the future, but clinging to all that is good from our past. Let us keep America dynamic, vital, but always securely rooted in the principles upon which it was founded.

Let us revitalize the teaching of the love of country in our schools, in our churches, and, most especially, in our homes, remembering, as Charles Dickens once wrote:

"In love of home, the love
Of country has its rise."

Let us inculcate in our youth a reverence for God and a love of country. And let us seek to re-instill in all our people a new respect for liberty under law, and for the order and security upon which society must rest.

And then, let us have a real re-birth of patriotism. It is by no means unsophisticated to be patriotic. On the contrary, the mature citizen can become a highly sophisticated patriot—weighing objectively what is right and what is wrong as he looks with understanding and compassion upon the land that is his home.

We have become too pseudo-sophisticated, too affluent, too soft, to permissive, to easy-going. The times call for men and for strong leadership. We need practicing patriots. We need men who will stand up—wherever they are, whatever their profession or calling—and fight for their country, who will answer when duty calls and do whatever duty bids. We need some new profiles in American courage.

We need a re-affirmation of American devotion to law and order and a renewed respect for authority. We need a return to the time-tested virtues and old-fashioned ideals upon which this Republic was founded.

So, let us on this Memorial Day resolve anew to fight the apathy and indifference that strangle patriotism. Let us by our words and by our deeds, by our precepts and our practices, re-establish adherence to all that is good and sound in America and in the American dream. Let us seek to restore unity. Let us build our political power without political oppression. Let us remain militarily strong, but without militarism.

Let us remember, on this Memorial Day, that there are many forces at work in our midst that would destroy us, if we would let them. And let us determine, for the sake of those we honor today who died that America might live, that such destruction will never come to pass.

Joseph Addison, the great British essayist, said:

"What a pity it is that we can die
But once to save our country."

I would say to you, rather, what a pity it is that we, who can live but once, fail to do all that we can do to save our country and to preserve its greatness.

It is a brave and noble thing to die for one's country.

It can be even braver and more noble to live for one's country.

EFFORTS BY INLAND STEEL TO ELIMINATE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed by the concentrated efforts expended by a major Indiana industry, the Inland Steel Co., to reduce both air and water pollution from its varied operations. On June 20 the company will dedicate a new \$7 million air pollution control equipment for its No. 3 open hearth shop at the Indiana Harbor Works. Previously, it had installed some \$4 million worth of cleaning devices in its new basic oxygen furnace shop, and the cost for water pollution abatement installations alone at the Indiana Harbor works will total some \$50 million by 1970.

The March 1968, issue of Indiana contains an article describing in some detail the activities and future plans of the Inland Steel Co. to minimize industrial wastes. Also, the magazine Ground Water Age for June contains an interesting study of the new injection well which the company is building in East Chicago to dispose of the "pickle liquor" used to remove mill scale from hot rolled steel. In addition, I have received from Inland Steel a more complete description of the new air pollution reduction facility which will soon be in operation at Indiana Harbor. The latter, which replaces seven large smokestacks with electrostatic precipitators will clean the gasses from seven furnaces and will comply fully with a strict new air quality control ordinance adopted in 1967 by the city of East Chicago under the leadership of Mayor John B. Nicosia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three articles outlining the record of Inland Steel Co. in combating pollution be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the publication Indiana, March 1968]
INLAND STEEL CO. SPENDING MILLIONS TO
CURB AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Industrial wastes contribute heavily to the ever-increasing problem of air and water pollution. The Inland Steel Company at the Indiana Harbor Works recognizes this problem and is spending millions of dollars to do something about it.

By 1970, the cost of abatement of water pollution alone at the Indiana Harbor Works will be about \$50 million due to more than \$6 million being spent on anti-pollution devices to be built into recently announced projects such as the 80" Cold Strip Mill and the Mold Foundry expansion.

In 1965 an air pollution control program for East Chicago was initiated by Inland and Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company. This multi-million-dollar plan calls for full control of emission from open hearth steelmaking furnaces and sintering plants by 1973.

Striving to achieve the 1973 deadline, Inland opened the new Basic Oxygen Furnace shop, in place of the 12-furnace No. 1 Open Hearth. The BOF is equipped with \$4,000,000 worth of cleaning devices capable of removing more than 99 per cent of the dust from the exhaust gas of its two furnaces.

In 1966 at neighboring No. 3 Open Hearth, construction was begun on the foundations for a \$7,000,000 bank of electronic precipitators.

A 12-part program is Inland's answer to questions raised by the government concerning industry's part in the water problem. This program has received approval from the State of Indiana and will place the discharged water of the Harbor Works well within the regulations of the Calumet Area conference. (This conference was held in 1965 when the U.S. Public Health Service entered the water pollution picture by establishing quality standards for the south end of Lake Michigan.)

The first of the 12 points in the program provides for a waste acid collection and 4,300-foot-deep disposal system which will bury about 170,000 gallons a day of waste pickle liquor when it goes into operation this spring.

Another part of the program calls for the expansion and improvement of the industrial waste pond at the north end of the plant. Other features include a "closed-circuit" water treatment system for the 122 Merchant Mill, eight automatic waste water samplers at plant outfalls, larger water cooling towers at Plants 2 and 3 Coke Plants, and facilities for the disposal of coke plant lime still wastes to the East Chicago sewage disposal plant for treatment.

A change from a hot lime-phosphate process to a hot lime-zeolite process of water treatment at No. 3 AC Station to reduce discharges of phosphate nutrients is now in operation. Modifications to blast furnaces of Plant 2 to prevent dust-laden water from being discharged will essentially be completed this year. Similar improvements to Plant 3's blast furnaces, plus the addition of a secondary settling basin will also be completed this year.

In addition, this year will witness the completion of improvements to Plant 3 blast furnaces and modifications to Plant 2 and Plant 3 Coke Plant abatement facilities, plus a hookup to the city sewer for certain waste water and lime still waste.

The last of the 12 projects, the Terminal Waste Treatment Plant, is the costliest and most important, and it will take the longest to finish since a building site must first be created where the waters of the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal's Turning Basin now lie.

When it goes into operation in 1970, the plant will cleanse all water used in the older mills in Plant 2 by removing virtually all suspended solids and oil.

For 30 years Inland has been working on the problems of controlling the quality of the air and water environment of the Harbor Works. The cost of abatement equipment is high and in very few instances provides any return on the investment.

In a recent newsletter to company management people, Inland President Frederick G. Jaeks justified the expense. "The company realizes that it has duties and responsibilities which go beyond the profit motive. A lake suitable for a diversity of uses is of vital interest to us, for we not only work on its shores but also live and play here."

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration recently prepared a report on pollution problems in Lake Michigan and its tributaries. Two points directly pertain to Inland. One is that "action be taken toward the exclusion or maximum treatment of all industrial wastes contributing to pollution; and that industrial wastes be discharged to municipal sewers where at all possible."

The other recommendation is that "the discharge of oil from any source into any waters of the Lake Michigan Basin be stopped entirely."

With regard for these proposals, President Jaicks closed the company newsletter by saying, "We believe that with the completion of the current pollution abatement program, the Indiana Harbor Works will be well within both of these recommendations, and that Inland will be in the vanguard of Lake Michigan-based industries taking positive actions to ensure the preservation of a priceless natural asset."

Lieutenant Governor Robert L. Rock, Director of the Indiana Department of Commerce, toured Inland Steel on Tuesday, March 19.

Charles M. Squarcy, Assistant to the Vice-President, Steel Manufacturing, made arrangements for the Lieutenant Governor's tour.

[From Ground Water Age, June 1968]
INJECTION WELL INCORPORATES MANY SAFEGUARDS

More and more attention is being placed on the protection of our water supply, both surface and ground. This has posed a problem to some industries which produce vast quantities of obnoxious substances as by-products of their manufacturing processes. The production of steel is a case in point.

A by-product of steel production is called "pickle liquor" and consists of a combination of sulphuric acid, hydrochloric acid, iron sulphides and chlorides. This acid is used to remove mill scale from hot rolled steel. In the case of Inland Steel Co. of East Chicago, Indiana, the problem was what to do with about 158,000 gallons of this "pickle liquor" that was produced daily. Previously, it had been possible to discharge it into Lake Michigan. But recent antipollution legislation has made this impossible. The next step for Inland was to find some other more suitable place to discharge this pollutant.

Based on the results of a report prepared for Inland, it was decided to dispose of this waste through a deep well disposal system. The Mt. Simon formation, extending from 2,570 feet to 4,348 feet below surface, was selected as a suitable area into which to inject the waste.

The Mt. Simon formation is a huge aquifer that is saturated with salt water. This water ranges from 20,000 to 123,000 mg/l total dissolved solids, making it completely unsuitable for use. The aquifer also underlies thousands of square miles in Illinois, Indiana, and southern Michigan and is said to be capable of holding all of the water presently contained in the Great Lakes.

Another factor that pointed towards the use of the Mt. Simon formation was the fact that directly above it lies a solid shale formation that would act as an effective cap, thus preventing any possible movement of water upward to cause pollution. Tests further showed that the reservoir capacity of the aquifer was such that with uniform vertical distribution of the "pickle liquor," 100 years of continuous injection at 100 gpm would result in a radius of only 1,100 feet of waste liquid from the well bore to the waste front. The well bore itself consists of a 1,410 foot hole that extends from the upper shale caprock through the Mt. Simon sandstone to a point 4,300 feet below the ground where the well holes out in a granite formation.

Because of the highly corrosive nature of the waste, special considerations had to be taken during the construction of the well, especially as it pertained to material to be used for casing. While the Mt. Simon sandstone does not produce good water, aquifers higher up are in use, and there could be no risk of contaminating these.

Drilling firm on the job was Stouder Drilling Co., Evansville, Indiana, and about six months were required to complete the 4,300-foot deep well.

CASING CRITICAL

To protect the upper aquifers, three sets of steel casing were set in the hole. Two of the

casings only went part of the way down while the third, or innermost one, extended below the upper layer of shale caprock. A corrosion-resistant injection tube was then placed into this inner casing. A plug was put in between the wall of the hole and casing just below the bottom of the shale layer to completely seal off the aquifer from those above. Following this, concrete was forced into the space between the hole wall and casing until it completely filled the space from approximately the 2,500-foot mark to ground level.

Additional protection against the possibility of having the "pickle liquor" leak into good producing aquifers was provided by pumping fresh water into the annular space between the similarly plugged space between injection tubing and inner casing. This water is under constant pressure so that in the event of a leak in the injection tube, the water would be forced in rather than having the "pickle liquor" forced out.

WELL DESIGN

Well design called for 16-inch surface casing to be set to the top of the Silurian limestone at about the 170 foot mark. After this, 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch intermediate casing was set to nearly 800 feet, and a long string of 7-inch casing went down 2,440 feet, through the shale caprock, and into the Mt. Simon formation. A 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch Fibercast chemical injection tube, in turn, went down 2,550 feet. The hole itself went down to the top of the pre-Cambrian granite located at about the 4,300-foot mark.

Cutting samples were saved and bagged during drilling. Specifications called for two sets of bagged samples of cuttings to be furnished. These were labeled as to depth and were obtained from every ten feet of the hole drilled. Two core samples were also taken. Each sample was 25 feet in length. The first was taken from the upper limit in the Mt. Simon sandstone, and the second was from the lower level.

TESTING OF WELL

Specifications also called for drill stem tests to be made. The first was taken in the lower Galesville sand, at a depth of 1,800 feet. The second and third tests were taken as soon as the coring had been completed in the upper and lower sections of the Mt. Simon formation. These tests were necessary to collect water samples, take pressure measurements and to determine the degree of permeability of the formation encountered.

Following the acidizing, pulling of tubing and swabbing of the well, an injection test was run using chlorinated water at a rate of a little over 300 gpm. The test was run at four different rates in all, each for one hour. Results of these tests showed that the disposal well would have an initial disposal capacity of approximately 62 gpm of 1.2 specific gravity "pickle liquor" just using gravity flow. A rate of 150 gpm for the same specific gravity fluid would require about 577 psi well head injection pressure.

Care also had to be exercised to insure that the sandstone in the Mt. Simon formation would not become clogged, thus retarding the flow of the waste into the formation. To accomplish this, a filtering system had to be installed. This system had to be capable of removing particles from the "pickle liquor" 10 microns or more in size. Injection pumps to send the filtered liquor down the well are capable of creating pressures up to 250 psi. Two 100,000-gallon collection tanks hold the waste before it is filtered and pumped into the well. Up to 174,000 gallons of pickling wastes can be pumped into the well daily. Cost of the well was more than \$2,500,000.

STATEMENT BY INLAND STEEL CO. ON NEW AIR POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITY

A \$7,000,000 program for the reduction of air pollution from the seven-furnace No. 3 Open Hearth shop at the Indiana Harbor Works of Inland Steel Company will bear fruit

on June 20, when a huge bank of electrostatic precipitators will be put into operation.

The equipment will clean the shop's gases in accordance with an air pollution control agreement signed in May of 1965 between Inland and the City of East Chicago, Indiana.

The City of East Chicago passed a new Air Quality Control Ordinance in 1967 which superseded the Air Pollution Ordinance of 1950. The limits on particulate emissions established by this new Ordinance are among the most restrictive in the country, and are far more restrictive than those set by the Ordinance of 1950. Although the pollution abatement facilities for Inland's No. 3 Open Hearth shop were planned long before the new Ordinance was passed, Inland installed the best equipment available, which the manufacturer guarantees will exceed the requirements established by the 1967 Ordinance.

The control equipment is one of the largest such installations in the nation, and consists of a bank of electrostatic precipitators 300 feet long and taller than a 10-story building. The unit will clean the dust from up to 1,600,000 cubic feet per minute of flue gas exhausted by the open hearth furnaces.

The seven large smokestacks which originally discharged the waste gases have been capped, so that all the gases now emerging from the steelmaking furnaces are collected in ducts which lead to the precipitator.

Dust-laden gases pass successively through four precipitator fields in which the dust particles are electrically charged, then attracted to steel screens having an opposite charge. A small vibration of the screens will drop the dust to a receiving hopper.

Inland's research personnel are presently working on developing a process which would permit the re-use of this iron-bearing material in Inland's steelmaking operations.

In the first phase of the program, the dust will be collected from the hoppers, dampened, balled and stockpiled at the plant.

The precipitator is not the first air control measure taken at Inland, nor will it be the last. In the agreement signed by Inland and its neighbors, the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company, with the City of East Chicago, the two companies' combined schedule of dust reduction calls for the completion of air control projects by 1973.

According to the records of East Chicago's Air Quality Control Department, the level of particulates in the city's air has shown a significant decline since 1964. Air analyses at that time showed an average of 224 micrograms per cubic meter, and that figure dropped to an average of 146 micrograms per cubic meter in 1967. Future decreases are to be expected as the steel companies' pollution control programs continue.

At Inland Steel, other primary steel production facilities have already been the target of air quality control efforts.

The company's twin-furnace basic oxygen steelmaking shop was put into service in 1966 with dust collection equipment already installed. Exhausts at this installation pass through scrubbers to remove more than 99 per cent of the dust particles emerging from the furnaces.

Water used in the scrubbers is passed through thickeners so that dust particles settle out and are removed. The water is recirculated, to minimize the discharge of solid particles to the U.S. Ship Canal, adjacent to the plant.

The inauguration of Inland's basic oxygen furnace increased the net steelmaking capacity of the Indiana Harbor Works, and it made possible the shutdown of the plant's 12-furnace No. 1 Open Hearth shop. Termination of operations at the 64-year-old shop in itself removed another source of dust particles.

Some of Inland Steel's gas cleaning equipment predates by decades the significant steps for air quality control now being taken by the company. Gas washers have been employed in each of the plant's eight blast

furnaces since they were built, the first in 1907. Thickeners to prevent water pollution resulting from the gas cleaning operations were first installed in 1927.

Inland ranks the preservation of water quality equal in importance to its air quality programs.

By 1970, some \$50,000,000 will have been invested by the company in water treatment projects, either as separate centralized treatment facilities or as adjuncts to individual steel processing facilities.

The goal of Inland's water control programs is to meet or exceed water quality criteria established by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Indiana Stream Pollution Control Boards.

NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE'S 14TH ANNUAL CAREER SERVICE AWARDS PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on April 27, the National Civil Service League held its 14th annual career service awards program. The career service awards program is a public service of the National Civil Service League designed to promote efficiency in government by recognizing 10 career public employees for significant contributions; encouraging others in government service to pursue excellence; promoting public appreciation of quality in government; and stimulating able young people to choose careers in government.

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

The success stories of the 10 career civil servants who won the career service awards of the league give an inkling of the jobs open to able young people in government today. But there is much more to the story. Their success, adventures, rewards, satisfactions—though admittedly not typical—are shared by hundreds of thousands of other public employees. And more than 9 million people who staff National, State, and local governments share these rewards today in every kind of occupation. They range from managing and manning thousands of social services to the frontiers of space.

This year's awardees were:

Brent Ashabranner, Peace Corps;
Dr. Lewis M. Branscomb, National Bureau of Standards;
Edward P. Cliff, Forest Service;
Samuel M. Cohn, Bureau of the Budget;
J. William Doolittle, U.S. Air Force;
James F. Kelly, Health, Education, and Welfare;
Dr. Alexander D. Langmuir, Public Health Service;
Ellsworth H. Morse, Jr., General Accounting Office;
Milton Shaw, Atomic Energy Commission; and
Arbon W. Stratton, Veterans' Administration.

At the program honoring these awardees, Mortimer M. Caplin, president of the National Civil Service League, presided. The banquet was attended by outstanding leaders in Government, business, and career employees.

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

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

PROGRAM

Presiding: Mortimer M. Caplin, President, National Civil Service League.

Presentation of Colors: Military Color Guard.

Address: The Honorable McGeorge Bundy, President, The Ford Foundation.

Message from the President of the United States: The Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission.

Awards Presentation: Bernard L. Gladieux, Chairman, Board of Directors, National Civil Service League.

Together with Government officials, officers of the National Civil Service League.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, an outstanding address was delivered by Hon. McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, in which he stressed our Nation's dependence on a highly capable civil service.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bundy's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY McGEORGE BUNDY, NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 27, 1968

It is a great pleasure for me to be here and to have a chance to talk about the public service. In a very strong sense, what is said at a meeting like this is of relatively low importance compared with what is done.

Look at the records of the men who are up for honors tonight, and consider how unlikely it is that our government—perhaps any government twenty-five years ago—could have brought forward ten professional civil servants with records of achievement as clear and as varied as these. Then remind yourselves that there were ten Career Awards of this calibre last year and the year before, and that already people are wrestling with the problem of nominating and choosing ten for the year to come. Reckon the great number of men and women whose skills, whose commitment, whose service, whose accomplishment, reflect the combination of human quality and wider purpose which the Federal service means to so many of us.

Do all this, and you understand at once—in a way which no words of any individual can improve on—the degree to which the public service in the United States is now an indispensable, inescapable, and most fortunate part of the reality of our society as a whole. So we today celebrate a phenomenon without which the United States Government could not play a role—either at home or abroad—commensurate with its size, strength, and accountability.

It is entirely proper that for one evening we should emancipate ourselves from the great spectator sport of the Presidential campaign. But it is also entirely proper that we remind ourselves that whoever has the misfortune to win will find himself turning from the contest of the polls (obviously a good and necessary and extraordinarily important affairs) to the question of the process of government. When that happens, whatever may be the abrasive edges of his contact with the men and women who are here in the Federal government already, the man who wins and the men he brings with him will find themselves inescapably dependent upon the quality of the professional civil servants.

It is not at all clear to me that this great dependency on a highly capable civil service happened by design. I intend no offense to John Macy, for I think when the history

books are written the record of the Civil Service Commission in the years in which he has been chairman will be one the great stories in the American public service in its own right. But I think he would join with me in the hypothesis that the process by which the strength and quality of the public service have grown over the last two generations is even more significant than the very important and constructive individual steps to improve the status, role, and varied opportunity of the civil service. Notably under the last three Presidents, the concept of a professional career service has moved forward to include a closer and more self-respecting connection to government officials with political responsibility. This process of change has also begun to redefine the relation between the public service and the voter. It is more important than ever, in fact, that the public service should not be political in the bad sense of the word, because the public service commands a kind of public respect and public acceptance which it did not have in earlier times. This process, I suggest, is wider and deeper than laws and executive orders and exhortations, even from Presidents. It is somehow a part of the way in which this nation now conducts its business because it must.

THE PAY OF PUBLIC SERVANTS

Now, there are many problems left in the new public service—many lacks, many uncertainties, many moments of delay and discouragement and many pockets of imperfection. The most obvious—and I think it not a trivial point—is that the compensation for service to the government is still a very long distance from what it should be. This is a proposition still more dramatically true in cities and states than in the Federal service. But the lack in Washington is very strong. I have recently had occasion to look at the question of compensation and the position of the officers of the cabinet. Cabinet officers today receive salaries of \$35,000. I amused myself by asking whether if the current salary of a cabinet officer were doubled he would be better or worse off, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, than he would have been sixty years ago. It turns out to be almost a dead heat between a salary of \$70,000 in 1908 and the actual cabinet salary of \$12,000 in 1908 when you take into account both changes of price levels and what the Internal Revenue Service has done to take-home pay in the intervening years.

By one of the major reforms of recent years (a reform for which John Macy should share the credit that is officially and properly given to virtuous committees)* the basic responsibility for changing top Federal salaries now rests with a new institution called the Quadrennial Salary Commission. This independent body will have the job of making recommendations to the President, and the President in turn will have power to make recommendations to Congress—and those recommendations, which will probably be closely parallel to what the Commission brings in, will take effect unless the Congress takes positive action to overturn them. This procedure takes the individual Congressman off the hook, and quite properly so. The first Quadrennial Salary Commission will go to work this year, and I think there are at least three reasons why its members may wish to consider a recommendation to restore the cabinet salary position of 1908.

The first is quite simple and historical: 1908 was a pretty good year—it was Theo-

*After making this tribute at the League dinner I was informed by an unimpeachable source that the true originator of this ingenious reform is Senator Dirksen. I am delighted to offer hearty thanks to him for a characteristically practical contribution. You often find strong currents under roaring surf.

dore Roosevelt's last in office and his cabinet had many good men, so that level is a good one to restore.

MOBILITY

My second reason is supply and demand on a wider level. It is not only the honest-to-goodness cabinet officers who deserve more pay. Indeed the larger reason for lifting the ceiling is to be able to help some people on the third and fourth floors. The most preposterous salary schedule now operating in any large organization is that which operates in the Federal government between what is called level 5 and level 2 of the top professional range. The last time I looked, you could go from level 5 to level 2 in jumps of either \$500 or \$750, and after sharing the booty with Mr. Mortimer Caplin and his heirs and assigns, you had just enough money left to take your wife out to dinner and explain to her that it wasn't a raise, it was simply an improvement in status.

To cram four administrative levels right at the top of the Federal professional service between \$28,000 and \$30,000 is to assert futility. It makes it quite impossible to exercise true flexibility of movement in and out and up and around the Federal government. Government deserves—and any first-rate society ought to provide—a frame of mobility for first-rate men. The present frugal squeeze at the top imposes very heavily upon the sense of dedication, commitment, and willingness to persevere that has been the fuel of the Federal service, professional and amateur alike, for so very long.

I am not urging that the level of compensation at the top of the Executive branch (or any other branch of government) should be made competitive with the higher reaches of the more remunerative professions, or the executive suite of the corporate world. That is not the point; the point is simply that a government with the kinds of authority and concern, the breadth of responsibility, and the variety of problems of the United States government, handicaps itself when it leaves almost no salary space between the top of the ordinary civil service and the cabinet rank itself. So I would tolerate the "waste" of this double salary on cabinet officers. Let 'em eat cake, so that a reasonable supply of freshly baked bread can be obtained and distributed in the working parts of the government.

EXPANDING DIMENSIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY

The third reason for a salary revolution is the growth curve of the Federal government and of all government. I am not talking about the size of the government, or the magnitude in terms of manpower, or even a budget of any given office. Rather I mean the inevitability that when the National Civil Service League meets twenty-five years from now to give what may then have to be twelve or even fifteen awards, the difference between the range of responsibilities of the men who are honored then and of those who are here this evening will be as great as the difference between the responsibilities of these ten men and those of senior civil servants in 1940.

The revolution in the role and responsibility of government has been continuous since 1933; it continues today. Major problems that now are only marginally the problems of government will be central problems of government in another generation. The most obvious and the most rapidly growing one is education. The Federal government will not run the schools in 1985, but without the Federal government the schools will not run; neither will the colleges or the universities. Take the environment too: the Federal government will not own and operate the environment, but without the Federal government, the environment will be intolerable. And take international affairs. In relative growth, we are told in studies largely sponsored by the Civil Service Commission,

the international side of the government will not grow. I think myself that is a happy sign; I am all for Ambassador Tutthill's theory of the small and beautiful embassy. Sending more people to solve international problems is very often not the answer. So relative magnitudes may not grow in those crude terms, but the dangers of the world in the next generation will not grow less. Nor will the inescapable responsibility of the United States government as the greatest world power, and the only one that is constantly refreshed by having to bounce against the feelings of its own people on foreign affairs.

All these are only the more obvious areas for large governmental engagement. Others will be sure to come closer to center stage. What happens to the oceans? What happens to the processes of life in an urban society in which the very constitutional boundaries of the states may become out of date in a way which we only faintly sense today? How will all of this be reconciled with a continuing process of democratic election, democratic responsiveness, and citizen participation out in the communities of the country? How will we sort out the hundreds of government programs mounted only in the current Administration? Again I am talking not in terms of budgets or of money, but in terms of the growing skill that governmental efforts will demand, the dedication they will assume, the responsibility they will offer, the challenge they will set to the men and women of the public service. All this is another reason for respectable rates of pay.

So history, supply and demand, and the future together are compelling. Yet I am not saying that salaries or compensation are an end in themselves. If you will allow me a remark from my bygone university experience, I remember that fifteen years ago the question of what you paid a professor had become critical, not because professors were starving, but because the rates of pay in the academic profession had fallen so seriously behind the responsibilities and the requirements of the academic profession that there was an imbalance which amounted to a disorder in that whole part of our society. I don't want to say that professors are now getting paid enough (or even too much), but the scales are a great deal better than they were. The self-respect of the profession is greater than it was. We have restored the dignity of the faculties of our country just in time for them to deal with the question of the dignity of the undergraduate. I think we should do the same for the Federal government because there is a lot of trouble ahead and the society will pay dearly for skimping on the quality of its public service.

THE PROFESSIONALS AND THE PRESIDENCY

The pay question is serious, but it is just one aspect of a more profound question in the public service—the relation between the professional service and the amateur service, or if you will, between the Presidency (which is more and more an institution that goes out far beyond the reach and the personality of a single individual) and the continuing civil service as an arm of the Executive Branch of the Federal government.

This is a subject which is close to my heart and one on which, in my judgment, a great deal of nonsense has been written. Certainly there is an intake of breath, a kind of pause for observation, and a process of mutual examination, when a new administration comes in. There is a wariness deriving from somewhat different patterns of experience and expectation—in a curious way, a kind of exaggerated expectation on both sides—of the professionals by the new amateurs and of the new amateurs by the professionals. This derives not from the intrinsic nature of the people on either side, but from the incurably optimistic view which both sides share as Americans, namely that the government of the United States can, in fact, do

anything it puts its mind to. This proposition is at once essential to the conduct of democratic government in a difficult time of the world's affairs, and contrary to fact, because the U.S. government cannot, at any given moment, do anything it has a mind to. The reasons why it cannot are as varied as the problems it confronts, but at four- or eight-year intervals you get a group of people who, having toiled through an election year, have very high hopes. An election year is indeed very hard on the candidates. It is very hard on the rest of us too, and very hard on the government of the United States, which is required to hold its breath for a period that may run up to eighteen months. That requires quite a lot of breath control, and when the government of the United States has been holding its collective breath for this length of time, it wants to exhale in somebody's face.

But when a candidate has been running exceedingly hard and avoiding fatal mistakes at the rate of fifteen or twenty a day and comes to the end of an exhausting contest, his view is that it is time that he should sink into a large soft protective net and, "by God, these people—the public service—haven't been doing anything for a year. Let them show what they can do."

Now this is the surface reaction and the troubles it creates are as predictable as Daylight Saving, no matter who wins and no matter how many government officials stay and how many quit in January, February and March of next year.

But all of this is not the point. The point is the opposite: inescapably and by the nature of their tasks, the persons who constitute the Presidency—the Administration—and the continuing professional service on the other hand, will, in fact, do business with each other. (It is far from clear just who the members of the Administration are and how wide that term should be spread; there will be people who think of themselves as the Administration although the Administration doesn't think of them as the Administration, and that will take some time to sort out, too.)

The collaboration will happen with least friction and with most necessity in that mysterious center of all kinds of power—that place where politics and professionalism are mixed together behind the protective architecture of General Grant—the Bureau of the Budget. Because by definition he will be an intelligent man, whoever is the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the next time will make friends with the incumbent. The rest of the new Administration will learn slowly about what is going on there, but those who are smart will get there early enough to be remembered in the process that shapes what comes to be the 1970 budget.

GROWING SYMBIOSIS

Joking aside, I am not really talking about the gamemanship of getting into the process. What counts in the end is something wider and deeper: The Federal government is an instrument which cannot operate without the Presidency, and the Presidency is an instrument which cannot operate without the Federal government. With all their respective troubles and all their abrasions and all their impatience, one with the other, and all of the stories which can be told in and out of school about this or that outrageous requirement from the White House or this or that impossible delay in performance from this or that bureau or department, the fact of the matter is that these two great elements in the American process of government are natural allies. (Of course there are pockets of power out in the Executive Branch that are vaguely hostile to the Presidency and think of themselves as independent of it and accountable only to themselves.) We all know that the popular myth that the Executive Branch,

and especially the Presidency, is too big for its britches, is a foolish notion. The real questions that have to be raised about the effectiveness of the Federal government have to do not with excessive authority or arbitrary strength or terrible usurpation, but with the way in which an extraordinarily complex entity, tightly limited both by public opinion and by the legislature, conducts its affairs. We know, indeed, that the question that has to be asked about the government is how to make it work—how to make the decent and responsible and good things happen.

What I am trying to say, out of my experience as an amateur and my observation over a longer period, is that in the end there is no substitute for the effective communication of purpose and knowledge and understanding back and forth. I think if you try to say that one part of the job belongs to the political people—the Administration—and that another part belongs to the professionals, you will quickly be in trouble. Political judgments (not public political responsibility, for that is another question) have to be a part of the thinking of the professionals, and an understanding of professional judgments must be a part of the way of life of the Administration. The lists of people who have won the Career Award, who have made their names in the professional public service of the United States government, have a close relation to the political offices of the United States government in later years. One may joke about a distinguished professional who becomes a cabinet officer, but in seriousness one should recognize that advancement to the cabinet is recognition both of the distinguished professional service of an individual and of the inescapable interpenetration of the final political process of executive government and the professional service which the National Civil Service League exists to celebrate. This symbiosis will grow, not decrease. All the internal governmental wars and all the abrasions and all the mutual suspicion we have had in the past will continue, but they will be increasingly in the minor key. The major mode will be the sense of common enterprise.

That is, I think, the meaning of the growing concern with the effectiveness of the civil service and the concept of the civil service idea which is reflected in the public expressions and the actual practice of the last three Presidents. It is the meaning of the reality of our society as it is in 1968 and, still more, as it will be in 1978. For as long as we speak the English language, the civil servants will say "politician" with a special tone of voice, and the political office holders will say "bureaucrat" in a special tone of voice. It is a curious and interesting habit among Americans that they keep bad words for good things. But in terms of reality, the political leader and the professional civil servant will more and more be partners. They will know it more and more and the country will know it too.

CRIME AND THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following newspaper stories in the RECORD:

From the Washington Post of June 4, 1968: "Marchers Balked at Justice Department"; "Rustin Pushing for Big March"; "Rustin Call Cites 'the American Promise'"; and "Poor March Subdues Militant 'Bandido'."

From the Washington Star of June 4, 1968: "Marchers Hold 8-Hour Vigil at Justice Department"; "The Invaders Seize Bus, Stir Row at Tent City"; and "Judge in Riot Cases Criticizes District."

From the Washington Post of June 5, 1968: "Marchers Tell Clark Law Fails."

From the Washington Star of June 5, 1968: "Abernathy Denies Rustin Authority"; "Marchers Split on Protest Site"; and "Two Slain in Shooting on M Street."

From the Washington Post of June 6, 1968: "Marchers' Rift Breaks Into Open"; and "Hill Delegation Visits Resurrection City, Promises Hearings."

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 4, 1968]

MARCHERS BALKED AT JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

(By Paul W. Valentine)

More than 400 clamoring demonstrators of the Poor People's Campaign took their grievances to the locked doors of the Justice Department yesterday in an inconclusive call for action on their demands.

Leaders said they were prepared to surround the Justice Department building for an indefinite period unless Attorney General Ramsey Clark agreed to meet with a delegation of 100 demonstrators. The marchers left shortly after 10 p.m. with an agreement to meet with Clark today.

Hosea Williams, the bearded leader of direct action for Resurrection City, emerged from the building at about 8:20 p.m. with a small group after what he said was a meeting with Clark.

Williams picked up a bullhorn and announced to the crowd: "I am deeply hurt . . . I have lost a lot of respect for Mr. Clark. He said in effect, 'I am God and you all are nobody.'"

"We're going to march around this building and Mr. Clark will not go home out of this door this night without talking to us." He called for those willing to be arrested to line up in front of the building's entrance at 10th Street and Constitution Avenue nw.

About 300 demonstrators formed in a line, and Williams led about 100 of them in a march around the block.

The Attorney General left the building at 9:50 p.m., unobserved by the demonstrators. Shortly after, about 126 Campaigners, led by Williams, left the Justice Department for a meeting near the campus of George Washington University.

En route to the site, however, Williams learned that the meeting had ended, and the group returned to Resurrection City. The remainder of the demonstrating group at the Justice Department dispersed at about the same time.

Clark, meanwhile, had agreed to meet with 100 Campaigners this morning. Rudolfo (Corky) Gonzales, a Mexican-American leader from Denver, said the demonstrators would return to Justice for the meeting.

A Justice Department spokesman said last night that the Government was willing at all times to meet with members of the Campaign, but that it didn't plan to honor impromptu demands for meetings with large delegations.

The spokesman said that Clark had offered to meet with 25 persons yesterday on the question of Mexican-American issues. He also agreed to meet with 100 Campaigners today to talk about general demands.

Demonstration leaders insisted on the meeting last night with 100 persons representing all elements of the Campaign, a demand that was rejected by Clark at the meeting with Williams and the others.

Earlier, the four-week old Campaign won the endorsement of a Cabinet member, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall.

He told a group of about 30 Indians at the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

"I think the Poor People's Campaign is achieving important aims and awakening the conscience of the country in a way that hasn't been done before."

The Justice Department demonstration came in a day crowded with Campaign activity, including picketing by Indians at the National Press Building and a visit by Mexican-Americans to the Mexican Embassy where they asked Ambassador Hugo B. Margain to take their grievance to the United Nations.

Margain refused, saying it is not Mexican policy to meddle in the internal affairs of other countries.

The specific purpose of the Justice Department demonstration was to demand Federal intervention in the Los Angeles County prosecution of 13 Mexican-Americans indicted on charges of conspiring to disturb the peace. They are accused of leading a walkout and boycott of 15,000 students last March at a number of predominantly Mexican-American schools in Los Angeles.

Gonzales, Mexican-American leader from Denver, said they are demanding that Clark exercise his power to grant a 72-hour period of immunity against further prosecution of the 13 defendants while an investigation of possible civil rights violations is made.

Justice officials said they know of no 72-hour immunity period. They said it is possible to seek either a temporary restraining order through a Federal Court or attempt to remove the case from State to Federal jurisdiction, but these actions would require the initiative of attorneys for the defendants.

The 250 demonstrators walked from Resurrection City near the Lincoln Memorial to the Justice Department, getting soaked in an afternoon shower along the way.

At the northwest corner of Constitution Avenue and 10th Street nw. they were met by Nathaniel E. Kossack, second-in-command of the Department's Criminal Division.

Kossack told Gonzales a delegation of five persons could see Stephen Pollak, assistant attorney general in charge of the Civil Rights Division.

Gonzales insisted that a "more representative" group of 100 see Attorney General Clark. Kossack agreed to see what could be done and disappeared into the building while the demonstrators pressed around the locked entrance.

Department emissaries returned to say Clark would agree to see a group of 20.

The increasingly hostile crowd shouted, "No, no, everybody, everybody."

Gonzalez was unable to quiet the crowd. Hosea Williams, the bearded Negro leader of direct action for Resurrection City grabbed the bullhorn from Gonzales and beseeched the crowd to be silent.

He reminded them that the demonstration was primarily on behalf of Mexican-Americans who had agreed among themselves earlier that a group of 100 would be enough.

"I make a motion that we support their demand for 100," Williams shouted. The crowd, at least half of it Negroes, yelled agreement.

Later in the afternoon, Justice Department emissaries offered to let in 25 then and 100 today, according to Gonzales, but the demonstrators refused and settled down for an indefinite stay.

While the crowd waited for officials to respond to their demands, many chided the Metropolitan Policemen surrounding them for removing their nameplates and numbered badges.

"It's part of the conspiracy so that when they beat you, you don't know who they are and you can't sue 'em in court," yelled Williams over the bullhorn.

Assistant Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson, highest-ranking officer on the scene, quickly went

through the ranks of patrolmen, and within minutes all were wearing their name plates and badges.

Police officials say that policemen are routinely asked to remove the metal pieces in circumstances where a civil disturbance is possible to avoid having them ripped off and used as weapons.

Williams and other Negro leaders appeared to take a relatively smaller role in yesterday's demonstration, letting Gonzales and his lieutenants assume the leadership and deal with Government officials.

Though demonstrators were meeting tactical resistance at the Justice Department, their reception at the Interior Department earlier in the day was different.

In praising the Poor People's Campaign, Secretary Udall said, "It quickened a lot of action in my Department and in the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

The Indians met with Udall to hear his answers to demands they presented May 1, concerning their charges of "paternalism" by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Udall said some persons in the Bureau are "doing a first-rate job" but acknowledged that others "have what I call too much of a paternalistic attitude."

His comments drew applause from the Indians. He met with them for about 90 minutes, then served them coffee and cake.

Earlier in the morning, about 25 Indians picketed the National Press Building at 14th and F Streets n.w., to protest what they feel has been unfair reporting.

Henry Adams, a spokesman for the Indians, said yesterday about 40 Indians from Washington State are pulling out of the Campaign to test their fishing rights in their home State. He said they will deliberately fish by nets in some 20 proscribed rivers.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 4, 1968]

RUSTIN PUSHING FOR BIG MARCH

(By Robert C. Maynard)

NEW YORK, June 3.—Bayard Rustin is pulling together the liberal-left coalition that helped bring 250,000 marchers to Washington in August of 1963, but he concedes that times have changed.

"If we get 100,000 on June 19, it will be a howling success," the 57-year-old civil rights leader said here today.

Although he is doing many of the same things he did to bring off the Aug. 28, 1963, march, Rustin cited several differences in the mood of the Nation and the character of the job he has been asked to do by the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Above all, Rustin said, is the factor of time. It took three months to organize the 1963 march; this one has to be done in a little more than two weeks. The mood of the country has changed, he said, and the war in Vietnam has divided the Nation, possibly draining some of the support for the march.

He also cited the "white backlash" and development of the black-power movement as factors that could decrease the June 19 turnout in support of the Poor People's Campaign.

"In 1963, we were asking people to march for dignity," Rustin said in a two-hour interview here. "Now we are asking them to march for jobs that will cost the Nation billions of dollars."

Against all the obstacles, Rustin said, the job must be done because "if it is a success, then every institution in America will be better off; if it is a failure every institution in the country will be weakened."

Although Rustin said it is too early to announce the program for the June 19 demonstration, he said: "We will have a seat by state and alphabet for every member of Congress and for every announced presidential

candidate, so that we and the people will be able to see who is there and who is not there and vote accordingly in the November election."

He said that it is imperative that Mr. Abernathy's Campaign gain some "visible" concessions from the Government to give the poor hope and to restore their faith in the Government.

Rustin has already made some demands on the Government in behalf of the Campaign. He has issued a "call to Americans of good will" that spells out in greater detail what the Campaign's goals are.

Mr. Abernathy and other officials in SCLC have spoken up to now of "jobs or a guaranteed income." The Rustin call lists a series of specific economic demands that are described as "immediate." They include the reviving of the principle of the post-World War II Full Employment Act.

But the guaranteed annual income, which SCLC has indicated is a top demand, is not listed in Rustin's call as an "immediate demand." It is listed instead as part of a long-range "economic bill of rights."

Rustin said there is no basic difference between his proposals and those of SCLC. He said his proposals simply break into a series of individual items the overall economic objectives of the Campaign.

Smoking incessantly and gesturing with his hands as he spoke, Rustin gave his views and explained his hopes while working and eating a sandwich at his desk in the Harlem loft building that houses the A. Philip Randolph Institute, of which he is director.

In addition to the demands made of Congress, Rustin said he has made several requests to Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

In a meeting with Clark in Washington on Friday, Rustin requested that the Government provide toilets, water fountains, blankets and 25 first-aid stations and close Independence and Constitution Avenues between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

Other facilities for the June 19 march that Rustin requested include sound equipment and special arrangements whereby D.C. Transit Co. would set up a special bus route from Union Station and National Airport to the Washington Monument. Also included was the extension of the June 16 deadline for the occupancy permit for Resurrection City.

"I also made it clear to the Attorney General that the Government must be prepared to make some concrete and visible effort with regard to the demands of the Poor People's Campaign," Rustin said. He said he expects an answer from Clark Tuesday.

Also at the meeting were Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League; Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and Leonard Lesser of the AFL-CIO.

Rustin, an earlier critic of the Campaign, was asked to explain his current involvement.

"My criticism of the Poor People's Campaign at the beginning was merely about questions of logistics, and not that I was against the march," he said.

He said that on the day before the funeral of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. he told Mr. Abernathy that "if there was anything I could do to help in this time of trial for our Nation I would be glad to do it." He said soon afterward the call to organize the march came from Mr. Abernathy.

Rustin, who estimated the total cost of the June 19 march at \$125,000, said that \$25,000 had already come in from an old supporter in previous civil rights marches, the United Auto Workers. Support in the form of personnel and funds is coming in from church groups, ethnic groups and student groups, most of which he has worked with in the past, he said.

In addition, he said, many of the parade marshals and bus captains from the 1963

march were being asked to help through a special mailing.

One area from which he expects help that was not available five years ago, is from businessmen. He said the Urban Coalition, a recently organized business group, had promised support.

Discussing safeguards against violence, Rustin said that an organization of Negro policemen across the Nation has promised to provide 1000 marshals with police training or with military background.

Rustin said he supports the Campaign despite criticism of its lack of organization.

"I'll be damned if I'm going to criticize Resurrection City when the rest of American society is in such disorder," he said.

Speaking specifically of Mr. Abernathy, Rustin said, "Anybody who follows Dr. King is being measured by a standard that appears once in a century. Nobody knows the burden Ralph is under, not only in following Dr. King, but a martyred Dr. King."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 4, 1968]

RUSTIN CALL CITES "THE AMERICAN PROMISE"

(NOTE.—Here is the text of the "Call to Goodwill" issued by Bayard Rustin, coordinator of the June 19 mass march on Washington.)

On June 19, thousands of concerned Americans will converge on Washington to express their support of the Poor People's Campaign.

They will be drawn from all walks of life, from all races and creeds. They are determined to abolish poverty in this land of plenty. And they are dedicated to the principles of nonviolence, integration and democracy. We call upon all who share these basic commitments to join with us in this massive effort.

We march to redeem the American promise.

Almost 200 years ago, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed every man's right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But . . .

Is there a meaningful right to life when the Department of Agriculture tells us that nearly 20 million Americans are deprived of necessary nutrition because they are poor?

Is there genuine liberty when economic misery turns millions into outcasts who are so despairing that they do not even register to vote?

Is it possible to pursue happiness in the "other America" of the poor when according to the Council of Economic Advisers, the number of "occupied dilapidated units" in the big-city slums has increased in the last four years?

Is this justice? The richest 10 per cent of the farmers and farm corporations get more than half of a multi-billion dollar subsidy, while 82 per cent of the hungriest citizens are excluded from the Federal Government's basic food programs and two out of every three poor children don't even get a free school lunch.

Is this justice? One Federal program has helped over 10 million middle class and rich people to buy their own homes, while only 650,000 units of low-rent housing—usually ugly and segregated—have been built for the desperate.

Let America treat its poor children at least as well as its rich farmers.

Let America subsidize the families in the rotting tenements at least as well as those in the affluent suburbs.

Let us adopt an economic bill of rights. This must be our goal if the American promise is to be fulfilled. We must guarantee that:

Every employable citizen has the right to a meaningful job at decent wages. The poor are not lazy. In fact the vast majority toll long hours at menial, underpaid labor. Their wages must be raised. New careers must be created for them—in building decent hous-

ing for all; in raising the level of education, health and social care; in reconstructing and beautifying America. This is not makework. This is meaningful work that goes to the heart of our nation's needs.

Every citizen who cannot work be guaranteed an adequate income as a matter of right. A thousand economists of varying persuasions have called for a guaranteed annual income as morally necessary and economically sound.

We recognize that this economic bill of rights cannot be adopted overnight. And we are not blind to the conservative mood of the present Congress. But we shall not sit back and let the forces of reaction and cynicism win the day. This nation can and must take specific, tangible steps toward redeeming the American promise. We shall therefore make the following immediate demands:

I

We call upon the President and all Presidential candidates to endorse the basic principles of an economic bill of rights.

II

We demand that Congress, in this session:

1. Recommit the Federal Government to the Full Employment Act of 1946 and legislate the immediate creation of at least one million socially useful career jobs in public service.
2. Adopt the pending housing and urban development act of 1968.
3. Repeal the 90th Congress's punitive welfare restrictions, which put a freeze on the number of families eligible for welfare aid, compel mothers of preschool children to seek employment and deny assistance to unemployed fathers unless they can produce evidence of previous employment.
4. Extend to all farm workers the right—guaranteed under the National Labor Relations Act—to organize and bargain collectively.
5. Restore budget cuts for bilingual education, Head Start, summer jobs, Economic Opportunity Act, Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

III

We further call upon the President to declare a national emergency and, under his present statutory authority:

1. Institute food distribution programs wherever severe hunger exists in America.
2. Provide free food stamps to those who cannot afford to buy them.
3. Help poor farmers set up cooperatives.
4. End discrimination in the food offices of the Agriculture Department.
4. Give the poor first priority in existing health programs and create health services in isolated rural areas.
6. Include the poor in the planning and administration of Federal programs at local levels.
7. Organize maternal and child health centers in poverty areas.

To abolish poverty requires a massive, nationwide and integrated effort. By themselves, the poor are neither numerous nor powerful enough to win these advances. Therefore, we march together—black and white, red and brown, country people and slum dwellers, the poor and those who are not poor—because only through such a united effort can we truly overcome.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 4, 1968]

POOR MARCH SUBDUES MILITANT "BANDIDO"
(By Robert F. Levey)

A year ago this week, in a converted Albuquerque, New Mexico dairy, five Spanish-Americans using an overturned soft drink machine for a table were planning a victory—military, if it had to be—over the U.S. Government.

It is unclear whether Reyes Lopez Tijerina, his two brothers, his lawyer and a top lieutenant actually mapped down to the letter

that night the violence that would erupt the next week in unlikely Tierra Amarilla (Yellow Earth), New Mexico.

But a Santa Fe grand jury thought so, and the men were indicted for an armful of charges, including a triple kidnaping, the point-blank shooting of a State Policeman at the Tierra Amarilla courthouse and the springing at gunpoint of a dozen imprisoned followers.

NOW NONVIOLENT

And now, Reyes Tijerina, 41, who once vowed to shoot all who denied him his land and once had 600 New Mexico State Police and National Guardsmen combing arroyos and sand dunes for him, is doing his non-violent "thing" with the Poor People in Washington.

There are those in the Southwest who are laughing.

In New Mexico, for instance, Tijerina's 1967 revolt succeeded in polarizing Spanish and "Anglo" (white) groups in an area that had been without violent and overt race strife for 500 years.

Now, there is fear big-city-style on both sides, accentuated by the mystery pistol-whipping murder this spring of Eulogio Salazar, a Santa Fe Deputy Sheriff. Salazar was one of those kidnaped in the Tierra Amarilla raid, and would have been a star state witness.

ALREADY INTEGRATED

That all comes on the heels of Tijerina's conspiracy conviction for an October, 1966, takeover of a New Mexico national forest, where Tijerina and a band of about 200 scared off the U.S. Forest Service with shotguns and elected their own judges and police.

Anglo New Mexicans cannot understand the discontent—in a state where a Spanish man can easily get a car loan with a \$3500-a-year salary, where housing integration is a reality, where a U.S. Senator is Spanish, a third of the State Police Spanish, half the state government Spanish.

They can understand Tijerina's non-violent stance even less in light of what "The Bandido," as he is known, has apparently wrought.

But the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Spanish are middle-class urban. The discontent—and Tijerina's following—is among the farmers, in such hamlets as Pojoaque, Espanola, Raton and Socorro.

The Albuquerque FBI has estimated that of the 2000 families that pay \$10 a year to belong to Tijerina's *Allianza Federal de Mercedes*, 85 per cent live in remote areas.

UNDERSTANDING REACHED

Now no longer down on the farm, the man who has admitted that his ambition "is as big as the land the U.S.A. owes us" might have been expected to flounder. Tijerina's confrontation and later "understanding" with the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy this week put that idea to rest. Tijerina should remain a Poor People force until June 19.

Reyes Tijerina (pronounced RAY-ess tee-hare—EE-nuh) is a man given to passion and principle, as the roots of his name (King Tiger) suggests.

Born into a family of eight children in Lyndon Johnson's south Texas, Tijerina began his social action career unspectacularly as a labor union recruiter near San Antonio. He was later a union official in Mexico, a small-scale farmer back in Texas, and starting in 1960 the head of his *Allianza* in Albuquerque.

Possibly because his interest and skill in social action are homegrown, his statements to strangers, reporters and "foreign" crowds tend to sound pompous. It is Tijerina's organizing ability—masterful in the "down home" setting of a street crowd or a shack with chills drying on the roof—that constitutes his force.

LAND THE ISSUE

His gripe is basically that the U.S. Government, by deliberately misreading the

treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo that ended the Mexican-American War cheated today's Spanish-Americans out of millions of acres of land that belonged to their forefathers in the American Southwest.

The relevance of that complaint to those of the Poor People is "obvious," Tijerina says. "The government owes us our land. They will be more likely to see why what we say is true in this climate."

Thus, the first curiosity of Tijerina's presence here. Unlike the Negro leadership of the Campaign, he makes no mention of social justice in the form of jobs, income or food. His rural poor want to end their poverty without Government help on their own land. "We are a proud people," Tijerina says often.

Does that imply that Negroes are not? And might not Tijerina's campaign pale in the face of the larger, mostly Negro, one?

Tijerina will scrupulously avoid racial comment. But he has said he trusts the Abernathy leadership and will happily work with it. "We are one group," he says.

So a major marriage of necessity—and the second curiosity—have taken shape. As Tijerina the Tactician reads it, the Negro leadership needs non-black faces in Resurrection City. The Spanish leadership needs new, national, non-violent exposure. Both are looking in the end to favorable congressional response, Tijerina says, and both want to dilute some of the militancy and militarism of their previous stances.

Tijerina's only prior visit to Washington was long, non-violent and non-productive. He negotiated with the State Department on and off for four weeks about his land claims, and few paid much attention. This time, says Tijerina in a familiar piece of phraseology, "it is for keeps. This is the last chance for white America."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 4, 1968]

MARCHERS HOLD 8-HOUR VIGIL AT JUSTICE DEPARTMENT—PROTEST BY 600 FAIL TO TRIGGER HOPED-FOR ARRESTS

Nearly 600 Poor People's campaigners straggled back to Resurrection City and other billets through the downtown area shortly before midnight last night after an eight-hour protest at the Justice Department failed to trigger the mass arrests that now are part of announced march strategy.

The Mexican-American contingent, in the vanguard of yesterday's demonstration, was to return to the Justice Department again today, either for a meeting with Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark or for a new protest.

Hosea Williams, a top official of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said this morning that after the Justice Department march the demonstrators would go to the Office of Economic Opportunity at 1200 19th St. NW for a response to demands made last month.

CONFER ON STRATEGY

A high-level strategy meeting was under way at the private Hawthorne School in Southwest, where the Mexican-American group is staying.

The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, SCLC leader, met briefly with the group before departing for a one-day Florida trip to speak at a memorial service for the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

Also at the meeting were Williams and the Rev. James Bevel.

By mid-evening yesterday, Clark through an intermediary, agreed to meet today with a group of 100 persons representing all factions of the campaign to discuss the entire range of their complaints.

But he reiterated his position that he would meet with a delegation of only 20 or 25 if a dispute about the indictment of 13 Mexican-Americans on the West Coast was to be the only topic.

The rambling, disjointed demonstration finally began breaking up at 10:30 p.m. when

leaders announced that members of a militant Mexican-American group in Los Angeles had been released from jail.

Throughout the long day and into the night, through intermittent rain and sunshine and darkness, between 50 and 600 demonstrators demanded to see the attorney general and got no farther than the steps of the side entrance at 10th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.

EIGHTY POLICEMEN WATCH

More than 80 policemen, night sticks in their hands, stood in 10th Street watching the demonstration and refused to make arrests when the march leaders decided that that wanted to go to jail.

All other entrances to the Justice Department part of the building were locked and signs on the doors read: "Closed, use 10th Street Gate." Several security guards could be seen behind the glass doors at the 10th Street entrance.

At the FBI entrances of the building on Pennsylvania Avenue, security guards would not permit anyone to enter without a special building pass.

Some 400 protesters marched singing from Resurrection City to the Justice Department in the early afternoon to demand an investigation into the indictment Friday of a group of 13 members of the "Brown Berets" who have been charged with conspiracy in connection with a walkout of several thousand Los Angeles high school students in March.

Through the day the group stood milling about and singing at the door. * * * Herera reported back and forth between his Spanish-American leader Rodolfe (Corky) Gonzales and Justice officials.

The dispute was stalemated between the demand of the demonstrators that Clark see a delegation of 100 marchers, and Clark's insistence that he would meet with 20.

Both sides had made concessions. Clark at first had said he would meet with three to discuss the issue of the Los Angeles arrests and the demonstrators had at first demanded he see the entire group and also listen to demands for results in the search for the slayer of King.

Williams, who leads the campaign's direct action, was present as were several lower-ranking SCLC officials. Abernathy was reportedly busy attending "important meetings" around town. He showed up later in the evening for a brief speech at a rally in the Ebenezer Methodist Church at 4th and D Streets SE.

As the protest dragged on into the early evening, Williams and Gonzales frequently complained to the crowd about the stalemated negotiations.

"We will walk in very orderly," Gonzales argued. "I don't see why in the world Clark is afraid to sit down and talk to these people." The Denver-based leader of the Crusade for Justice, a Mexican-American civil rights organization, demanded that all ethnic groups in the march be present in a meeting with Clark.

Williams charged that the Negro in America has suffered injustice all over the country and has "never gotten any justice. We must have this representative group."

The Rev. James E. Groppi, the leader of a group of militant Negro youths from Milwaukee, told the demonstrators that "as long as we wait we keep the man waiting and keep those policemen on overtime, it is costing the city a lot of money." Father Groppi, a white priest, led the months-long demonstrations for open housing in Milwaukee.

Between singing and chanting, demonstrators taunted the lines of police. At one point, Williams called to the policemen:

"Any right-thinking policeman would throw down his badge and join us. . . Any right-thinking policeman would not be part of a system that kills people."

Then he pointed again to the street, where on one end of the police line the officers were mostly Negroes and on the other end mostly white.

"As hard as America tries," Williams shouted, "they can't hide their sickness.

"They just put 12 policemen in back of us and you know what? They are black. They sent them out to beat their brothers. It's conspiracy! It's injustice! It's genocide!"

At another point, the policemen had removed their badges and name plates from their shirts so as not to offer a grip for antagonists during a struggle.

As members of the crowd shouted that this had been done so no one could identify the individual officers, a high police official circulated among the police lines and the men pinned their badges and plates again on their uniform shirts.

At about 8:30 p.m., Gonzales announced over a bullhorn that Clark was still refusing to see the committee of 100 and "still wants to segregate us . . . it will be 100 or nothing." The demonstrators shouted approval.

"We don't think everybody here should go to jail," Gonzales continued. "I know you all want to go."

The crowd cheered as he announced that he would choose from the Mexican-Americans, Williams from the blacks, and Hank Adams from the Indians, the demonstrators who would prepare to go to jail.

Williams, who had entered the building to talk with Clark, took the bullhorn and said he was hurt by his meeting with Clark. "I had a lot of respect for Mr. Clark until a few moments ago," he added.

Without being an "Uncle Tom," Williams argued, he had used every means of diplomacy possible with the attorney general.

Williams said he promised Clark that he would not speak for the black people at the meeting, and that Adams would not speak for the Indians. "The only spokesman would be Gonzales, and we would not take any more of his (Clark's) time," Williams explained.

"It would have been a breach of our integrity to give more," Williams said.

Assistant Police Chief Jerry Wilson, who was in charge of the large police detail, said he had enough officers and would transport "400 or so" protestors to jail if necessary. There were some estimates that hundreds of police were in the area.

A large group of the chosen demonstrators, protected by a line of marchers with arms locked, sat on the steps of the Justice building, while another group walked toward Pennsylvania Avenue for a march around the building.

MARCHERS IGNORED

Williams placed the marching group between the seated demonstrators and the police who were standing in the street. The police ignored his marchers.

When Wilson was asked if he would arrest the demonstrators, he said:

"Well, although they're blocking an entrance to the Justice Department, no one was using the entrance—it was closed anyhow. As for the sidewalk in front of the entrance, no one is using it at this time of night so they can just stay there if they want.

"It's obvious by all of this that they're just trying to get arrested and trying to provoke an incident with us. We figure that after a while they'll get tired of all this noise and they'll go away," Wilson said.

Visibly frustrated, Williams finally announced over the bullhorn to the marchers that, "we found out that they aren't going to arrest us. You who want to stay all night until attorney (General) Clark opens that door can." The rest, he added, would be going to a strategy meeting at Resurrection City.

At this, Gonzales grabbed a bullhorn and criticized Negroes lining up behind Williams for following "a bunch of old preachers."

"If a strategy conference doesn't produce strategy and just comes up with bureaucratic decisions to fight bureaucracy, then we're in a bag," Gonzales said.

MOST LEAVE FOR MEETING

The bulk of the demonstrators left for a meeting at Lisner Auditorium at George Washington University. At 20th Street and Virginia Avenue NW, Williams told the group that the meeting that had been held by the Poor People's University at the auditorium was over. The group turned around and walked back to Resurrection City.

At 10:30 p.m., leaders at the Justice Department vigil announced that the 13 arrested in Los Angeles had been released, and the group returned to Resurrection City shouting: "We won a victory, brothers, we won a victory."

During the long sit-in at Justice, three small children were taken away in ambulances. The demonstrators were brought a hot meal about 7:30 p.m.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 4, 1968]

THE INVADERS SEIZE BUS, STIR ROW AT TENT CITY

(By Fred Barnes and Michael Adams)

A group of angry youths, whom Resurrection City marshals admitted they couldn't control, commandeered a Poor People's Campaign bus early today and threatened to drive to the Pitts Motor Hotel campaign headquarters for a protest.

The action by about 20 youths, identified as members of the Invaders gang from Memphis, prompted marshals to seek aid from U.S. Park Police to stem the latest outburst of dissension at the campsite.

But instead of heading for the motel, the youths staged a two-hour talk session in the bus and then walked back to their huts in the compound about 4 a.m.

The incident followed sporadic rock and can throwing from inside Resurrection City that forced park policemen to block off for 35 minutes the westbound lane of Independence Avenue SW, which borders the campsite.

The bus seizure grew out of an attempt by the youths to break into a truck trailer filled with food about 2 a.m. Unsuccessful in that venture, they marched to the bus, which was parked about 25 feet outside the campsite's west gate.

According to marshals, some members of the group had threatened to burn down the motel, apparently as a protest over the continued residence of some campaign leaders there. They believe all the leaders should be living at Resurrection City.

One marshal told park policemen the youths were beyond the control of the campsite officials.

"About the only thing we can do is jump on them. That's the only way to control them," the marshal told Lt. W. J. Grishkot. But he added that there weren't enough marshals available for that. "We can't stop them," he concluded.

He requested that park police block off the exits from the campsite so the bus couldn't leave. Grishkot declined, saying such action wasn't within park police power.

As it turned out, no blockade was needed at the exit.

One was needed on Independence Avenue, Lt. Grishkot said, after park policemen were repeatedly pelted as they drove by.

"I'm getting tired of this . . . getting hit by rocks every time we go through there," one officer said. "One of these times, they're gonna smash a windshield."

A few minutes later the windshield of a private vehicle was smashed by a rock, Lt. Grishkot said.

He then blocked off Independence from 17th to 23rd Streets from 12:10 to 12:45 a.m. Rocks and cans were littered across the road,

mostly along a section near the southwest end of the campsite.

Earlier yesterday and last night, a young white man who "took over" a hut in the campsite held marshals at bay with a knife and ax, grabbed a gun from a policeman who came to help and was finally felled with a chemical spray. The man, described as an outsider rather than a resident of Resurrection City, was sent to St. Elizabeths Hospital for observation.

During the day, the man turned down the pleas of a psychiatrist stationed with a medical unit at the campsite. At nightfall, marshals asked police for help.

Lt. Ronald Kerzaya of the park police talked the man into admitting him into the tent and, after Kerzaya had entered the man lunged at the policeman and got his service revolver from his holster. The policeman withdrew.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 4, 1968]

JUDGE IN RIOT CASES CRITICIZES DISTRICT (By Donald Hirzel)

A judge criticized District officials yesterday for what he termed their failure in the early stages of the April riot to order police to make arrests and enforce the law.

Judge Alfred Burka made the comment in the Court of General Sessions at the conclusion of the first group sentencing of persons arrested in connection with the riot. Burka has scheduled group sentencings for various dates this month.

Some defendants have been sentenced on riot-connected charges by other judges, but this was a group sentencing.

"I have questioned several police officers," Burka said, "and there is no doubt in my mind they operated with implicit or implied orders not to make arrests."

He added that there appeared to be no effort to instill in the public mind the idea that looters would be arrested and prosecuted, and he referred to the fact that seven persons sentenced by him yesterday said they had no fear of arrest when they went into the streets.

He also condemned those who took part in the rioting, declaring: "People we were depending upon to uphold law in the District were involved in the disorder and very few of them were caught."

PROBLEM FOR JUDGES

Burka said judges are greatly concerned about sentencing rioters because so many of the defendants have no previous police records and are family men with steady jobs.

"If we don't send them to jail, it is a sign to everyone with a clean record that he is entitled to one free ruling, but if I do . . ."

His words trailed off, and then he looked at the last man in the group he sentenced yesterday and said: "Here is a man with a wife and four children and another on the way who is working steadily to support his family . . ." Again his voice trailed off in the middle of the sentence.

He then sentenced the man, Nathaniel Dodds, 51, of the 1100 block of 10th Street NW, to a suspended 360-day jail term and placed him on probation for a year for attempted burglary II (looting).

Dodds is in a sense both typical and untypical of the rioter.

WATCHED THE PEOPLE

He told the court he is a dishwasher and makes \$58 a week. He came here from Mississippi 15 years ago after serving a six-month jail term there in 1935 for manslaughter.

He had no arrest record since being in Washington, until April 5, when he got off work and went home and sat on the porch drinking beer and watched the people milling about on the streets.

When he saw people carrying television

sets and other items up the street, he asked where they got the goods and was told they came from a nearby store.

"I saw others taking things, and I thought of the things my kids needed," he told the court. So he joined the looters but was arrested before he got anything.

"Would you have gone if you had been warned that looters would be arrested or shot?" Burka asked.

"No sir," Dodds replied. "People told me the police weren't arresting anybody and I thought it was all right since everybody else was doing it."

He said he saw "lots of police around, but nobody was being arrested."

DIDN'T EXPECT ARREST

The others sentenced yesterday also said they did not expect arrest. They also said they went into the streets because everybody else was looting.

The others sentenced had good-paying jobs, unlike Dodds, with one making \$4 an hour as a cement finisher. None of them graduated from high school.

Jessie J. Hinson, Jr., 23, of the 500 block of 7th Street SE, a truckdriver charged with attempted burglary II and petty larceny, received a suspended 360-day jail term and was placed on probation for two years.

He had one previous arrest for breaking and entering in Lancaster, S.C., in 1962, but no arrests since he came to Washington. He told the judge "I got with the wrong crowd" during the rioting and was arrested. He is married and has two children.

A. D. Huff, 36, of the 2100 block of 4th Street NE, had no arrest record. He told Burka he completed the second grade before going to work on his father's farm. He has been in Washington eight years and works as a cement finisher.

He received 180 days for petty larceny and rioting, with the sentence suspended. He was placed on probation for one year.

John H. Walker, 22, of the 3400 block of 14th Street NW, charged with attempted burglary II and petty larceny after his arrest in a clothing store, received a suspended 180-day sentence and was fined \$100 and placed on probation for one year.

Walker, a machine operator with a fifth-grade education and a native of Washington, was bailed out after his arrest by his employer who then wrote a letter to the court in which he described Walker as "honest, trustworthy and a loyal employee."

The letter stated, according to Burka, that Walker on numerous occasions had been left alone in the plant with large sums of money and never took one cent. His boss wanted him back on the job.

Walker said that when he entered the clothing store there were policemen two doors away, but "I didn't think about police. It never occurred to me that I would be arrested."

"How do you feel about what you did now?" Burka asked. Walker replied: "Bad."

Charles E. Dean, 19, and Dempsey H. Bowie, 23, came to Washington from Alabama about four and a half to five years ago and live in the 500 block of 3rd Street NW. Both are employed as cement workers earning \$3.17 an hour and neither had an arrest record.

Dean completed the ninth grade and Bowie the seventh grade. They said they "saw a bunch of other people walk out of the store" and then they were arrested.

Both were charged with attempted burglary II and received suspended 360-day terms and were fined \$100 each.

ONLY ONE GETS JAIL

Only one man received a straight jail term. He was James McDonald Carroll, 31, of the first block of Bryant Street NW. He was charged with carrying a pistol without a permit.

He received 360 days in jail after Burka reviewed his conviction record, including

charges of petty larceny, assault and carrying a dangerous weapon.

A lifelong resident of Washington, Carroll is a laborer with a sixth-grade education.

He claimed he had just bought a .22-caliber pistol from a youth on the street when he was arrested. Police said they recovered the gun and 26 rounds of ammunition. Carroll said he planned to take the gun home.

The last of the eight to appear before Burka was Sylvester Burrows, 47, of the 1200 block of 5th Street NW, who was charged with attempted burglary and rioting.

He previously entered a guilty plea to the charges, but when he came before Burka yesterday he said it was all an "accident."

Burrows claimed that on April 5 he was standing near a liquor store when a crowd surged by him and the next thing he knew he was in the store, where he was arrested. The judge set aside the guilty plea and set a trial for July 2.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 5, 1968]

MARCHERS TELL CLARK LAW FAILS—LEADERS CALL FOR REFORMS, EQUAL JUSTICE

(By Willard Clopton, Jr., and Paul W. Valentine)

One hundred representatives of the Poor People's Campaign spent an emotional 2½ hours with U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark yesterday, charging that the scales of justice in America are weighted heavily against the needy.

Nine speakers, drawn from all ethnic and geographical groups participating in the Campaign, railed against the Nation's chief law-enforcement official, accusing him of falling far short of his responsibility to assure equal justice for all people.

Clark responded by issuing a 15-page summary of actions being taken by the Justice Department, but he failed to satisfy the protesters.

His report focused on court actions that have been or are being taken to promote equal opportunity in the fields of employment, education, housing and legal protection.

While the meeting was under way, a key member of Congress was demanding that the residents of Resurrection City be required to evacuate their 15-acre camp by the Reflecting Pool when their permit to occupy the area expires June 16.

Rep. Kenneth J. Gray (D-Ill.), who was instrumental in having the permit issued, said the shantytown is a threat to the health and safety of both the campers and residents of Washington.

The statements were part of a House Public Works Committee report endorsing Gray's bill to prohibit camping on public property here after June 16.

Three Committee members filed a dissenting report, saying a forceful termination of the permit would open the way "for demagogic and violent approaches of the . . . militant extremists."

The three—Reps. Jerome R. Waldie (D-Calif.), James C. Cleveland (R-N.H.) and Richard D. McCarthy (D-N.Y.)—argued that the "passage of this bill would be one clear indication that the Congress will not encourage access to customary channels of presenting grievances and seeking change."

In another development, Hosea Williams, the Campaign's chief of direct action, repudiated a statement on Monday by Bayard Rustin of New York, who sought to present the Campaign's demands in a five-part "package" that Congress could more conveniently deal with.

Williams said that Rustin, the civil rights theoretician who masterminded the 1963 March on Washington, has no other responsibility in the Campaign than to "do some public-relations" work for the planned mass rally here June 19.

"His policy statement is completely out of order . . . He had no business doing it and we will not accept it," Williams said.

The late-afternoon visit to the Justice Department was preceded by a morning meeting of the Campaign steering committee, at which non-Negro participants in the protest sought a large role in decision-making.

REPRESENT ALL VIEWPOINTS

Rudolfo (Corky) Gonzalez of Denver, a spokesman for the Spanish-speaking contingent, said afterward that the steering group had been "restructured" to better represent all viewpoints.

Rivalry over decision-making has accounted in part for the delay in moving the large Mexican-American contingent into the camp. The group has been staying at Hawthorne School, 501 I st. sw.

Williams said efforts will be made to have all Campaign participants in the camp within a few days. The population at the muddy encampment stood at about 1,500 yesterday, about half the number the leaders said would live there throughout the Campaign.

About 250 protesters marched to the Justice Department at 3 p.m. The majority waited outside while the 100 met Clark in the Department's Great Hall.

The meeting was set up after a large group from Resurrection City demonstrated outside the building for eight hours on Monday in a vain effort to arrange for a delegation to go inside.

The Attorney General greeted the 100 courteously, presented his 15-page report and received scattered applause.

The document said the Department has given its "highest priority" to enforcing Federal laws against discrimination in employment. Clark said that 22 suits have been filed, 12 of them this year, to promote open hiring and promotion policies.

He also said that all U.S. attorneys have been asked to "commit more manpower to civil rights enforcement, particularly in the employment area."

Clark said the Department is now involved in 165 school desegregation cases in 14 Southern states and recently filed its first two suits in Northern states.

PROMPT ENFORCEMENT

He said Justice Department officials are "committed to full and prompt enforcement" of the housing provisions of the 1968 Civil Rights Act and that "FBI investigations are already under way" in preparation for the Department's assumption of responsibility under the Act next Jan. 1.

He also noted that the Act extends the Department's power to prosecute those who interfere with persons exercising their rights to equality in education, jobs, housing and other areas.

"Those provisions will be promptly and effectively enforced," he said.

Among the Campaign spokesmen was the Rev. James Groppi, the Catholic priest who has campaigned for Negro rights in Milwaukee.

"The courts and the judicial system are corrupt," Father Groppi charged, noting that a Milwaukee judge had ordered a \$50,000 bond for a youth arrested for looting but only \$2,500 bond each on two white youths who fatally shot a Negro woman.

PROTESTS LIGHT FINES

He also reported that a court there had fined a slum landlord only \$1 on each of 12 housing violations among the landlord's ghetto properties.

"We didn't come here to play games," the priest said, angrily. "If we have to turn this Capital upside down, brother, I'm all for it."

Jose Ortiz, a Puerto Rican youth from New York City, said that the Government must raze slum dwellings "or we will do it ourselves. We ain't got money, man, but we got matches."

He added: "If capitalism's so good, show me it's good."

Lola Mae Brooks, a housewife from Sunflower County, Miss., waved her finger in Clark's face and asserted loudly, "We ain't going to wait till you set us free." She also told him, "You talk about justice! Why don't you find the killer of Dr. King?"

Reporting later to the group outside the building, Gonzalez said:

"We told Clark that if he didn't cure the illness of this country, we'll go home and cure it ourselves . . . If we get no action, we'll have to take the law back to the people and let the people make this society the way they want it to be."

The group left the building about 5:30 p.m. and returned without incident to Resurrection City. Leaders plan a visit today to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

MAN, 38, DISARMED, SENT TO HOSPITAL

A 38-year-old man armed with a butcher knife and a pistol he had taken from a Park policeman was disarmed by Resurrection City marshals near an entrance to the camp Monday night and sent to D.C. General Hospital for mental observation.

The man, identified by the police as Maurice Farr, who gave authorities an incorrect Washington address, was sent to the Hospital after being examined by doctors at the camp.

Later Monday night, police closed Independence Avenue along the southern edge of the city to traffic after a number of rock-throwing incidents were reported. Park Police said that one of their cars was damaged and two motorists reported their cars were struck by rocks or bottles.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 5, 1968]

ABERNATHY DENIES RUSTIN AUTHORITY

(By James Welsh)

Specific goals of the Poor People's Campaign, only loosely defined since the start of the march, remained uncertain today after top officials of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference criticized a detailed policy statement released by Bayard Rustin.

Rustin, longtime civil rights leader and named by the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, SCLC chief, to organize the massive one-day protest here on June 19, released the statement Sunday, delineating the immediate and long-range objectives of the campaign.

Rustin was quoted earlier as saying he had "full authority" from Abernathy in issuing the statement. But last night, interviewed in Miami, Abernathy said, "I did not authorize and neither did I issue" the policy statement.

Abernathy, who returned here today from addressing a labor convention, refrained from criticizing Rustin. Nor did he repudiate Rustin's statement. He did say it failed to go far enough.

Hosea Williams, "direct action" leader of the campaign for the SCLC, yesterday rejected the Rustin statement as "a bunch of jazz and foolishness."

Rustin had issued "a call to Americans of good will" to support the march and to work for "an economic bill of rights" and a number of specific legislative demands.

SHOULD BE "BROADER"

"I do not think it is comprehensive enough to cover the demands of the Poor People's Campaign," Abernathy said last night. "I go along with some of his ideas, but I think it's got to be much broader."

Abernathy expressed belief the Rustin statement should have contained a condemnation of the war in Vietnam. He did not elaborate on what he considered other shortcomings of the Rustin statement.

Abernathy said that he would "issue a statement once I have a chance to discuss it with Mr. Rustin."

From New York, Thomas Kahn, press officer for Rustin's June 19 mobilization effort, said this:

"I myself read off the policy statement to

Andy Young (the Rev. Andrew Young, a top SCLC official), and I was in the room about 24 hours later when Mr. Rustin was on the phone to the Rev. Abernathy. There was full agreement then."

A CONDITION OF JOB

That was the weekend before last, said Kahn. Further, he said, authority to clarify the campaign demands was one of a number of conditions Rustin set forth in agreeing to coordinate plans for the march.

Some of SCLC's top hands are known to be cool toward Rustin who, though an old ally of Dr. Martin Luther King, originally opposed bringing the Poor People's Campaign to Washington. Rustin organized the 1963 civil rights march on Washington, which brought about 250,000 people here for one day.

Congress, still largely noncommittal in its response to the Poor People's Campaign, now faces two questions:

—Who speaks for the campaign and its legislative demands?

—Which set of demands is to be taken seriously?

CAPITOL HILL CONFUSION

On Capitol Hill, confusion over policy came as an unpleasant surprise to the congressmen working most closely with lobbyists for the Poor People's Campaign. Plainly, most of them had welcomed the Rustin statement of objectives as an alternative to the rambling vaguely worded list of demands originally submitted by the SCLC.

"This new statement is something we can work with, and there is some hope these goals can be attained," said Alton Frye, a member of the staff of Sen. Edward Brooke, R-Mass., now working full time for an ad hoc committee of liberal senators and congressmen concerned with the campaign.

Members of the ad hoc committee made a tour of Resurrection City this morning.

RUSTIN'S DEMANDS

The "immediate demands" in Rustin's statement include 1 million jobs for the poor in public works, 6 million new housing units over the next decade, repeal of the "punitive welfare restrictions" included in last year's amendments to the Social Security Act, extension to farm workers of the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, restoration of social-welfare budget cuts and administration efforts to push laws already on the books and thus increase the flow of food and health services to the poor.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 5, 1968]

MARCHERS SPLIT ON PROTEST SITE—RIFT FOLLOWS THE SHOOTING OF KENNEDY

A small Mexican-American contingent from the Poor People's Campaign marched on the Department of State today after a violent argument with campaign officials on protests today in the wake of the shooting of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

Southern Christian Leadership Conference officials charged that the protest by the Spanish-speaking group had not been cleared with SCLC, and that a main target of the campaign today was to be the National Rifle Association, with headquarters on 16th Street NW at Scott Circle.

"We've got to bring the attention of the nation to the NRA," said Hosea Williams, leader of "direct action" for the campaign—"They're going to kill all our leaders . . . The NRA encourages a sick nation to kill us off. . . ."

The argument between Williams and Reyes Lopez Tijerina erupted shortly after a group of about 15 senators and House members belonging to the special congressional liaison committee for the march toured Resurrection City.

A TERSE ANNOUNCEMENT

Word of the critical wounding of Kennedy came to the camp residents about 4:30 a.m.,

when the camp public address system tersely announced: "Sen. Kennedy has been shot—keep calm."

SCLC leaders scheduled a prayer service for Sen. Kennedy at the Lincoln Memorial before the march on NRA headquarters, where some 300 employees evacuated the building this morning after a telephoned bomb threat. NRA officials said a number of other threats have been received there since the shooting. The organization has opposed gun control legislation.

The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, SCLC chief, arrived at Resurrection City about 9 a.m., where many of the 1,750 residents were gathered in small groups, discussing the shooting of Kennedy in Los Angeles.

RECOUNTS SHOOTINGS

After conferring with staff members, Abernathy issued a statement, saying, "I was terribly shocked because of the shooting. A little under five years ago, President Kennedy was killed. Two months ago our leader, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., was killed, and now, Robert Kennedy, a gallant fighter for peace has been felled by bullets . . . We must quickly move to end this (attitude of hate)."

As the call for a demonstration on the NRA was being made in the camp, Tijerina jumped on the small plywood stage in the center of the camp and began calling for volunteers to accompany the Mexican-American delegation to the State Department.

Williams grabbed the bullhorn from the fiery New Mexican land-reform leader, and said, "I know nothing about this demonstration . . . I am the leader of direct action and all such demonstrations come out of this city. . . ."

PERSONAL INSULTS EXCHANGED

After several heated exchanges, including personal insults, Tijerina left to take his group to the State Department, asking that the SCLC contingent come by there on the way to the NRA and the Spanish-speaking group would join them.

Abernathy said that SCLC may suspend all further protests for the day after the NRA demonstration.

"We've got to do something about banning firearms," he said. "We do want the life of this great American (Kennedy), who was concerned about all people, saved. . . ."

TOUR BY CONGRESSMEN

The congressional group, led by Sen. Edward Brooke, R-Mass., the only Negro in the Senate, arrived by bus for the tour at the invitation of the SCLC.

Brooke said, "Our hearts are heavy. We certainly pray for the family of Sen. Kennedy and we also pray for our country."

Sen. Jacob Javits, R-N.Y. told campsite residents, "We are here to learn." When asked if Congress had done enough to prevent such tragedies as Kennedy's shooting, he said, "Obviously we haven't—John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy—when does it all end."

The committee members toured the campsite, where the long inundation of mud now was beginning to harden, and then held a brief question and answer session with residents, and were generally well received.

VISIT TO JUSTICE

A delegation of 100 campaigners, representing the different ethnic groups, yesterday presented grievances to Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark at the Justice Department as about 200 others waited outside on Constitution Avenue.

About 100 demonstrators were permitted to enter the Justice Department building for the meeting with the Attorney General. Another 150 to 200 remained outside.

Wooden folding chairs were set up in a second-floor meeting room for the demonstrators, who were there specifically to get a response on demands that had been left there by Abernathy last month.

Seated in chairs at the front of the audi-

torium facing the audience were Clark, Stephen Pollack, assistant attorney general on civil rights, and Roger Wilkins, director of the Community Relations Service. Some 10 U.S. marshals stood behind the officials.

CLARK SPEAKS OF JUSTICE

Williams told Clark, speaking first, "We're only asking for justice for all mankind."

Then Clark spoke. He said that the federal government and particularly the Justice Department had made great strides in civil rights in recent years in the areas of fair employment, school integration, the protection of civil rights workers, fair housing and fishing rights for Indians.

"I hope we can go forward in quest of freedom," Clark told the restless demonstrators. "I hope that we will realize that justice has been found only when there is order under law."

At this point Rudolfo Corky Gonzales, who had earlier attempted to interrupt Clark, spoke for the first time.

"We didn't come here to patronize Mr. Clark," said Gonzales. "We didn't come here to be polite. . . . We've had civil rights legislation for years, but there have been so many amendments to it it is not worth the paper it's written on." His words drew loud applause.

CITES CALIFORNIA CASE

The mustachioed Gonzales cited specifically a case in Los Angeles in which 13 Mexican-Americans were indicted on charges of conspiracy to commit a disturbance in connection with the East Los Angeles student boycotts. The men are accused of inspiring the boycotts. The Mexican-Americans claim they are being used as scapegoats.

The Rev. James Edmond Groppi, the white priest who lead the Milwaukee youth council of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told Clark, "If 500 members of the Daughters of the American Revolution had been outside, you would have accepted them. But somehow the poor are second-class citizens." Groppi was referring to the fact that yesterday Clark refused to meet with all of the demonstrators who had come to the Justice Department building.

CRITICIZES POLICE CONTROL

Groppi criticized the Justice Department for not exercising more control over local police departments throughout the country.

Jose Ortiz, a Puerto Rican leader from New York City, said heatedly to Clark, "You better go tell the government to get their guns together 'cause we're ready to go and die . . . For every poor person killed 10 cities are gonna burn in flames. We may burn some places down, but when we build 'em up they're gonna be ours. . . ."

But the most fiery speaker of the afternoon was Lila Mae Brooks from Sunflower, Miss. Speaking to Clark, she said, "You think 'cause you're white you're free. But you ain't any more free than us. You talk about justice in the South . . . If you have justice we're gonna have it too. And if we don't have it, you better be gone."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 5, 1968]

SHOOTING BRINGS POLICE OVERTIME

The night shifts of the Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments were held until 9 a.m. today and the day shift which normally reports at 8 a.m., was called in early when word of the shooting of Sen. Robert Kennedy reached police headquarters.

A number of policemen in specialized jobs who were scheduled to be off, also were ordered to report.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 5, 1968]

TWO SLAIN IN SHOOTING ON M STREET

Two young marine lieutenants were fatally shot and a third officer and a young woman

were wounded early today in a burst of gunfire at a Georgetown hamburger shop.

Police arrested three men a block from the scene, the Little Tavern at 3331 M St. NW, and charged them with homicide. The three, all Negroes, gave California addresses.

One told police he had come to Washington late last week to join the Poor People's Campaign. He told police he was living in a 14th Street apartment and not at Resurrection City.

POLICE LIST NAMES

Police listed the dead officers as Lt. William King, 21, and Lt. Thaddeus Lesnick, about 20, who had come to Washington with three other officers late last night after a social function at the Marine base at Quantico, Va.

The wounded man, police said, is Lt. Ellsworth E. Kramer, 26, who suffered a scalp wound. A woman with the group, identified as Barbara Kelley, 25, of the 1800 block of Metzert Road, Adelphi, Md., was shot in the hip.

All the victims were white.

Charged with homicide are Gordon Alexander, 27, and Cornelius Frazier Jr., 23, both of San Jose, Calif., and Benjamin Murdock, 20, of Los Angeles.

The other two lieutenants from Quantico were identified by police as Daniel LeGear Jr., 26, and Frank R. Marasco, 23.

Earlier this week in Georgetown, an 18-year-old Wilson High School senior, Thomas Williams, was shot to death in a parking lot behind the all-night Peoples drugstore at Wisconsin Avenue and O Street NW, about three blocks from the site of this morning's shooting.

A 29-year-old man described as a former member of a motorcycle gang is being sought in the Williams shooting, which followed an exchange of words between two small groups of youths on Wisconsin Avenue.

In today's case, the five officers came to Washington and called on some friends, police said.

Finally the five, accompanied by Miss Kelley, went to the hamburger shop and were at the counter when some words were exchanged with three men after one of them made a remark about the name of one of the Marine officers, displayed on his uniform, police said.

The three civilians left, but returned in a matter of minutes and shooting began, police said. Police said they later recovered two guns. One witness reported that nine shots were fired.

Police converged on the area after the shooting, which took place about 3 a.m. Pvt. Junior Webster, alone in a scout car, said he heard the shots and took off after a Mustang racing from the scene and captured the three suspects.

Lesnick was pronounced dead at 3:15 a.m. at George Washington University Hospital, and King at 3:50 a.m. at Georgetown University Hospital.

Kramer was taken to the GWU hospital and later moved to Bethesda Naval Hospital where his condition was termed satisfactory. Miss Kelley was in the GU hospital, also in satisfactory condition.

Police identified Alexander as the suspect who said he had come here to join the Poor People's Campaign. They quoted him as saying he did not come East with the other two suspects but became acquainted with them here.

A roommate of Miss Kelley said the wounded woman has worked for two years as a medical secretary at Holy Cross Hospital in Silver Spring, and comes from Montgomery, W. Va.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 6, 1968]

MARCHERS' RIPT BREAKS INTO OPEN

(By Paul W. Valentine)

A long-smoldering dispute in the Poor People's Campaign erupted yesterday when Negro leader Hosea Williams and Mexican-

American Reles Tijerina squabbled at a public meeting over who is leading whom.

The two men, standing on a raised platform above about 200 Resurrection City residents shouted at each other, projecting their voices with a bullhorn, which they courteously passed back and forth.

It all began after Williams, who says he is director of demonstrations, announced plans for a march on the National Rifle Association to protest the shooting of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.).

Tijerina, leader of a group of Mexican-Americans who have refused to move into the predominantly Negro Resurrection City and are staying at the private Hawthorne School about a mile away, then announced separate plans for a march on the State Department to protest American enforcement of the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

A perplexed look came over Williams' face and he took the bullhorn from Tijerina's hands.

"I know nothing of this demonstration, and I am supposed to be in charge of direct action."

Tijerina took the bullhorn back and said the march had been discussed Tuesday at a meeting of the Campaign's steering committee.

The two took several turns arguing over the bullhorn while the crowd, clearly divided among Negroes and Mexican-Americans, grumbled and glared among themselves.

Tijerina accused Williams of "humiliating" Mexican-Americans by leaving them out of the decision-making processes of the Campaign.

Williams countered, "Brother, we need to coordinate." At another point, he said he would take the issue to the encampment's "City Council."

Tijerina dismissed the suggestion as something for Williams to "hide behind." Tijerina has contended that the Council consists primarily of Campaign caravan leaders, most of whom are Negro staff workers for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

As Tijerina continued his criticism of the Campaign leadership, Williams and several Campaign marshals began hustling the crowd away for other activity.

A few Negro staff workers remained with Tijerina and agreed to meet privately later in the day to discuss the Mexican-American role in the Council.

One source closes to the Negro leadership said the difficulties in getting Resurrection City built and enduring the recent rains have prevented SCLC from giving more attention to the role of non-Negro minorities in the city. He predicted that the private meeting with Tijerina would patch up the situation.

Meanwhile, Tijerina said, he will continue to plan demonstration independently at the Hawthorne School but will invite Resurrection City residents to join them.

"We need unity, and I want that," he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post
June 6, 1968]

HILL DELEGATION VISITS RESURRECTION CITY, PROMISES HEARINGS

(By Jean M. White and Willard Clopton, Jr.)

Congressmen repaid the visits of Poor People's campaigners to Capitol Hill yesterday as a delegation of about 15 Senators and Representatives went to Resurrection City.

Flanked by his colleagues, Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.), head of a congressional liaison committee, promised the residents to hold hearings at the camp so they can deliver their complaints directly to Congressmen.

The congressional visit to the rut-marked camp started off a day in which one band of demonstrators besieged the State Depart-

ment and another carried the campaign to the antipoverty headquarters of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

STORMY OEO SESSION

At a stormy two-hour session in an eighth-floor OEO conference room at 19th and M Streets n.w., nearly 150 Campaigners listened as poverty officials answered a list of demands they had presented earlier.

Hosea Williams, a fiery Campaign official, said he would take the answers back to Resurrection City where SCLC officials would study them.

"If we like them we'll come back here and thank you and if we don't we'll come back to demonstrate," he told Bertram Harding, acting director of the OEO, who presided at the meeting.

It was a day overshadowed by the news of the shooting of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy. The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy led a prayer service in front of the Lincoln Memorial, monument to another victim of an assassin's bullet.

Mr. Abernathy, who took over the leadership of the Campaign after the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., told those knelt in prayer at the west end of the Reflecting Pool:

"I believe a conspiracy is taking place in this country designed to kill off all people who are standing up bravely for the rights of the poor people."

PROTEST ANNOUNCED

The leaders had announced a protest at the headquarters of the National Rifle Association but called it off for the prayer service.

Earlier, welcoming the Senators and Representatives to the camp, Mr. Abernathy said he was glad to see them there because "we get a little tired of going up to the Hill."

The Congressmen tasted some of the dark bread cooked in the camp bakery, visited the day-care center for children, and went to the encampment's "City Hall."

Sonya Mae Smith, a Campaigner from New York City, was receiving a U.S. Senator with a robe thrown over her blue and white flannel pajamas while heating a tin can of water.

"Welcome to my home," she said, opening the flap of the shanty that she shares with two others.

Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.) went in and asked questions about the heating and cooking.

Clark was one of six Senators on the tour. In addition to Brooke, the others were Sens. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.), Charles H. Percy (R-Ill.), John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.) and Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.).

They were joined by a delegation of Congressmen, including Reps. Charles C. Diggs Jr., (D-Mich.), Patsy Mink (D-Hawaii), Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., (D-Mass.), William A. Barrett (D-Pa.), Robert Nix (D-Pa.), James C. Corman (D-Calif.) and William B. Widnall (R-N.J.).

Most of the Senators and Representatives on the visit serve on a 30-member ad hoc committee set up to act as a go-between for Congress and the Campaign.

Set up informally but with approval of the House and Senate leadership, the committee hopes to head off emotional confrontations and help the poor people get their message across to Congress.

Brooke, the chairman, has been stressing the need for "realistic goals." Yesterday he made a pitch for support from the campaign for the \$5.5-billion housing bill passed last week by the Senate.

"We are hopeful one of your goals will be this housing bill," the Senator said.

Mr. Abernathy summoned the residents of the shantytown to an open-air meeting in "Martin Luther King Plaza" to meet the Congressmen.

Brooke, only Negro in the Senate, was cheered as he was introduced as a "black brother and a soul brother."

He opened the meeting to complaints. When they came fast and furious, Brooke suggested that the liaison committee send down subcommittees to hear gripes on jobs, housing, welfare, and hunger.

While the friendly Congressional liaison committee members were visiting Resurrection City, the House Rules Committee approved legislation that could close the camp on June 16. The vote was 9 to 6.

Approval came over the objections of Committee liberals, who said the bill could bring a re-enactment of the 1932 Bonus Army confrontation and touch off riots.

The present Resurrection City permit expires June 16. The proposed bill would ban camp-ins of any kind on public property inside the District.

But Rep. Kenneth J. Gray (D-Ill.), the measure's chief sponsor, said yesterday he doubted that it could get through Congress to take effect either by June 16 or June 19, when a massive demonstration is planned.

Rep. John Young (D-Tex.) told the Rules Committee that the campaign has been "a big flop" so far, adding, "I would hate to see us set the stage for the people that they've been unable to set for themselves."

Some of the visiting Congressmen yesterday saw an open split among the Campaigners when Reles Tijerina, head of the Mexican-American faction, refused to delay a march by his people to the State Department.

Tijerina seized a bullhorn from Williams, the demonstration director, who was calling for a march on the National Rifle Association.

Later Tijerina led a band of followers to the State Department. The demonstration turned into a stand-off.

Tijerina asked to see Secretary of State Dean Rusk and was told that the Secretary was greeting the visiting President of Costa Rica.

About 45 minutes later, Covey T. Oliver, assistant secretary for inter-American affairs, came out to the demonstrators and delivered a five-minute talk in Spanish.

Tijerina cut him short and said the demonstrators were there to present grievances and not to listen. He wanted to know "who comes first—a foreigner or your citizens?"

Oliver asked in return: "Where is your courtesy to a visitor?"

At one point, he told Tijerina, "Obviously, you are not in rational control of your faculties."

The demonstrators later walked back to Resurrection City.

The demands presented to the OEO by the marchers ranged from requests that more poor people be placed in policy-making positions on local antipoverty agencies to a demand that OEO get an extra \$75 million from Congress immediately to beef up summer programs.

Acting Director Harding said he felt the Campaigners would agree when they studied his ten pages of answers that most of their demands had been met by his office.

He said it was impossible at this time of year to get another \$75 million out of Congress and that he was more concerned with trying to drum up support for next year's \$2.8 billion proposed budget, almost \$400 million higher than the OEO budget for the fiscal year ending June 30.

NEBRASKA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. President, next week the Nebraska Rural Electric Association essay contest winners will be in Washington. This visit is their award for composing essays on "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community."

These youngsters' essays are especially valuable in indicating the great advances made through the electrification of rural

America. These enlightening compositions, selected from several hundred on the subject, emphasize the special significance of rural electrification not only in the authors' own communities but also throughout Nebraska where 98 percent of all farms now have electrical power. Certainly the farms of today enjoy increased comfort and productivity thanks to the labor-saving devices made possible by electricity.

Fifty years ago when the electrical revolution had not yet reached the farm—the oil lamp, the coal-burning stove, and the hand milking of cows were all commonplace. With the advent of low-cost rural electrification—lighting, cooking, and even milking are now well within the confines of modern living.

This years' contest winners are most fortunate to have grown up in an age when a seemingly endless array of electrical appliances are a natural part of rural life. It appears evident from these youngsters' essays that they are well aware of the rigors of farm life before the wonders of rural electrification became widespread.

Again this year I take great pleasure in offering some of these fine presentations for preservation in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD essays written by the following:

Beth Popken, 16, a junior at St. Patrick's High School in Maxwell, Nebr. Sponsor: Dawson County Public Power District, Lexington, Nebr.

Janice Porter, 16, a junior at Wheatland High School in Madrid, Nebr. Sponsor: the Midwest Electric Membership Corp., Grant, Nebr.

Craig Rowland, 17, a junior at Newcastle High School in Newcastle, Nebr. Sponsor: Northeast Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Emerson, Nebr.

Georgia Thurber, 15, a sophomore at Nelson High School in Nelson, Nebr. Sponsor: South Central Public Power District, Nelson, Nebr.

April Walgren, 15, a sophomore at Osceola High School in Osceola, Nebr. Sponsor: Polk County Rural Public Power District, Stromsburg, Nebr.

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

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Beth Popken, age 16; grade, 11; school, St. Patrick's High School; name of father, Donald H. Popken, Maxwell, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by Dawson County Public Power District, Lexington, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth. And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of God moved over the waters. And God said, 'Let there be light.' And light was made. And God saw the light and that was good."

Through man's progression toward civilization, each forward step has depended upon his development of a better source of light for his use.

First, burning torches, then candles gave way to oil lamps and gas lights. Now, we have the modern wonder of light available at the touch of a switch almost everywhere.

I did not live in the days my Grandma tells me about, when one of her daily chores

was to fill the coal-oil lamp and clean the chimney—I'm afraid people my age tend to take our wonderland of light and convenience a bit too much for granted.

A massive blizzard and ice storm two years ago taught me, very pointedly, how much we depend on electricity in our daily life here on the farm, and in our tiny rural community. For four days and nights life seemed at a standstill. The lights were out! We had no heat, no water, and no radio or television. We hand-pumped water for our cattle, our food and meat was spoiling in the freezer, and a neighbor spent nearly twenty hours a day hand-milking his large dairy herd. In our town, the grocer was giving away meat and ice-cream for lack of refrigeration. By the time the power was restored, everyone was mentally and physically exhausted.

It had always been a mystery to me why man had lived for centuries making little or no progress. Why, in just the last hundred years man had advanced from horse and buggy to space ships, and from oil lamps to laser beams?

One night during the blizzard blackout as I sat shivering in our cold house staring at a candle flame, it dawned on me that electricity was the "foot" on the accelerator of progress.

Beginning on the day Ben Franklin flew his kite, electricity has revolutionized the world. As man has learned to utilize this magic power for his service, electricity has become the silent partner of industry and agriculture.

Today, every person served by electricity has the equivalent of thirty slaves at his command. In our homes, we put our kilowatt slaves to work washing and drying our clothes, running the vacuum sweeper, and heating the iron, the coffee pot, and the toaster. Our slaves spin the records on our stereo set, bring in the pictures and sound on television, and spread heat and light throughout the house.

The handiest "hired man" on a farm is electricity, for it replaces muscles with electrical energy in countless tasks, and it never asks for Sundays off.

I thank the Lord for the light of the day, and when evening comes I'm glad my day doesn't have to end. Thanks to R.E.A. we have light.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Janice Porter, age 16; grade, 11; school, Wheatland High School, Madrid, Nebr.; name of father, Don Porter, Elsie, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Midwest Electric Membership Corporation, Grant, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

As the flag of the United States is the symbol of freedom, so has Willie Wirehand become the symbol of a better way of life for rural Americans. Willie Wirehand was chosen by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association members in 1950 to serve as their national symbol of rural electrification.

It was through the hard work of many dedicated men with courage to fight for rural electrification that rural electricity became a reality; a reality not only in our United States but in other parts of the free world.

Electricity is the keystone of modern farm methods, and is now supplied to 98 percent of the 3,800,000 farms in the Nation today. When rural electrification came about, it brought great economic as well as social changes. It, as you might say, brought the farmer out of the "dark ages."

Well do my parents remember carrying lanterns and replacing mantels. Then came about the wonderful transition of flipping a switch or pushing a button to provide instant light, untiring labor and home entertainment.

Government loans, through REA, have aided in successfully carrying out the rural electrification program by bringing electricity to farmers at reasonable rates. A rural electric cooperative is a private, non-profit enterprise—locally owned, managed and controlled by the members which it serves. They are always striving to make rural America a more prosperous and better place in which to live.

Through greater research of electrical equipment, a constant, continual growth of the use of electric power has increased from approximately 175 KWH a month to an average of 750 KWH per month in The Midwest Electric Membership Corporation.

Electricity can answer the needs of rural people for modern business skills, marketing their goods, and managing their affairs for maximum profit. In a recent speech, our President said, "Rural America can offer good jobs for men and women, good schools for children, good homes for families, good hospitals for the sick, and all the good and necessary things to enlarge and enrich the quality of life."

Facts and figures of REA are impressive; but to me and my typical farm family, the most impressive aspect of REA is the steady availability of working appliances and the effect on our daily lives. Our family, neighbors, and friends depend on the constant use of electricity day and night, year in and year out. Only a widespread outage makes us realize how dependent we have become. Work comes to a stand-still indoors and outdoors with no electric appliances ready to clean, cook, milk, and irrigate. Homes soon seem very dark, cold and quiet to a teenager who has never known life without electricity; but always with plenty of light, controlled heat and the sounds of radio, stereo and television.

In this land of hopes and dreams surely no greater dream has been realized than that of rural electricity.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Craig Rowland, age 17; grade, 11; school, Newcastle High School; name of father, Earl Rowland, Newcastle, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Northeast Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Emerson, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

The value? It cannot be told in terms of money or statistics. How often has a farm family stranded by a storm listened to the radio or television, services impossible without electricity, to get information. Or the farmer who can simply turn on a heat lamp to keep small pigs warm instead of staying up all night tending a fire to keep them from freezing. And how often has a community waited out a storm when roads are blocked and communications down, and know that the electricity will keep flowing to warm their houses and run their appliances, because of the dedication of the linemen who go out in the worst of storms to keep the "juice" flowing?

Where would the farmers be without rural electricity? The inventive farmer can make machines with his electric welder that he couldn't afford to buy from an implement dealer. And what about the man who welds a piece of machinery instead of buying a new one, or having to run to town for costly repairs? And how would it be to have to pump a 1,000 gallon reservoir full by hand? I doubt that you would do many exercises afterwards! Also the automatic electric feeders on upright silos save many man-hours of work, and also increase the capacity of men to produce foodstuffs for the world. Compared to the days of yesteryear the farmer in the 60's is a superman, all with the aid of electricity. And with less labor! Now a man can fill a bin outside a shed with controlled environment and forget about having to

scoop feed or having to check feeders, or worry about the amount of feed his hogs or chickens receive, for it is controlled electrically. I myself can remember building a fire every morning and night in a heater to keep a tank from freezing over with ice. Now I simply plug in the electric heater when Old Man Winter comes knocking and forget about it until spring. Electricity has given the farmer more leisure time, and has provided him with more income at less cost, thus benefitting the community immensely. Also, many communities are serviced by the same REC the rural people are on, and benefit from the low rates.

Rural electrification has made the heating of houses easier, too. Many of our neighbors have their houses heated electrically, or at least have oil heaters using electricity to run their thermostatic control. Flameless electric heat cooks all of my meals. All you have to do is put whatever you want roasted or baked into the oven, set the timer, then come back later and take it out of the oven. The timer which turns on the stove at a certain time, allowing you to put in your meal, set the timer, go to church or do the wash or whatever, and then come to have your meal cooked to perfection, is the nicest thing on new electric stoves. Even gas stoves offer this (with their timers run electrically).

Electricity also brings us entertainment in the form of television, radio, and record players. It is much easier to simply walk into the living room and turn on the TV set, than to go 20 or 30 miles to see a show. And what ten band can be seen today that doesn't use electric guitars?

Without rural electrification not only my community, but the whole nation would suffer. Without our REC's the life of the farmer would not only be drab, but almost impossible in this age of high prices. Low-cost electricity provided by the rural REC's is the life-blood of the farmer, and the agricultural communities of the nation.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION TO OUR HOMES AND COMMUNITY

(By Georgia Thurber, age 15; grade 10; school, Nelson High School; name of father, Marvin Thurber, Nelson, Nebr.; Contestant sponsored by South Central Public Power District, Nelson, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

The first method of heat that I remember was the pot-bellied stove because I was always chosen to help bring in corncocks, wood, and coal to feed into that stove. On cold winter mornings Dad would start a fire in our stove so that the house would be "toasty warm" when we decided to crawl out of our beds. Those were "the good old days" (if you enjoyed bringing in corncocks, wood, and coal when there was snow covering the ground).

The next method of heat that I remember was a gas floor furnace. Better, but still not good. Dad didn't have to get up so early on cold mornings and that gas furnace kept us warm. However, there were still problems: there were many burned feet when we stepped onto the furnace grill barefooted, and it produced a lot of dust and lint.

Then, in our new house, we installed electric heat, which eliminated those problems. Now we have no burned feet, nor dust and lint. We have "Clean, flameless, and convenience electric home heating."

Rural electrification means a lot to me not only because I am relieved of some work but also because of other great changes it has brought. Because of electricity, my family and our community are enjoying the best of everything. How have these changes in rural living come about?

Half a century ago farm homes were lighted by dangerous and inadequate kerosene lamps. Farms and farm homes lacked labor-saving devices. They had no water systems nor means of sanitation.

In 1935, when REA came into existence, urban areas had had service for nearly 50 years. REA has had much catching up to do and has done a remarkable job. No industry has moved faster than the electric business.

In 1950, Willie Wirehand was chosen the symbol of REA. He's a hired man who is always there; never tires; is always ready to work; appears everywhere; and is recognized internationally.

Rural electrification has improved rural living standards. For instance, electricity can heat or cool a home. Eye-level electric ovens save stooping and bending. Many have glass doors so that housewives can check their meals. Housewives are spared from the endless job of heating water on the stove for dishes, laundry, and many other odd jobs by modern electric water heaters.

Rural electrification has been a prime factor in promoting adequate agricultural production in our United States. Through the use of power tools, farmers' hours on the job have been shortened considerably. Adequate lighting in the farmyards lengthens the farmers' days and prevents many farm accidents. The Mercury Vapor Lights with "dusk-to-dawn operation" have made a major difference on many farms. Through proper lighting, accidents may be avoided.

My rural home, where the heating medium has been changed from corncocks to current within my brief memory, is symbolic of changes brought to all rural America. At a cost all can afford, rural electrification has unified living standards in the United States and increased agricultural production.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By April Walgren, age 15; grade 10; school, Osceola High School; name of father, Paul Walgren, Osceola, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by Polk County Rural Public Power District, Stromsburg, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

On May 11, 1935, an order of the President granted power to an REA administrator to "initiate, formulate, administer and supervise a program of approved projects with respect to the generation, transmission and distribution of electric energy in rural areas."

This declaration was the climax to a revolution that hasn't been suppressed yet—a revolution begun through the determination of farmers who were seemingly still existing in the Middle Ages. The Industrial Revolution hadn't altered their lives; they were an isolated island of darkness in a sea of light. It is impossible for us to visualize performing all the actions of a typical day in this setting. Yet our ancestors were able to live and thrive in this simple way of life. Maybe if we were to retreat into history 50 years we might better appreciate our electric power.

I arose earlier than usual this morning because at our house Monday is proclaimed "wash day." After lighting a lantern I hastily made my bed; the floor felt frigid to my toes. I got dressed and hurried outside to assist in fetching the water while my brother gathered kindling wood. By now our breakfast was ready and we sat down to oatmeal, toasted homemade bread and peaches, which I had helped can last summer. Mother packed our lunches while my sister and I fixed each other's hair with the curling iron. We heard brother Jack announce he and Nellie, our horse, were ready for school. We grabbed our lunch pails and coats and fled out the door. When we arrived at school we warmed ourselves around the coal-burning stove until our teacher rang the bell. Since it was an especially dark day, everyone took seats near the windows. After school I returned home to find Mother awaiting me with the ironing and several flatirons which had been heating all after-

noon on the cookstove. When this task was completed it was suppertime. After the meal everyone helped clear the table so we could begin our studies by the kerosene lamp.

Although the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 states the actual functions of the REA, to me it symbolizes something deeper—the role of the farmer in our society. The need for his presence is just as great as for any other citizen, therefore he should have equal opportunities. REA patrons each year buy more than a billion and a quarter dollars worth of electrical equipment and appliances produced by workers in the cities. Their purchases create payrolls and strengthen the economy of our nation. Thus, agriculture and REA walk hand-in-hand in making our country a better place in which to live.

As a Nebraskan, I am proud of the fact that one of us, George Norris, introduced the rural electrification bill in the Senate. But I feel strongly it was the rural population itself that was responsible for the manner in which the "electrified farm" fever caught on. Their willingness to accept new ideas, ambition, and persistence were the deciding factors in the question, "Will rural American be electrified?" It is this attitude that accomplishes in life. It is through this attitude that the electrical revolution will continue.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Sidney Freidberg, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States;

Roy L. Call, of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Alabama;

Halbert O. Woodward, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas;

William Wayne Justice, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas;

Eldon B. Mahon, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas;

Richard B. Hardee, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas;

James B. McMillan, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of North Carolina; and

Walter L. Nixon, Jr., of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas A. Foran, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George C. Roeming, of Maryland, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office;

June L. Green, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia; and

John H. Pratt, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Myron H. Bright, of North Dakota, to be U.S. district judge for the eighth circuit.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edwin M. Zimmerman, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, as in executive session, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service which have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, ask unanimous consent that they may lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Edward E. Archer, of California, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion in the Diplomatic Service; and

Alexander Akalovsky, of Maryland, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion in the Diplomatic Service.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. FULBRIGHT), from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without reservation:

Executive A, 90th Congress, second session, International Grains Arrangement, signed in Washington between October 15 and November 30, 1967 (Ex. Rept. No. 6).

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider certain nominations reported favorably today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nominations, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Edwin M. Zimmerman, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Donald Frank Turner.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Myron H. Bright, of North Dakota, to be U.S. circuit judge for the eighth circuit vice Charles J. Vogel, retired February 20, 1968.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Walter L. Nixon, Jr., of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi vice a new position created under Public Law 89-372 approved March 18, 1966.

James B. McMillan, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of North Carolina vice Wilson Warlick, retiring.

John H. Pratt, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia vice Alexander Holtzoff, retired December 31, 1967.

Halbert O. Woodward, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas vice Joe B. Dooley, retired.

William Wayne Justice, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas vice Joe W. Sheehy, deceased.

June L. Green, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia vice Burnita S. Matthews, retired March 1, 1968.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Thomas A. Foran, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years vice Edward V. Hanrahan.

Eldon B. Mahon, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years vice Harold Barefoot Sanders, Jr., resigned.

Richard B. Hardee, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas for the term of 4 years vice William Wayne Justice, resigning.

U.S. MARSHAL

Roy L. Call, of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Alabama for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

George C. Roeming, of Maryland, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice Malcolm F. Bailey, resigned.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Sidney Freidberg, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the remainder of the term of 3 years from October 22, 1967, vice LaVern R. Dilweg.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed, en bloc.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar, Nos. 324 and 326, and 325.

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

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ernest Louis Massad, of Oklahoma, to be Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Waldemar F. A. Wendt, to be admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Harold Keith Johnson to be a general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. William Childs Westmoreland to be Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I feel privileged to have been selected by the Senate Armed Services Committee to present to the Senate the appointment of Gen. William C. Westmoreland as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.

Further, I consider it an honor to bring to the attention of my colleagues

some of the interesting details of the life of General Westmoreland, who appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee on June 4 for confirmation as Chief of Staff of the Army. General Westmoreland was born in Spartanburg County, S.C., March 26, 1914, and graduated from Spartanburg High School in 1931. He attended The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, for 1 year and was then appointed to the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

At West Point he had a distinguished record and was chosen as first captain and regimental commander of the corps. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the field artillery upon graduation in 1936.

He saw action in World War II in North Africa, Tunisia, Sicily, and participated in the drive through France and Belgium after D-Day. In October 1944 he was named chief of staff of the 9th Infantry Division and served in that capacity until the end of the war.

After parachute training in 1946, he took command of the 504th Parachute Infantry, and in August 1947, was named chief of staff of the 82d Airborne Division. He fought in Korea in 1952 and was promoted to brigadier general at the age of 38. In December 1957, he was given a second star and became the youngest major general in the Army.

General Westmoreland served as Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point until July 1963, and became commanding general, U.S. Army, Vietnam, and commander, U.S. MACV in 1964.

He returns to Washington after a demanding and extremely long tour in Vietnam to report for duty as the newly designated Chief of Staff of the Army.

Members of Congress will remember his appearance before a joint meeting of Congress last year, when he gave a report on progress of the fighting in Vietnam. My only regret is that the policy of the administration did not permit him to win a military victory in Vietnam, and that he is not returning with all of the fine fighting men whom he served so well.

General Westmoreland's wide background of important Army assignments, as well as his experience in dealing with diplomats of many nations, will serve him well in his new assignment. I join his many friends from South Carolina, from the armed services, from Congress, and from the American general public in expressing great confidence in his appointment and in wishing him every success in the Army's top post.

Mr. President, in order for many of his friends to become better acquainted with General Westmoreland's career and accomplishments, I request unanimous consent that his official Army biography, as well as an article entitled, "Our Man in Vietnam," published in the March 1968, issue of Data magazine, be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I request that the nomination of Gen. Wil-

liam C. Westmoreland as Chief of Staff of the Army be confirmed by the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

BIOGRAPHY OF GEN. WILLIAM CHILDS WESTMORELAND, U.S. ARMY

William Childs Westmoreland was born in Spartanburg County, South Carolina, March 26, 1914, and graduated from Spartanburg High School in 1931. He attended The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina, for one year and was then appointed to the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York. At the United States Military Academy he was first captain and regimental commander and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Field Artillery upon graduation on June 12, 1936.

His initial assignment was with a regiment of horse-drawn 75mm guns, the 18th Field Artillery, at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. In March 1939, he joined the Eighth Field Artillery of the Hawaiian Division at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii. Here he served as a battery officer, battalion staff officer, and battery commander. In May 1941, as a captain, he was assigned to the just organized Ninth Infantry Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, as operations officer of the 34th Field Artillery Battalion (155mm Howitzer).

In April 1942 he assumed command of the 34th Field Artillery Battalion and moved with it later that year to Morocco, North Africa. He commanded the battalion in combat in Tunisia and Sicily. During combat in Tunisia, his battalion was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

During the campaign in Sicily, General Westmoreland's battalion was successively attached to the 82d Airborne Division, and the 1st Infantry Division before returning to its parent division. In March 1944 he was named executive officer of the Ninth Infantry Division Artillery while the division was staging in Southern England preparatory to the invasion of the Continent. Following D-Day,

he fought with the 9th Infantry Division through France, Belgium and into Germany. In October 1944 he was named chief of staff of the division, serving in that capacity in continuous combat from the German border to the Elbe River.

In June 1945 General Westmoreland assumed command of the 60th Infantry Regiment in Germany and in January 1946 was transferred to the 71st Infantry Division and, as commander of that division, returned it to the United States for inactivation.

Following training at Fort Benning, Georgia, he earned the Parachutist and Glider Badges and assumed command of the 504th Parachute Infantry of the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina in July 1946. In August 1947 he was named chief of staff of the 82d Airborne Division, serving in that capacity for the next three years.

He was appointed an instructor at the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, in August 1950. Later that year he was designated an instructor at the newly organized Army War College, also at Fort Leavenworth, and in June 1951 moved to Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, with the Army War College, serving as a member of the faculty until July 1952.

On August 1, 1952, he assumed command of the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team in Korea. While under his command, the unit was twice committed to combat and during the interim was deployed to Japan as theater reserve. The Republic of Korea awarded his unit the Distinguished Unit Citation. During this period he was promoted to brigadier general at the age of 38. In August 1953 he was awarded the Master Parachutist Badge.

In November 1953 he reported for duty as Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G1, for Manpower Control. In 1954 he attended the Advanced Management Program of the Harvard Business School in Boston, Massachusetts.

sets. He was named to the Secretary of the Army General Staff in July 1955.

On December 1, 1957, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Maxwell D. Taylor, pinned a second star on General Westmoreland, making him at that time, the youngest Major General in the Army.

General Westmoreland assumed command of the 101st Airborne Division "Screaming Eagles" at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, on April 2, 1958.

In July 1960, General Westmoreland was appointed Superintendent of the US Military Academy at West Point. He was transferred to Fort Bragg, North Carolina in July 1963 at which time he became Commanding General, STRAC and XVIII Airborne Corps.

In January 1964, he reported to duty at the US Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. He was assigned first as Deputy Commander, then Acting Commander and finally, in August 1964 was made Commander, US Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, and Commanding General, US Army, Vietnam.

PERSONAL DATA

Date and Place of Birth: March 26, 1914, Spartanburg County, S.C.

Parents: Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Westmoreland (Deceased).

Marriage: Date, May 3, 1947; wife, Katherine Van Deusen Westmoreland; children, Katherine Stevens Westmoreland, Margaret Childs Westmoreland, James Ripley Westmoreland, II.

EDUCATION

Spartanburg High School, Spartanburg, South Carolina, graduate, 1931.

The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina, one year, 1932.

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, graduate, BS, 1936.

Army War College (Instructor) 1950-52.

Harvard University, Advance Management Program #26, 1954.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF PROMOTIONS

Promotions	Temporary (AUS)	Permanent (RA)	Promotions	Temporary (AUS)	Permanent (RA)
2d lieutenant.....		June 12, 1936.	Colonel.....	June 29, 1951.....	
1st lieutenant.....		June 12, 1939.	Brigadier general.....	Nov. 7, 1952.....	July 14, 1962.
Captain.....	Sept. 9, 1940.....	June 12, 1946.	Major general.....	Dec. 1, 1956 (DOR Mar. 3, 1952).	Aug. 12, 1965 (May 20, 1963).
Major.....	Feb. 1, 1942.....	July 1, 1948.	Lieutenant general.....	July 31, 1963.....	
Lieutenant colonel.....	Sept. 25, 1942.....	July 1, 1953.	General.....	Aug. 1, 1964.....	
Colonel.....	July 28, 1944.....				
Lieutenant colonel (reverted).....	June 30, 1947.....				

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF ASSIGNMENTS

Assignments	From	To	Assignments	From	To
Battery officer, 18th Field Artillery, Fort Sill, Okla.....	June 1936.....	March 1939.	Instructor, Army War College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.....	October 1950.....	June 1951.
Battery officer, battalion staff officer, and battery commander, 8th Field Artillery Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.....	March 1939.....	May 1941.	Instructor, Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.....	June 1951.....	July 1952.
Operations officer, 34th Field Artillery, 9th Infantry Division, Fort Bragg, N.C.....	May 1941.....	April 1942.	Commander, 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team in Korea.....	August 1952.....	August 1953.
Battalion commander, 34th Field Artillery Battalion, 9th Infantry Division, Fort Bragg, N.C., to Morocco, North Africa (in combat in Tunisia and Sicily), to England.....	April 1942.....	March 1944.	TDY to Hq. Prov. Corps, Japan, Hq. Armed Forces, Far East, 8000th Army Unit.....	October 1953.....	November 1953.
Executive officer, 9th Infantry Division Artillery (combat in France, Belgium, and Germany).....	April 1944.....	October 1944.	Deputy assistant chief of staff, G-1 for manpower control, Washington, D.C.....	November 1953.....	September 1954.
Chief of staff, 9th Infantry Division (combat in Germany).....	October 1944.....	June 1945.	Student, advance management program, Harvard business school, Boston, Mass.....	September 1954.....	December 1954.
Regimental commander, 60th Infantry Regiment in Germany.....	June 1944.....	January 1946.	Deputy assistant chief of staff, G-1 for manpower control, Washington, D.C.....	December 1954.....	July 1955.
Chief of staff and division commander, 71st Infantry Division, Germany, and return with it to the United States.....	January 1946.....	May 1946.	Secretary of the Army general staff, 8525th DU, Washington, D.C.....	July 1955.....	March 1958.
Assistant chief of staff, 82d Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, N.C.....	May 1946.....		Commanding general, 101st Airborne Division and Fort Campbell, Fort Campbell, Ky.....	April 1958.....	June 1960.
Student officer, the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga.....	do.....	July 1946.	Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.....	July 1960.....	July 1963.
Regimental commander, 504th Parachute Infantry Regiment, Fort Bragg, N.C.....	July 1946.....	August 1947.	Commanding general, STRAC and XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, N.C.....	July 1963.....	January 1964.
Chief of Staff, 82d Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, N.C.....	August 1947.....	August 1950.	Deputy commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.....	January 1964.....	June 1964.
Instructor, Department of Instruction, Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.....	August 1950.....	October 1950.	Acting commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.....	June 1964.....	August 1964.
			Commander U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam and commanding general, U.S. Army, Vietnam (APO 96243 SF).....	August 1964.....	

LIST OF CITATIONS AND DECORATIONS

- Distinguished Service Medal w/OLC.
- Legion of Merit w/2 OLC.
- Bronze Star Medal.

- Air Medal w/8 OLC.
- American Defense Service Medal.
- American Campaign Medal.
- EAME Campaign Medal w/7 Campaign Stars.

- WW II Victory Medal.
- Army of Occupation Medal (Germany).
- National Defense Service Medal w/OLC.
- Korean Service Medal w/3 Campaign Stars.
- Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal.

Vietnam Campaign Medal w/4 Campaign Stars.

United Nations Service Medal.

Presidential Unit Citation (34th Field Artillery Battalion, Tunisia 1943).

Republic of Korea Unit Citation (187th Regimental Combat Team 1953).

Korean Uchi Distinguished Service Medal w/Gold Star.

Legion of Honor (French Government).

Belgium Fourragere.

Croix De Guerre w/Palm.

Order of Military Merit Taeguk (Korea).

Order of Sikatuna (Rankoflankan (Philippines)).

BADGES

Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Master Parachutist Badge.

Glider Badge.

General Staff Identification Badge.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND MATERIAL

Sports: Golf, Squash, Water-skiing.

[From Data magazine, March 1968]

OUR MAN IN VIETNAM: WESTMORELAND— A PERSONAL PROFILE

(By Gene Famiglietti)

"If you wanted to make a model of a four star general, you'd make it to look like General Westmoreland." So stated one Air Force lieutenant colonel on the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, staff about his boss recently. And that's generally what other officers and newsmen have been saying about Gen. William Childs Westmoreland for years. The "he looks like a general should" school won unexpected support from the fashion conscious early this year when Westmoreland was voted number 16 on a list of the nation's best dressed. When he was a two star general the New York Times—without apologies to Gilbert and Sullivan—said he was "the model of a modern major general."

One of the strange facts of the current Vietnam war controversy is that Westmoreland continues to enjoy a relatively good press. It's strange when one considers that the war has divided friends, political parties and nations. True there're occasional brickbats hurled his way, and the recent Tet (Vietnamese lunar new year) "offensive" in South Vietnam certainly couldn't have boosted Westmoreland's standing anywhere, but Westmoreland has generally had his way with newsmen and U.S. officials.

One exception occurred late last year when Westmoreland had been called home to report to the President. On the Senate floor Sen. Vance Hartke (D., Ind.), a persistent critic of the Administration's Vietnam war policies, questioned the propriety of the four star Vietnam commander making speeches in the U.S. while one of the most critical battles of the war (around Dak To) was under way.

Perhaps dulling the axes of most of the critics is Westmoreland's stand on the performance of the Negro soldier in Vietnam. The officers "idiots come in all sizes, shapes and colors" comments in Vietnam, his similar stand before the South Carolina legislature and other statements have made him a positive civil rights symbol.

Paradoxically some of Westy's biggest problems may have been caused by Defense Secretary McNamara last year. Comments about the large number of support troops in Vietnam were generally taken as criticism of Westmoreland whether or not McNamara intended them as such. McNamara later said: "The allegation that there is disillusionment or disappointment over General Westmoreland's handling of our armed forces in Vietnam is false. Such false statements do a grave disservice to one of the great military commanders of this country and to all men who serve under him. General Westmoreland has the absolute confidence of the President, of men and the entire membership of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff. There is no truth to the suggestion that he may soon be relieved."

Some of Westmoreland's friends say the general did regard McNamara's unfortunate comments as a public criticism. The general fought back in the newspapers through a second party.

WHAT NEXT

Even as this appears the general's next assignment may already be in process of announcement by the President or Defense Department. Logically it would be announced after a major U.S. victory, certainly not at a time when it could be connected to a lack of U.S. progress or a setback.

The "insiders" have tabbed the 53-year-old soldier as the next Army Chief of Staff, succeeding Gen. Harold K. Johnson. Others insist that assignment as Army Chief of Staff is in reality a demotion for Westmoreland. They argue for nomination of Westy as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Since the term of service chiefs is limited by law now to four years some shifts will have to be made this summer. Gen. Johnson, for example, will have had four years in his Army post shortly.

It's unlikely that Westmoreland will side with those who argue that his selection as Army Chief of Staff is a slap in the face. Unless there's been an overnight change, Army officers still aspire to become the military leader of their service, and not Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman.

One Westmoreland intimate in Washington contends that carting Westmoreland off to an assignment in Europe or keeping him in Hawaii by giving him a normally Navy billet as commander in chief Pacific could find the general rebelling.

Political observers have not failed to notice Westmoreland, remembering General Dwight Eisenhower in 1951. Westmoreland has also been cast as President Johnson's Grant, meaning that in the fashion of Union Gen. U. S. Grant, Westmoreland is going to bring home news of an impending U.S. victory. Grant thus helped Lincoln to an election win. Columnist Stewart Alsop wrote recently that the Johnson Administration was counting on Westmoreland to do a "General Grant."

ALWAYS ON TOP

If it somehow transpires that Westmoreland does not come out at the top, or somewhere close by, it'll be a switch. An examination of his military career shows he's made a habit of being number one.

After attending the Citadel in South Carolina for a year Westmoreland entered West Point. He emerged as first captain of the Corps of Cadets in 1936. Later he was the Army's youngest two star general, and the second youngest officer to be assigned as Military Academy commandant.

Throughout his career, he's had a can't miss label.

Westy's first assignment following graduation from the Military Academy was with a horse drawn 75mm artillery regiment.

A captain by 1941 Westmoreland was assigned to the then just organized 9th Infantry Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., as an artillery unit operations officer. Twelve months later he was CO of the battalion.

At 29 Westmoreland was a full colonel. As Col. William C. Westmoreland he led the 34th Field Artillery ashore in North Africa. The battalion fought in Tunisia and Sicily, winning a Presidential Unit Citation.

Later the officer fought with the 9th (which, incidentally now is one of his Vietnam divisions) in Europe, finally becoming chief of staff.

This rise from a battalion operations officer to division chief of staff in three years even during wartime can be classed as slightly meteoric.

Before the end of the war in Europe Westmoreland had his first infantry command. He

was named CO of the 60th Infantry in Germany in June 1945.

Most of today's soldiers may be unaware that Westy has ever been anything but infantry or airborne. Friends say Westmoreland got the airborne bug during the time the 34th Field Artillery was attached to the 82d Airborne Division. Perhaps convinced that airborne was the "wave of the future" (much in the fashion that today's ambitious soldier wants an air cavalry assignment under his belt) the field grade officer joined recruits and junior officers to hoof it through airborne training. A fellow officer remembers Westmoreland taking voluminous notes, on the chance they'd come in handy later.

He got his first airborne command quickly, becoming CO of the 504th Parachute Infantry at Fort Bragg. By mid-1945 he was chief of staff of the 82d Airborne Division, not bad for a soldier airborne less than two years.

There still exists a closeness between Westy and airborne soldiers. You see it in Vietnam when Westmoreland remembers an airborne NCO he served with previously. It's like going back to your hometown.

Before assuming command of the 187th Regimental Combat Team (Airborne) in Korea 1952 Westmoreland served as an instructor at the Army War College and the Command and General Staff College.

Following Korean duty the Spartanburg, S.C. native was ordered to a top manpower job in Washington. Next, in 1954, he attended the Harvard Business School.

The Harvard experience according to one former aide, is a big factor in his career. Westmoreland attended a several month course at the school well before the current emphasis on military management. Much of what he learned at Harvard was later introduced in the 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell in 1958.

COMMANDING

A reporter who met the general a decade ago recalls:

"I first met the general in 1959 at Fort Campbell, Ky., when he was commanding the 101st, and commanding is the word. At that time he was the youngest major general in the Army. It didn't take long to discover that Westmoreland wasn't like some other commanding generals I had met . . .

"Westmoreland needed and wanted no information officer at his side when he discussed his work at length, and indeed it was plain that he considered himself to be the real information officer of the division anyway.

"He explained in detail programs he called Operation High Gear, Chairborne and Command Data.

"He talked about 50 factors in 50 areas, when he was correlating hundreds of facts about troop command administering training and why he was trying to get men in the 101st to write him with any ideas they may have to improve the division . . .

"And he talked continually, and with conviction, about challenges, challenges, challenges."

"Many men," Westmoreland said, "can do 50 to 100 percent more than they think they can if they have a challenge."

An officer who served with Westmoreland at Campbell remembers how he reduced the division budget, letting stocks remain on the depot's books, instead of his. And he recalls how Westmoreland went to the troops to present an award or citation.

This had the effect of proving the general cared, and it also saved the time (hence money) of his soldiers and civilian employees.

"And I sensed," the visitor remembers, "that he knew he was going somewhere in the Army. He surely was aware that many of his men—officer and enlisted—had the idea that 'if Westy says go, we go' and that they felt he was destined to be top man in the Army one day."

After Campbell Westmoreland became West Point commandant and then commanding general of the 18th Airborne Corps.

And in 1964 the man who talks incessantly about challenges was handed one of the top parts in the biggest challenge the nation has ever faced. In January Westmoreland started his fourth year in Vietnam.

VIETNAM

Perhaps not as enthusiastic—or at least outwardly so—as he was in 1964 Westmoreland still is the commanding general. He knows it, visitors know it and the men in the field know it.

A reporter talked recently to the general in his second floor office at the Military Assistant Command compound in Saigon.

At the time Westmoreland had just issued a statement on the risks of a bombing pause. It was a statement issued on his own, he said, not cleared by the White House, State Department or the Pentagon.

Asked what he needed, he said "the support of the American people." Sound corney? It didn't come from the General.

More troops? Not a black and white question, he said. Of course we could use more, but additional troops could have a bad effect on the already impaired Vietnamese economy.

Westmoreland who is sometimes accused (by men of his own staff as well as in the U.S.) of not pushing the Vietnamese harder for reforms, has made defense of Republic of Vietnam troops a big part of his job. He has argued publicly that the Vietnamese are much maligned, that they have fought with few real leaders, and with the few available trying to run both the military and civilian sides of the government. Give them five years, and the South Vietnamese will have a first class army is a Westmoreland battletory.

Westmoreland has a practice of disarming interviewers by asking them what they think. He appears genuinely interested in the answers. And reminiscent of the past at Bragg and Campbell and the Military Academy he talks about leadership. Challenge the troops, he says, and they'll do marvelous things for you.

A soldier, Westmoreland says, has to be understood, know what he's doing and be told his job is appreciated. Commanders have to prove they're interested and care about his welfare.

"Get this across and they'll go.

"They've done right by me."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gen. William Childs Westmoreland to be Chief of Staff, U.S. Army?

The nomination was agreed to.

MR. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination today.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MR. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

APPROPRIATIONS TO FEED THE HUNGRY

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, the controversy rages with respect to the adequacy of appropriations to feed the hun-

gry in the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, has been of the view that he should return to the Treasury \$227 million in unexpended customs receipts this year rather than to use the money to feed the poor, as many of us contended he had every right to do.

Because of the controversy, on the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] the Senate voted 31 to 30 a week or 10 days ago to remove from the agriculture bill the provision which Secretary Freeman contended prevented him from using this \$227 million to feed the poor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a column entitled "Power of Seniority Versus Food for Poor," written by the extremely able columnist and reporter for the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jerome S. Cahill.

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

WASHINGTON BACKGROUND: POWER OF SENIORITY VERSUS FOOD FOR POOR

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—In the United States Senate, seniority must be served and, because this is true, one of the few legislative victories scored this year in behalf of the Nation's hungry poor may be nullified.

It was a surprise victory, and by the narrowest of margins. By a vote of 31 to 30, the Senate voted to strike from an agriculture appropriations bill language that Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman contended restricted his authority to feed the poor.

Because of the restriction as Freeman interpreted it, the Agriculture Department planned to return to the Treasury \$227 million in unexpended customs receipts this year. The plan was given nation-wide exposure in "Hunger, U. S. A." a citizens' study alleging 10 million American poor suffer from chronic hunger despite the abundance of U. S. farm production.

What threatens to make the 31 to 30 victory illusory is the fact that a conference with the House now must be scheduled on the issue—and all seven of the Senate conferees either voted against, or were paired against, the liberalizing amendment.

Appointed on the recommendation of Sen. Spessard Holland (D., Fla.), manager of the bill, the conferees include Holland and three other Southern Democrats, Richard Russell of Georgia, John Stennis of Mississippi and Allen Ellender of Louisiana, and three corn belt Republicans, Karl Mundt of South Dakota, Roman Hruska of Nebraska and Milton Young of North Dakota.

With the possible exception of Young, all rank high in terms of seniority, which is why they were appointed. But the big question is whether they will battle down to the wire to preserve in conference an amendment they opposed on the Senate floor. If past experience is an indication, the answer probably will be no.

Preserving that \$227 million to feed the hungry was one of the chief goals of the Poor People's march encamped here and that is all the more reason why the ad hoc bipartisan group of Senators and Congressmen supporting the poor people wants to make the 31 to 30 vote stick.

One plan under consideration to accomplish this is the mailing of a "round robin" letter to the Senate conferees, signed by all Senate members of the ad hoc committee, urging them to stand fast behind the amendment, which was sponsored by Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.).

If this fails, an attempt could be made to

defeat on the Senate floor any conference report that did not embrace Javits' amendment.

Just this procedure was followed in a similar situation earlier this year. On March 11, by a one-vote margin that Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey contributed, the Senate voted 43 to 42 to add \$25 million for Head Start classes and \$75 million for jobs for youth this summer. Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D., Pa.) joined Javits in pressing for the extra funds.

However, as in the present case, a majority of the Senate conferees voted against the \$100 million and when they reported back from the conference, the money was missing. Thereupon the Senate rose up and defeated the conference report, 54 to 24, and four of the conservative conferees were replaced by Senators more sympathetic to the majority view.

Senator Clark has been advocating for years the adoption by the Senate of a rule that would require the Senate's presiding officer to appoint to conference committees only those Senators who can in conscience support the Senate's position in confrontation with the House.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, the column points out that about 3 weeks or a month ago when a similar situation arose with respect to appropriations for the Headstart program, the Senate overruled its Committee on Appropriations and directed that the extra money be appropriated for Headstart. Thereafter, conferees were appointed, a majority of whom were not in accord with the view taken by the Senate, and they brought back a conference report which struck out the appropriation for Headstart. The Senate rejected the conference report, and on my motion the conferees graciously agreed not to serve again and other Senators who favored the position taken by the majority of the Senate were appointed in their places.

I had thought that that wise decision, which merely carries into effect innumerable precedents from the past in the Senate, would prevail for the future of this session, at least, and until we can really write a rule which would make it mandatory, as it has been merely a custom that a majority of Senate conferees must have represented by their votes the position taken by the Senate in disagreement with the House.

As appears from the column I have just had printed in the RECORD, the same thing has happened again, and Senate conferees, none of whom voted for the Javits amendment to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use money to feed the hungry, have been appointed conferees. My understanding is that no conference report has yet been agreed upon.

I hope very much that my admired colleagues who are in this somewhat invidious position would do what their colleagues did a few weeks ago and resign as conferees in order that Senators who supported the Javits amendment might be appointed in their stead.

THE NEED FOR A CHANGE OF ATTITUDE

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, we have all spoken, and many of my colleagues with eloquence, about the tragic event which resulted in the assassination of our be-

loved colleague, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. I would hope that that tragic circumstance would awaken the country to the fact that something pretty drastic has to be done to change our procedures, our ideals, our attitude toward law, and our attitude toward social benefits.

I think I see signs in the country that the change in point of view is taking place. I would hope it would be accompanied by a drastic change in point of view of the Senate.

In order to call to the attention of Senators what is being written in a number of newspapers of wide circulation, I shall introduce a series of articles. The first article is a very incisive and provocative column written by Joe McGinniss, a brilliant young reporter with the Philadelphia Inquirer, whose columns I have had occasion to have printed in the RECORD in the past. The article is entitled "America the Ugly: Where Hate and Fear Create Vision of Hell," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer. I ask unanimous consent that this incisive and penetrating column may be printed in the RECORD in full, and I call it to the favorable attention of my colleagues.

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

The article, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

AMERICA THE UGLY: WHERE HATE AND FEAR
CREATE VISION OF HELL

LOS ANGELES, June 5.—It is hard to think of what to write while you are coming out here in an airplane because of an event which has proved that you do not live in a country anymore but in a cesspool. It does not happen anywhere the way it happens here. Not in Russia, not in China, not in North Vietnam.

Nowhere anymore does a man have to feel when he stands up to try to lead his people that he runs at least an even chance of getting his skull pierced by a bullet from someone who does not like the things he says.

Nowhere but in America.

This country does not work anymore. Maybe it stopped the day John Kennedy was killed, and only we did not know it at the time.

Now, less than five years later, with the man who killed Kennedy murdered, with Martin Luther King gone to a crazyman's gun, and with Bob Kennedy now lying in a bed in a hospital in Los Angeles with a hole in the middle of his head from where a bullet had plowed through his brain, now we have to know it. Now we cannot hide from it anymore. This is not a country.

The richest, most powerful place in the world and all that the money and power have produced has been a bunch of people so filled with fear and hate and ugliness that when a man tries to tell them they must do more for other men, instead of listening they shoot him in the head.

This is not a country anymore. This is a vision of hell.

You go out on a plane into the heart of the horror and the only thing to do is to write about the man.

I do not know Bob Kennedy very well but I know him better than I know the other men who are trying to be President, and I know him well enough to like him.

The hatred people have for him is something I could never understand.

I have heard tell of the stories, all of the things that are supposed to prove that this man is mean and small and without ethics, but all I know for sure about him as a professional man is that he cares about the

people in America who do not have a chance and all I know about him personally is that he loves children and the outdoors and he has a great ironic way of laughing at people and things, including himself, and that when he tells you something he means it.

The first time I met him was last November, in Washington, just before I went to Vietnam. I had been told that he had some inward thoughts on Vietnam that might be helpful to me in appraising the place and that while he did not want to express them publicly because they were very different from the thoughts Lyndon Johnson had at the time, he would be glad to discuss them in private.

I saw him in his office in the new Senate Office Building at 2:30 on a terribly bright fall afternoon. What I remember most about the office are a couple crayon drawings, done by his children in elementary school, that were hanging on the wall.

Behind his desk there were cartons containing copies of his book, "To Seek a Newer World," which was about to come out at the time. What I remember most about him was how ill at ease he seemed.

How much difficulty he seemed to have in talking to someone he did not know. Shyness in as public a man as Robert Kennedy seemed impossible but shy is the way he struck me.

We talked—he talked, mostly; haltingly, his voice often trailing off, his sentences often grammatically incomplete—for 45 minutes.

As I got up to leave he wished me luck, and, thinking briefly, perhaps, of what he knew of guns and bullets, said, "If you get up near, ah, areas where's there's trouble, ah, be careful." I told him I would, and he said, "I wouldn't want to hear that anything had happened."

Then he reached behind his desk and picked up one of the books.

"Here, why don't I give you this," he said, and he inscribed it, "For Joe McGinniss, with best wishes for the future—and if you find the answer, please let me know."

Then he gave me another copy of the book and asked me to deliver it to a reporter for the New York Times in Vietnam named Johnny Apple. This copy was inscribed, "Here is the answer. Read it before it's too late."

Then he gave me a letter of introduction to Apple. I cannot remember the wording exactly but it was written in typical Bob Kennedy irony and said something like, "Please try to refrain from being your usual arrogant self and be nice to this young man and help him win a Pulitzer Prize."

He told me to please see him when I got back because he would like to hear my impressions. This I considered traditionally political politeness and had no intention of doing so, but sometime in February I got a letter from him saying that he had seen a couple of the pieces I had written and would like to see the rest if it were convenient for me to send him a set.

It was not long afterward that he decided to run for President. In Washington, the day he announced, things were too hectic for more than a brief hello, but the day after Lyndon Johnson's announcement that he would not run again, I was with Kennedy in a private room at LaGuardia Airport waiting for his campaign plane to leave for Philadelphia.

What was mostly on his mind was Mr. Johnson but he was still too stunned to make much sense talking about it and soon the conversation went around to the problems of poverty and racial hatred about which he feels so strongly.

The talk was about what the summer looked like and to Kennedy it did not look good. Then someone mentioned Martin Luther King and the proposed march of the poor to Washington.

"He can't control them anymore," Kennedy said. "He hasn't had any real power

for two years. They've moved past him. They believe too much in violence now."

Then he suddenly turned to me and said, "Hey, that sounded quite like a trip you had through the delta."

He lost in Oregon and took it like a gentleman. He did not try to say he won. Then he went on television with Gene McCarthy and showed that he had more than glamour and money; that he had poise and a mind that worked.

He won the race he had to win in California and afterward he appeared full of the good humor and wit that is so much a part of him.

Then he got shot in the head, like his brother.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the next item is a column published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, written by William McGaffin, reporting on a speech made by George F. Kennan at Williamsburg, Va., recently, entitled "Kennan Prescribes an Elixir for a 'Sick Society.'" I ask unanimous consent that the column, which to my mind is entirely sound and deserves the widest possible attention, as, indeed, does the full text of Mr. Kennan's address, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

KENNAN PRESCRIBES AN ELIXIR FOR A "SICK SOCIETY"

(By William McGaffin)

WASHINGTON.—George F. Kennan chose an appropriate place the other day for delivering a provocative critique on the troubled America of 1968.

The distinguished historian, educator and former diplomat was the principal speaker in Williamsburg, Va., at the annual ceremony commemorating the legislative "Prelude to Independence," which took place there in the dramatic summer of 1776.

After describing what a "sick society" we have become with unresolved problems of growing danger in the big-city ghettos and on the college campuses, he stressed what must be done to bring the country back to what our forefathers intended it to be.

"A nation in such a state of internal disarray—a nation faced with domestic tasks of such magnitude—cannot afford the luxury of extravagant excursions, whether of altruism or of military adventure, into the world beyond its borders," he declared.

"It has no choice but to prune its external involvements to the bone, to cure itself of all dreams of being more to others than it is to itself, and to adjust the objectives of its foreign policy to a realistic assessment of its own capabilities."

Kennan is not only one of the most knowledgeable but one of the most articulate critics of our involvement in Vietnam.

"It is little short of fantastic," he said, "that a country facing such domestic problems as we now face, and one that stands virtually on the brink of a major international financial humiliation, should be continuing to pour its substance, to the tune of a full fourth of its budget and more than a half million of its young men, into a military adventure on the other side of the world, in an area to which its vital interests are only remotely related."

Since it was Kennan who helped formulate and put into practice the U.S. policy of "containment of Communism," it is all the more impressive that he feels the time has come for a new policy.

"The world had changed very greatly over what it was 20 years ago. Neither the hopes nor the fears that have inspired our policy over the intervening years have full validity today."

In his judgment, "At many points, in Europe and elsewhere, where we have become accustomed to regarding our presence and attention as essential to stability, others can now do without us."

Not all of them are going to find it as pleasant as they thought they would "when Yankee really goes home," he says, but he thinks we have no choice. "And many of them may gain from the denial of America's favors a respect for what America has to offer which the extravagant extension of those favors was never able to produce."

Kennan by no means recommends an America withdrawing into isolationism. He recognizes our responsibilities for the problem of Germany. He also notes the "two great latent crises" of the Middle East and the southern part of Africa.

What he counsels is that we do not attempt to solve these crises at once because "we do not have the answers in our pocket."

Rather, he hopes that we will "shape our conduct in such a way" as to help prevent them from becoming threats to world peace.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Mr. Kennan is of the view that we should very much curtail our activities overseas in order to assure we may take care of the critical needs of the people of our own country, which our enormously swollen military appropriations are presently preventing us from doing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Domestic Disarmament," written by that able journalist, Henry Gemmill, published in the Wall Street Journal of June 6, 1968.

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

DOMESTIC DISARMAMENT: STRICT RESTRICTIONS ON PRIVATE GUNS MAY PROVE INEVITABLE

(By Henry Gemmill)

WASHINGTON.—It seems reasonable to suppose that at some point the U.S. will decide to undergo domestic disarmament.

The shooting of Presidential candidate Robert Kennedy will in itself not bring that to pass, any more than did the assassination of his brother or the slaying of Martin Luther King. Perhaps the most that can be expected is that the shock of this event will put fresh steam into Congressional action on legislation that could mildly restrict fresh additions to the huge armament stocks scattered amongst the populace. The day when most of the guns will actually be grabbed out of their hands is uncertain and distant—yet its arrival may prove inevitable.

During recent years a highly competent "gun lobby" has been given most of the credit or blame for fighting off myriad Congressional moves intended to curb the domestic traffic in firearms. Certainly such groups as the National Rifle Association have used the most modern techniques—mass letter-writing campaigns and the like—in mobilizing opposition pressure. Nevertheless, the essence of the gun-bearers' strength has not resided in these techniques.

It has, on the contrary, represented the vestigial sentiment of a vanishing America—the thinly populated frontier society. It seems predictable that in an urbanized and crowded America the gun lobby will in the end, for good or ill, find itself overwhelmed—much as the equally competent doctors lobby eventually was in its fight against medicare. Like civil rights legislation, domestic disarmament is likely to be voted in successive and increasing doses.

ALREADY EVIDENT TIDE

The direction of the political tide is already evident, even if its ultimate dimensions remain to be proved. The pollsters discovered more than a year ago that heavy ma-

ajorities of the public favored tighter restrictions on gun ownership. The firearms legislation that came alive on Capitol Hill this spring was, though modest, the first approved by a Congressional committee in three decades.

One could be less confident about a continued pressure for domestic disarmament if it resulted solely from the slaughter of national leaders. Such high tragedy does genuinely move and significantly crystallize opinion—but may well be less basic than the fact that great numbers of ordinary people are becoming concerned about their own safety.

A sample of this sour taste of fear is available right here in this capital city; Washington lacked bus service during recent nights because drivers have been terrorized by gun-slitting bandits who've shown they are willing to shoot to kill. The cities are growing, and the statistics on violent crime growing even faster. And alongside this constant danger there stands the growing threat of sporadic urban riot with its sniper gunmen.

Of course there remains an ambivalence among Americans, largely because the nation is not yet totally city-oriented. It is mainly the Eastern Senators, like Dodd of Connecticut, who have pushed longest and hardest for gun control. A Senator from the open acres of the West is still likely to feel as his ancestors did; Idaho's Senator Church turned up last summer with a petition against control from 44,000 constituents.

Indeed, the frontier tradition is not yet dead even in the metropolises. The United Auto Workers strongly backs gun control legislation—and its leaders, in doing so, no doubt accurately reflect the Detroit workers' revulsion against riot and crime. Still, the union's officials say they get plenty of hot protests from the rank and file. Reason: Many a member thinks of himself not as the assembly-line unit which he is for most of the year but as the male huntsman in quest of prey—which he becomes, briefly, once a year when he shoulders a gun and heads for the Michigan wilds.

Without suggesting that such inner urgings will easily be quelled, it does seem likely they will by degrees be subordinated to what appear to be the urban necessities. It becomes increasingly difficult to maintain national policy in the traditions of a vanished era, and that applies even to the Constitutional question often raised by opponents of gun control.

"The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed," says the Second Amendment to the Constitution. Plain enough, perhaps, except that it is part of a sentence stating the need for "a well regulated militia"—and one can conjecture that the present Supreme Court, always willing to interpret the antique document as it deems fit for contemporary needs, might concur with any law taking guns away from folk who are not militiamen. If not, this is a Constitution that can be amended once again.

Apart from the romantic notions and legalisms rooted in the American past, no doubt there are many rational arguments that can be offered against domestic disarmament. Once upon a time there was a Constitutional amendment that tried to take alcohol away from the populace; it proved so unenforceable it was revoked. Getting all the guns would unquestionably pose fantastic problems of enforcement, and at best take years to accomplish with reasonable success. The dangerous people—the insane, the conspirators and the criminals—are hardly the citizens who would quickly comply.

And even if the day came when none but the police had guns, violence would not have been utterly eliminated. The word "assassin" predates firearms; it belonged first to a murderous sect of Moslems and was spread by Crusaders equipped only with various sharp and blunt instruments. Such weaponry will remain available to the mugger on the dark

street, to the madman who thinks he must "save" the country from its leadership.

MORE PERSUASIVE LOGIC?

But the pounding events of local and national news—and one can be sure they will continue to provide fresh terrors—are likely to make the logic of gun control far more persuasive. When the man who runs the dry cleaning establishment is shot down for his petty cash, the other shopkeepers down the street would like to try getting rid of those guns.

There are really no statistics to demonstrate scientifically that more psychotics exist per 100,000 of population than in 1868. But there can be no doubt that any single psycho can now threaten far more humans than he could a century ago. People are packed in around him, and he—like everyone else—has become enormously mobile.

It is becoming increasingly clear that if the pistols and rifles are left readily available in urban America, then some unpleasant changes are going to be made in other American traditions.

Any prominent politician and any leader of a controversial movement will have to stick to the TV studio, or hide behind a protection squad when he moves in public view. Before he withdrew from this year's Presidential contest, it was clear that Lyndon Johnson—whose instinct is to plunge into crowds—could not conduct a normal campaign at all unless he flagrantly violated the admonishments of the Secret Service men who must be concerned with the President's safety. Before he was slain, Dr. King fully knew he faced death. Before he was shot, Robert Kennedy's risks were reported repeatedly by the press corps traveling with him.

The habits of the ordinary citizen are in jeopardy as well. In this capital today hotel rooms are empty as tourists fear to travel. There are fewer customers in the downtown stores as suburban housewives fear to shop.

So the alternatives to domestic disarmament are not likely to look appealing. The ugliest of all is this: The householder, shopkeeper or bus driver who fears guns on the loose will go get a gun for himself. If one is wrong in supposing the U.S. will choose domestic disarmament, one may be right about the possibility of a domestic arms race.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article points out the necessity, as a matter of common decency, for much stricter gun control legislation than we enacted in the Senate a little while ago, or than will be enacted in the House perhaps this afternoon.

For myself and several other Senators with whom I have conferred, I believe that we should not rest on our oars but should bring out and pass at this session of Congress a far stricter gun control bill than we passed a few weeks ago.

Let me point out that this was one of the great causes of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Unfortunately, despite many efforts, we have not yet been able to persuade the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to print cartoons. One day, perhaps, it will grow up and do that as it should have been done years ago. But I call the attention of the Senate to the Herblock cartoon in this morning's Washington Post which I think speaks for itself but which cannot, of course, be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, there are three perceptive articles written by that brilliant commentator Clayton Fritchey, dealing with three different aspects of life today, one of which has to do with what I hope is not a good analogy, that of the position in which Adlai Stevenson found

himself at the time of the Korean war, and the position in which our honored Vice President—who now occupies the chair—finds himself today. I commend the editorial to him and to all Senators, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Newsday, May 29, 1968]

STATE OF AFFAIRS

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—When Vice President Hubert Humphrey sees the headlines these days on the record U.S. casualties in Vietnam, he must wince at the memory of what similar headlines did to his friend, Adlai Stevenson, when he was campaigning for the Presidency in 1952 while the Korean peace negotiations were going on.

It wasn't Stevenson's fault, any more than it is now Humphrey's, that the U.S. government (headed by his mentor, President Truman) was deadlocked with the enemy over various negotiating differences, some of which in retrospect no longer seem as significant as they did then.

But even in 1952 the U.S. voting public (as distinct from the military and the diplomats) already had doubts as to whether the arguments (and sometimes the hair-splitting) at the Panmunjom peace table fully justified the continuing casualties, which inevitably became an important factor in the Presidential contest between Stevenson and Gen. Eisenhower.

In October 1952, the Republican candidate said that "if there must be war in Asia, let it be Asians against Asians . . ." He added that "the South Korean battle line today should be manned primarily by Koreans." Truman promptly accused Eisenhower of holding "out a false hope to the mothers of America in an effort to pick up a few votes" by calling for U.S. withdrawal of troops from Korea.

The Truman rebuttal was of no avail. Eisenhower made his famous "I shall go to Korea" speech, and what had seemed like a close election was turned into a landslide for the General. Now, 16 years later, the U.S. is involved in another negotiating stalemate, and once more the rising casualties are seizing the headlines and troubling a deeply concerned public.

"Patience" is being counseled on all sides as the U.S. and North Vietnamese negotiators go round and round to no purpose in Paris. "This sort of thing can't go on forever," Ambassador Averell Harriman assures the press. The Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam, of which Eisenhower is a prominent member, warns that impatience is "our deadliest enemy" in negotiating with Hanoi. George Ball, the new U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., also calls for "patience and a sense of perspective."

This raises a nice question as to who has the best perspective: the government or a casualty-minded public? It was the "impatience" of that public which brought about the Paris talks through pressure on the Johnson Administration to curtail the bombing of North Vietnam. It may take more of the same impatience to break the new stalemate over stopping the bombing altogether as a first step toward actual peace.

The public's instinct is that sooner or later the Administration is going to stop the bombing on one face-saving pretext or another. The feeling grows that Johnson's resistance to a total pause is more political than military. So which is more important—saving face or saving casualties? American deaths are presently running four times heavier than at the same stage in the Korean war.

Jean Jacques Servan-Schreiber, a French editor who knows the U.S. well, says, "The task of negotiating demands greater imagination and leadership from the U.S. There's nothing more absurd than to keep killing people when you know you're going to have peace."

Many Americans seem to share this view, but there are high officials in both Washington and Saigon who still put "victory" ahead of peace. The generals have once more convinced Johnson that we are winning the war, and so he tells his negotiators that "we will never compromise the future of Asia at the negotiating table," whatever that means.

In Saigon the Vietnamese press is threatened with life imprisonment for advocating neutralism, and Vice President Ky says he will "execute anyone who mentions coalition government." If this spirit is to dominate the peace talks, American boys will be dying in Vietnam far into the unforeseeable future.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the second article written by Mr. Fritchey deals with the priority which the military use of the atom still commands. He points out that debate over the treaty banning proliferation of nuclear weapons is groaning along, and that the continued military priority over use of the atom is causing daily danger to the lives and safety of the men in our Armed Forces and, indeed, to the general public.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Newsday, May 31, 1968]

STATE OF AFFAIRS

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—The debate over the treaty to ban the proliferation of nuclear weapons drones on at the United Nations, just as the effort to convert atomic energy to peaceful uses also languishes around the world because of the priority that military use of the atom still commands.

When Dag Hammarskjöld was Secretary-General of the U.N. he hoped that civilian use of the atom would make up for the fact that "man in his folly should have thought of no better use of a great discovery than to manufacture with its help the deadliest instruments of annihilation." One of the developers of the bomb, Prof. Fermi, put it another way. "It would be nice," he said wryly, "if it could cure the common cold."

These days, the atom is in the headlines because of the activities of nuclear-powered submarines carrying nuclear missiles that are almost as deadly a threat to the world as intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Scorpion is only the latest incident. The week before there were headlines on the Japanese government banning U.S. submarines from visiting Japan out of fear that the U-boats were leaking deadly radiation. Only a few weeks before that came the revelation that Russian nuclear submarines are now on full-time patrol off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the U.S. And the submarine race has only begun.

A Japanese physicist, Prof. Iwao Ogawa, many months ago anticipated some of the dangers of nuclear submarine accidents, as well as the more subtle threat of atomic wastes from such underwater craft while in or near ports. He said, in part:

"There is an increasing risk of radioactive hazards, associated in peacetime with continual operation of a huge number of nuclear-powered submarines. The risk is partly due to possible accidents with the high-power nuclear reactors on these vessels which operate adjacent to populated areas. Another risk factor is the long-term accumulation of long-

lived radioisotopes in the sea water as a consequence of frequent waste-disposal from these vessels."

It is an interesting commentary on the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, which brought the U.S. and Russia so close to war, that the much greater potential threat of 1968, embodied in the off-shore fleet of Soviet submarines, stirs little or no public concern. Six years ago a handful of medium range missiles in Cuba (which could have been wiped out by the U.S. in one air strike) triggered the greatest of all postwar confrontations, but today we take in stride a far bigger, and evergrowing off-shore concentration of submarine nuclear power which is largely invulnerable to our bombers.

It is, of course, no secret that the expanding U.S. underwater fleet also patrols in waters off the shores of Russia and Communist China. The range and power of the missiles on both U.S. and Soviet submarines are increasing. The day may come when they, rather than the stationary and possibly vulnerable intercontinental missiles, will be the main nuclear deterrent.

Meanwhile, the experts, if not the public, are disturbed by dangers that little can be done about. It is widely known in defense circles, for instance, that U.S. and Russian submarines often tail each other beneath the seas. Prof. Ogawa notes the "latent risk of an accidental outbreak of a nuclear war by nuclear submarines." The risk, he says, "comes from the fact that wireless or any other form of communication among submarines under water is extremely difficult, if not utterly impossible."

It is therefore not easy for a "sub" to keep itself "always under the control of the distant headquarters." What happens if two unidentified U-boats approach, and one fires mistakenly on the other in self-defense? "The act might very well provoke the outbreak of total nuclear war," warns Ogawa, and adds, "The more nuclear submarines the major powers launch, the more serious and more probable will be the risk of such an accidental war."

It has not been mentioned in the U.N. debate over the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons that there will be another hidden, but awesome, danger if the treaty fails and the present exclusive nuclear club is joined by a number of other nations. What then would happen if an unknown (and unidentified) submarine launched a nuclear attack on, say, either the U.S. or Russia?

All missile defense systems are presently based on the assumption of instant retaliation, but could there be, and would there be, such retaliation if the source of the attack was in doubt? If so, against whom? It would be the final irony to destroy the world through a case of mistaken identity.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, finally, in connection with the phobia in this country for law enforcement regardless to what extent it conflicts with civil liberties and the Bill of Rights, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on this subject written by Mr. Fritchey.

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

[From Newsday, Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., June 5, 1968]

STATE OF AFFAIRS

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Three hundred of the nation's leading district attorneys got up and cheered recently when they were told that "the law enforcement system has collapsed in this country." Even now it is not altogether clear what the applause signified.

The only thing certain is that crime and punishment have become such highly emo-

tional topics in the U.S. that (like Vietnam) they can no longer be discussed rationally. Logic, for instance, has almost ceased to be a factor in the Congressional showdown this week on the omnibus Crime Control Act. The opposing sides are simply not listening to each other.

The Senate version of the bill removes certain Supreme Court restrictions on the admissibility of confessions; it also authorizes wiretapping and electronic bugging on a broader scale. Speaking for the bill's backers (chiefly a coalition of southern Democrats and midwest Republicans) Sen. John L. McClellan (D. Ark.) says, "Until the courts, particularly the U.S. Supreme Court, begin to administer justice with greater emphasis on truth and a deeper concern for the protection of the public, the crime rate will continue its spiral upward, and the quality of justice will further deteriorate."

The opposition also cuts across party lines. Sen. Clifford Case (R. N.J.) said the bill would permit "a return to barbarities" in obtaining confessions. Sen. Edward Long (D. Mo.) called the wiretapping provisions "blatantly unconstitutional." The American Bar Assn. and the American Civil Liberties Union have joined in the opposition.

Confessions, wiretapping, and bugging inevitably arouse intense feelings, for they raise questions over first-degree police methods on the one hand, and privacy and police state snooping on the other. The problem of effective law enforcement has almost been lost sight of in the frenetic Congressional debate.

On the basis of the testimony adduced so far, there is little reason to think the crime rate would be affected much one way or the other by either the inclusion or exclusion of the controversial sections of the Crime Control Act. The Act does provide for much-needed federal grants to improve state and local police forces, but in general the legislation is not a serious answer to the nationwide crime problem.

Congress knows this, but the bill has the following virtues: (1) it gives the appearance of doing something important in an election year; (2) it suits the purposes of the anti-Supreme Court Democratic-Republican coalition; (3) it doesn't cost a lot of money.

The man who told the convention of district attorneys that "the law enforcement system has collapsed in this country" was G. Robert Blakey, a Notre Dame law professor and consultant to the President's Crime Commission. "We are still working under a system that was devised hundreds of years ago in England," he pointed out. "It has not worked in our complex society."

Unfortunately, Prof. Blakey had no specific remedies of his own to offer, but he believes that "once everyone realizes that the system has collapsed, we can begin to do something about it." He may well be right, but a truly effective federal-local attack on crime (and its origins) might cost as much as Vietnam, and why spend that kind of money when Sen. McClellan assures us that his bill will do the trick. "Whether we have law and order in this country," he says, "may well turn on the disposition of this bill."

What really turns on this bill is whether the poor and ignorant will have the same rights when arrested as the well-informed and well-to-do. Organized gangsters also know their rights. They don't have to be told they are constitutionally entitled to counsel or that they can refuse to incriminate themselves.

It is not difficult to see who will suffer, and be discriminated against, if the Crime Control Act curtails the Supreme Court's insistence on suspects being informed of their rights upon arrest. Sen. Edward Brooke (R. Mass.) puts it this way: the bill really says that "those aware of their rights shall be entitled to them, but those not aware shall be made the victims of ignorance."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should say that while I voted for the Safe Streets and Gun Control Act, and have no second thoughts, I did it with considerable reservations because while I think on the whole that the provisions of the legislation outweigh its disadvantages, I feel that the provisions overruling the decisions of the Supreme Court are unconstitutional, that the provision on wiretapping, particularly, without a court order, and several other provisions of the bill, are most unfortunate.

The article points out a number of those disadvantages. Nevertheless, I still feel that on the whole it was a proper exercise of discretion to vote for the bill and I hope that it will make a small contribution to reestablishing the rule of law in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LAG IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, rather much in the spirit of what we have been doing today, I invite the attention of the Senate to the Bilingual Education Act which the President signed into law on January 2, last, and where we are having grave budget problems. To compound those problems, which are bad enough now, we are having problems even in getting the guidelines set by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, so that this kind of education—to wit, education in English and Spanish primarily—would be able to get some monetary and other help.

Mr. President, on January 2, the President signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 (Public Law 90-247) which included, among other provisions, a new "Bilingual Education Act" of which I was pleased to be a cosponsor. This provision established a new program seeking to provide a solution to the problems of some 3 million youngsters who are educationally disadvantaged because of their inability to speak English, 1.75 million of whom are Spanish speakers principally of Puerto Rican and Mexican origins.

The Bilingual Education Act authorized \$15 million for the current fiscal year—none of which has either been requested or appropriated—and \$30 million for the next fiscal year which begins on July 1. Of this amount the administration has requested \$5 million, one-sixth of the authorization.

But, not only does the budget for bilingual education fall short of the need—one year has been passed by and only a small fraction of the fiscal year 1969 authorization is requested—but a further obstacle stands in the way of success for this program. Today, more than 5 months after the enactment of the law and a few scant weeks before the new fiscal year, at a time when school districts are beginning to prepare plans for the new school year commencing in September, 3 months hence, the Office of Education still has not promulgated the guidelines for the Bilingual Education Act. Without these guidelines, school districts wishing to participate in the

program are unable to apply for funds or even make some preparation to apply for funds. Much stress has been put on educational planning by the Office of Education. Yet, this planning by local school authorities which OE deems so important is frustrated by OE's delays in publishing guidelines for Federal education programs. Late guidelines tend to result in hastily conceived programs which fall short of the promise envisioned by Congress in enacting the law.

I therefore urge the Office of Education to distribute to local school districts without further delay the guidelines for the Bilingual Education Act and other new education programs in order that the communities might participate in these programs to the greatest advantage. Further delay will serve only to frustrate the achievement of the objectives sought in the uniquely slum and ghetto areas throughout the country, which were so much the heartfelt passion of our beloved colleague, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, on which basis I took the liberty of making these remarks today.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House and that the Vice President be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, pending the call of the Chair, the recess not to extend beyond 3:45 p.m. today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

At 3:30 p.m. the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) in the chair.

ON ARTS AND POLITICS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on Friday, May 31, 1968, Mr. August Heckscher, administrator of Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs, and Commissioner of Parks of New York, delivered a remarkably forward-thinking and provocative address at the graduation exercises at the Rhode Island School of Design.

I was so struck by his remarks that I thought my colleagues would enjoy and benefit from them, too; and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his talk be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ON ARTS AND POLITICS

(Address by August Heckscher, Administrator of Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs and Commissioner of Parks, at the Rhode Island School of Design, Friday, May 31, 1968)

That the Commencement Address is not the most useful or relevant of man's many inventions is something I have long suspected. But as we gather in this spring of 1968, and as I rise as Commencement speaker before you, I confess I am overwhelmed by something more than doubt. I am afflicted by an absolute certainty. The certainty is that, all things considered, we are engaged upon an embarrassing enterprise. Only by patience on your part, and by some candor and brevity on mine, can we hope even partially to redeem the situation. I am, as you will observe, plainly over thirty. I am (as my introducer will probably have made all too clear) a member of the Establishment. Now I am supposed by the rules of the Commencement-address game to say something which strikes you as wise, enlightening and prophetic. Indeed if you should feel like walking out, or incarcerating me in some nearby room, or even burning the whole place down, I would not be too surprised.

Let me begin with a few generalizations which, however obvious, you will at least have to admit are true. We live in a very extraordinary moment of history. To a degree unusual even in this Revolutionary age we are witnessing the breakdown of established arrangements and the release of pent-up frustrations. We see it on virtually every campus across the nation, in virtually every American city; we see it abroad in Bonn as well as Paris, in Warsaw and Prague and Brussels and Madrid.

We feel there is something common in all this ferment and violence—something more subtle than a single political influence and more profound than the tendency for one group to imitate what they have seen another doing on television.

For my part, I have been deeply puzzled, as I am sure everyone of my age has been, by these sudden and widespread developments. I have felt quite at a loss both as to their cause and cure. Those of us who, priding ourselves on being liberals, came of age in the New Deal generation carried for many years afterwards what seemed the key to all social discontents—a larger application of the principles of the welfare state, a greater equality among all citizens. But these decent answers don't seem to help very much now. They wouldn't help Grayson Kirk—even if Mr. Kirk were inclined to try them; they wouldn't help General de Gaulle.

Something more mysterious is evidently at work—and it is not Viet Nam, however wretched and horrible that has been, not the shame we feel at the plight of the Negro and the poor, not Communism, or Castro, or even the monstrous tyranny which denies cafeteria privileges to the young girl sleeping off-campus with her boy-friend. I would guess that the malaise goes back to something very fundamental and universal. Somewhere along the road, our civilization has gone off the track; under the twin influences of Technology and Organization it has denied to the individual the sense of having a meaningful role in the things that affect his life.

On occasions similar to this in other years I have spoken of Technology and Organization as the two dire threats to the freedom of man. I shall not labor the argument now. But it is worth listening for a moment to these words calling upon a society for change: "everything indicates that this change should include a broader participation by everyone in the conduct and results

of the activity in which each is directly engaged."

Those words are not from the Port Huron statement of the New Left; not from the radical devotees of participatory democracy. They are not even from a campaign speech of Senator McCarthy. They are from the May 24th speech of General de Gaulle to the French people. Once again that shrewd, worldly old soldier has seized upon the cardinal issue. For it is plain, is it not?—plain now to all of us—that in bigness and remoteness, in the promotion by impersonal forces of inhuman values, lie the ills of our time—and that everything else, the dissents, the abnegations, the spasmodic violence flow from these.

Some of you may in your time join the protests and even the violence. Some of you may seek through political processes the large reforms which must transform all our institutions. But most of you, I dare say—like most people in any age—will seek in the practice of your own trade, in the doing of the things that lie nearest at hand, to create a tolerable existence for yourselves. Without any very clear ideas as to the cause or the outcome, you will apply yourselves to the supreme and by no means ignoble business of getting on with your lives.

Because in one way or another you are all involved in the quality of outward things, in the look of the world, in its forms and colors and appearances, you cannot but add something significant to our times. Great numbers of people who live in cities, especially in the poorer neighborhoods, literally hate their environment. They can barely bring themselves to get up in the morning to face the grey reality of the average street. The younger and more vigorous do actually lay violent hands upon the world around them.

As Parks Commissioner I have found nothing more dismaying than the constant and ruthless vandalism in our city's parks. This vandalism is not careless or haphazard. It is, I believe, born of a deep anger against physical things—the kind of things that obstruct and burden the spirit; things formless and lifeless and dull. To the extent that by art or by good design you can change the face of man's dwelling and his universe, you will have done much for your own satisfaction, and conceivably as well for the harmony and order of the state.

I suggested a moment ago that people feel cut off from the possibility of having any real power over the institutions that affect them and the environment in which they live. This feeling of helplessness makes them want with passionate intensity to assert themselves where they can. So today, if through your arts you try to change the actual world, you will learn soon enough how clamorous and insistent clients can be—especially if those clients are the community.

Not long ago in a city like New York the architects and planners went ahead with their business, acting partly by rule, partly by their own taste and vision. A Parks Commissioner hired these architects and built parks. But things are different now. We scarcely dare change a fence or pathway without consulting the citizens who will be using the facility. The people insist on being treated as individuals, and they insist upon being recognized as members of a local, very specialized and sharply defined neighborhood. Thus the people of East New York do not want to be confused with the people of Brownsville, or the people of Bedford-Stuyvesant—though each may be but a block away.

Out of the urge to be separate and particular comes a city strangely alive, composed of myriad individualists and countless localities. To design or construct within this environment can be frustrating beyond words to the Administrator; it could be death to the artist who thinks only of expressing his own ego. But it has its rewards. Now and then

you will have the unsurpassed reward of managing to get close to the heart of a vital community—and perhaps at the same time of creating something really good.

To create is to act, and neither as artist or human being can you ever know precisely what the results are going to be. In the pursuit of the artist's vision chance inevitably plays its part—some trick of rhyme or rhythm for the poet, some oddity in the material with which the sculptor works. The results, for better or worse, are beyond predicting. In New York, John Lindsay likes to say to those in his administration: "Let's try it and see what happens." What does happen may be strange indeed; it may be better than anyone could have planned.

The frustration for anyone working in the public sphere—particularly in the urban sphere—are enormous. I say this, knowing and hoping that many of you will find yourselves trying to do something to make the city a better and more rational place. You must be prepared for the worst! Not only will the community tell you exactly what you should do or not do. The various centers of power within the political process will eat away at your heart. A thousand delays will threaten to make posterity, rather than the living generation, the beneficiary of your zeal.

It is painful in any work to see the achievement put off. Hope deferred, so the good book says, "maketh the heart sick." In political life it also maketh one's constituents very mad.

Indeed in political action there seems to be inherent and awful contradiction. Everything is required *now*—and yet everything, to be done at all, must pass through procedural complexities undreamed of by medieval theologians. It all seems absurd until one remembers that in the bad old days there were men in public service who used politics to feather their own nest—and that even in these enlightened days one or two of the same species have been found to exist!

In any case, whether slowly or with speed, you will surely fall short of the mark. Politics and art are alike in this, that the true practitioner is doomed to failure in his own eyes. Your masterpiece will not be accomplished. Certainly the problems of the city will not be solved in this generation or by any one man or any administration. One feels, working in New York today, that the Mayor knows this deeply and intuitively. Yet the knowledge scarcely appears to blunt his capacity to act.

To be aware of the impossibility of success and yet to do battle for a cause, to attack a blank page or a blank canvas, that is today's particular form of courage. It is sort of existential faith—faith that though nothing will quite work out, everything is to be gained by the seeking and the doing.

And then of course, in spite of all my warnings—notwithstanding reason and conviction—something *may* work out: not what we had expected or desired, but something at least recognizable as being more good than bad. The world may see that surprising moment as a victory for justice or truth, and proclaim that salvation is at hand. As artists and politicians we shall be more modest—knowing that every victory creates as many difficulties as it settles, and that every solution sets the stage for new problems.

Such is the fate of the artist and politician—creators both, if they are faithful to their trade. It is a fate, as I have been wanting to hint and suggest, which may be cheerfully submitted to in a time of upheavals such as ours. For those who do not take to the barricades, there is still a chance to make a little universe where we can feel relevant and engaged—and yet not be tempted into false hopes or naive illusions.

But, to conclude, it may be the barricades that you prefer after all. And who is to say that in the doomed, implausible adventure, in the flaming moment of anger and un-

questioned faith, there may not also be something valid? The answer to that question each man must decide for himself. The style of his life each man must choose.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is the moral of my discourse.

Thank you very much for listening.

POLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I came across a very interesting piece written by Paul Auer, a wise old skilled European diplomatist, that appeared in the April 13, 1968, edition of *Le Monde*.

He points out the need for some sort of assurance be given to Poland that her present borders will be secure, just as we in the West wish to have assurance that we will not be attacked by the Warsaw Pact nations.

He also stresses the fact that our attitude can play a role in helping to resolve conflicts in the historical tinderbox of central Europe.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a translation of the article entitled "Neutralization of Central Europe?" written by Paul Auer, and published in *Le Monde*, Paris, France, of April 13, 1968.

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

NEUTRALIZATION OF CENTRAL EUROPE?

(By Paul Auer, formerly Hungarian Minister to France)

The war in Vietnam has not yet ended, but one is tempted to hope that the cessation of hostilities will not be too far off. The problem of the Middle-East is also awaiting solution, but there, too, the excitement will probably subside. In spite of many serious problems, the burden of the big powers, especially the United States and the USSR, will be more or less relieved in the Middle-East and in Southeast Asia, where France no longer has special political interests, and the United Kingdom contemplates withdrawing from east of Suez. The slogan "Asia first" will, therefore, lose its actuality and the diplomats will finally be able to take an interest in the problems of our continent. This will be even more desirable because recent events in Central and Eastern Europe command increased vigilance. These events might create new situations, and, in view of the interdependence of nations in our time, relations between these and other countries, as well as among themselves, will have to be regulated by international agreements.

The march of events in Central and Eastern Europe can only be received with satisfaction. Democratization, tolerating criticism and a free press, authorizing the holding of meetings and the organization of free unions, assuring the role of Government and of Parliament, which heretofore depended on the Communist Party and which Czechoslovakia seems to contemplate doing, the independence shown by Rumania in foreign policy and economic reforms in Hungary, are measures long awaited by the people of this region. It is to be hoped that this evolution will save us from bloody revolutions. The fact that reforms are decided upon and applied by the highest government officials and that everything proceeds within the Communist Party structure and is followed with approval by the people as a whole, seems to guarantee the absence of threat of civil war.

It is also to be hoped that a Soviet intervention will not have to be feared, though the big neighbor of these countries will obviously not abandon so easily its dominant position in this region. However, if one wants

the evolution in Central and Eastern Europe to remain peaceful, a solution must be found that would also satisfy the USSR, by not hurting its prestige; for instance, if the influence of the Western nations, including the Federal Republic of Germany, is not strengthened, if West Germany recognizes the Oder-Neisse line as a definitive border, and if the security of the USSR is guaranteed collectively by the big powers. Such an arrangement would be acceptable to the NATO nations, on condition that the process of democratization—in the Western meaning of the term—be stepped up in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including East Germany, that the free movement of persons and goods between these countries and those of the West be assured, and, finally, that the Russian troops be withdrawn from the territories still occupied by them. The neutralization of these countries (including the Democratic Republic of Germany, after the Austrian pattern) would tend to favor this solution.

The future relations among these countries should also be studied. In an interview published by the Austrian paper, *Express*, Ludwik Vessely, publisher of the official organ of the Czechoslovak Writers' Association, *Literarny Listy*, admits that the Russians would "probably" not be opposed to a neutralization of this part of Europe, and he expressed the hope that the Danubian countries, once they are neutral, will succeed in creating a new entity among themselves.

The situation is not yet sufficiently advanced, to be sure, but it could develop much more rapidly than one might think. (Translated by Elizabeth Hanunian.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). 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 disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16489) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEED, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROBISON, Mrs. REID, and Mr. JONAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1292) to authorize the U.S. Secret Service to furnish protection to major presidential or vice-presidential candidates, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 2585. An act for the relief of Kap Rai Kim and Young Nam Kim; and

H.R. 11308. An act to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL OR VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 1292.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1292) to authorize the U.S. Secret Service to furnish protection to major presidential or vice-presidential candidates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1292), which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, unfortunately, because of the parliamentary situation that exists, objection has been raised in the House of Representatives to taking up the Post Office and Treasury Department appropriation bill which the Senate passed today by unanimous vote.

I am sure that the Members of the Senate in the Chamber and others who are not present recognize the importance of time in this matter, and the speed with which we enacted the authorizing legislation for the Secret Service and the necessary funds therein to provide the protection for major candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency.

Therefore, because of this objection, the House has sent over the resolution which has just been read. This provides the sum of \$400,000 for the completion of this year's activities by the Secret Service and authorizes them, in addition, to call on other agencies of Government, as the need should arise, to be under the direction of the Director of the Secret Service, with power to revoke in the President of the United States. In substance it is identical with the language of the bill passed by the Senate approximately an hour and a half ago, except in the matter of the funds—which are not equal to the \$2 million we provided in the permanent appropriation. The legislative history which was established on the Treasury-Post Office appropriations applies equally as well to this joint resolution and should be considered in its entirety as part of the legislative history on this joint resolution.

We will go to conference on the appropriations bill next week and will pro-

vide, I am sure, the additional funding to carry it fully throughout the next year. But for the purpose of the present vital need, demonstrated by the very considerate, thoughtful, and speedy action of the Senate, I believe it is imperative that we pass this joint resolution now and get it to the President for his signature.

I yield to the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the chairman of our subcommittee has correctly stated the facts. I am certain that everyone on our side of the aisle concurs, as I know our distinguished minority leader does, that the joint resolution should be enacted without delay. I am certain that there is no objection on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1292) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 10

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last paragraph of Senate Resolution 300 will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn until Monday, June 10, 1968.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, pursuant to the language in the last resolving clause of Senate Resolution 300, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late distinguished Senator from New York, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 10, 1968, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6, 1968:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Edward C. Sylvester, Jr., of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Lisle C. Carter, Jr.

James E. McCrocklin, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Wilbur J. Cohen.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Ralph K. Rottet, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233, effective from the date of his retirement.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

- Abercrombie, Thomas,
Abney, Robert O.,
Ahern, Michael B.,
Allcorn, William A.,
Alport, George H.,
Aman, Ronnie J.,
Appel, George C., Jr.,
Armistead, Joseph D.,
Askew, Arthur M., III,
Aune, Lawrence E.,
Ausel, James E.,
Ayles, Larry F.,
Bachelder, Ned W.,
Bachman, James H.,
Balley, Richard E.,
Bailey, Robert N.,
Baron, Anthony S.,
Barrett, Robert E.,
Bartholomew, Mark A.,
Baucom, Jerome V.,
Baxter, Richard P.,
Beechley, Bruce C.,
Beller, George W.,
Bender, Michael J.,
Benge Holmes D.,
Berryhill, Robert P.,
Bigelow, Donald E.,
Bigelow, John G.,
Biggs, John S.,
Bippes, Jackie E.,
Birdwell, Michael D.,
Bissey, Trevor E.,
Bittenbender, Edward,
Biviano, James W.,
Blanchard, James A.,
Blanks, John R., Jr.,
Blood, George H.,
Blumenthal, Russ,
Bogges, William W.,
Bohnak, Anthony J.,
Bohonak, Michael, Jr.,
Bonial, Edwin J.,
Bordenet, John F.,
Bornholdt, John N.,
Bradley, Glenwood,
Brajkovich, Catheri,
Brammer, Craig W.,
Braun, Bruce A.,
Brazee, Frederick E.,
Brazelton, John E.,
Brierly, William F.,
Brominski, Emil J.,
Brooks, Michael D.,
Brown, Barry M.,
Brown, Thomas E.,
Brown, Walter R.,
Bryan, Paul N.,
Bryant, James W., Jr.,
Bryson, Thomas E.,
Buckley, John R.,
Bugge, Robert R.,
Bunnell, Roger R.,
Burgett, Robert C.,
Burke, Charles F.,
Burtnett, John W., Jr.,
Butler, Francis P.,
Butner, Henry C.,
Camden, Harry C.,
Carawan, Larry B.,
Carroll, William F.,
Caskey, Kintred P.,
Charbonneau, Mauric,
Charlesworth, Russe,
Clark, Doris M. II,
Coffey, Vincent J.,
Collins, William F.,
Condon, Thomas B.,

- Conter, Edward N.,
Conway, John W.,
Cook, Theodore L.,
Cooke, Harold L.,
Copes, Ronald A.,
Corradini, Richard,
Costich, Kenneth II,
Courte, John P.,
Cox, Calhoun W., Jr.,
Cox, Robert S.,
Crowe, Bobby N.,
Crump, Wilbert S.,
Crutsinger, Larry L.,
Cummings, Timothy A.,
Curtin, Thomas P., Jr.,
Dahlen, Karl R.,
Dally, James I.,
Danley, John A., Jr.,
Daugherty, Joseph P.,
Davenport, Mildred,
De Palo, William A.,
Deputy, Thomas M.,
Dethorn, John R.,
Devine, William S.,
Dias, William R.,
Dickison, Daniel R.,
Dodd, David H.,
Donohue, Jeremiah F.,
Dougherty, John A.,
Downhour, Orbra W.,
Draper, Jerry Y.,
Drexler, Michael M.,
Drinkard, Thomas R.,
Duffy, George G.,
Dukes, Ronnie J.,
Dunkelberger, James,
Dunlap, Leroy C.,
Dunning, Thurlow R.,
Durand, William B.,
Dussling, William J.,
Edwards, McKinley C.,
Elliades, Milton L.,
Emerson, William K.,
Emmons, Mary A.,
Eriksson, William A.,
Evans, Frederick H.,
Fagan, William G.,
Fairfull, Thomas M.,
Falkenrath, James H.,
Faulkner, William L.,
Fear, Robert G.,
Felker, Richard F.,
Fiebig, Heinz,
Field, Charles L.,
Finney, Jackie L.,
Fitch, John,
Fitzenz, David G.,
Floca, Samuel W., Jr.,
Fultz, Richard H.,
Futernick, Allan J.,
Gamble, Stephen J.,
Garcia, Michael A.,
Gardner, Benj. R.,
Garner, David W.,
Garris, Jack R.,
Garvey, Dale M., Jr.,
Gentry, Mark O.,
Gerhart, George M.,
Gilmore, Lee R.,
Giroux, Ronald V.,
Gogolkiewicz, Richa,
Goodbary, Robert A.,
Goodman, Euell D.,
Goodspeed, Paul A.,
Gordon, Clark G.,
Gordon, Terry A.,
Gradwohl, Richard A.,
Graves, Lawrence D.,
Gray, Robert W., Jr.,
Greenberg, Harold S.,
Greene, Lee F.,
Grubb, Richard R. N.,
Gryczynski, Edward,
Guenther, Otto J.,
Haddock, Spencer R.,
Hall, Richard A.,
Hall, Wilburn C., Jr.,
Hammer, Martin A.,
Handy, Malvin L.,
Hardison, John R.,
Harman, Dick E.,

Harmon, Joseph S., XXXXXXXX
 Harwell, Richard M., XXXXXXXX
 Hasty, Robert G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hauck, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Hawkes, Allen W., XXXXXXXX
 Hawkins, Arthur G., XXXXXXXX
 Hayes, Samuel B., XXXXXXXX
 Hazen, David W., XXXXXXXX
 Hebert, Henry J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Heisner, Ralph P., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hemphill, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Henkel, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Herrington, Joyce, XXXXX
 Hickson, Richard L., XXXX
 Hill, Roylance W., XXXXXXXX
 Hinton, Robert R., XXXXXXXX
 Hockett, David R., XXXXXXXX
 Hodges, Edwin C., XXXXXXXX
 Hoebeke, Gary L., XXXXXXXX
 Hogan, Charles J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Holder, Bobby D., XXXXXXXX
 Holland, Francis B., XXXXXXXX
 Hollinger, Gregg N., XXXXXXXX
 Hoskinson, Charles, XXXXXXXX
 Huggins, Ansel L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hussong, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Jablonsky, Edmund A., XXXXXXXX
 Janieks, Girts U., XXXXXXXX
 Jenks, James E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jennings, David R., XXXXXXXX
 Jiles, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Jodoin, Kenneth F., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Thomas E., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Lee M., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Steven F., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, William H., XXXXXXXX
 Jordan, Don R., XXXXXXXX
 Kapke, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Kasner, Michael W., XXXXXXXX
 Keating, Charles F., XXXXXXXX
 Kellerhals, Paul W., XXXXXXXX
 Kelley, Stephen H., XXXXXXXX
 Kelly, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Kemp, James C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Kenney, Phillip L., XXXXXXXX
 Kidd, Wayne E., XXXXXXXX
 Killoy, David H., XXXX
 King, Cary S., XXXXXXXX
 King, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 King, William H., III, XXXXXXXX
 Kirkpatrick, Donald, XXXX
 Knightly, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Kocsis, John T., XXXXXXXX
 Kollar, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Kons, David D., XXXXXXXX
 Koppler, Doit L., XXXXXXXX
 Kozak, Peter T., XXXXXXXX
 Kramer, Robertojo A., XXXXX
 Krause, Michael D., XXXXXXXX
 Kritscher, Andrew M., XXXXXXXX
 Kyle, Frederick A., XXXXXXXX
 Laidman, David G., XXXX
 Larson, Jane S., XXXX
 Larson, Thomas R., XXXXXXXX
 Latham, Wayne K., XXXX
 Laurence, Brent H., XXXXXXXX
 Lavezzl, George B., XXXXXXXX
 Leary, Robert N., XXXXXXXX
 Leatherwood, James, XXXXXXXX
 Leclair, Bryan V., XXXXXXXX
 Lee, John G., XXXXXXXX
 Leide, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Lewin, John V., XXXXXXXX
 Lestochi, Louis J., XXXXXXXX
 Lewis, Edward R., XXXXXXXX
 Lewman, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX
 Lind, Gary C., XXXXXXXX
 Lockrem, Bernard J., XXXXXXXX
 Longoor, Clarence R., XXXXXXXX
 Loomis, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Lowe, Carl T., XXXXXXXX
 Lynch, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX
 Maas, Alexis, XXXXXXXX
 Mack, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 MacNab, Craig C., XXXXXXXX
 Maddox, Raymond N., XXXXXXXX
 Mallett, Walter A., XXXXXXXX
 Mangrum, Jerry W., XXXXXXXX
 Manuel, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Marine, Lawrence H., XXXX

Marrone, Ronald J., XXXXXXXX
 Martin, Peter R., XXXXXXXX
 Martinez, Jose, XXXX
 Maskiell, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Matthews, Lorraine, XXXXXXXX
 Maybee, Joseph, XXXXXXXX
 McCaslin, James P., XXXXXXXX
 McCauley, John K., XXXXXXXX
 McDonald, Theodore, XXXXXXXX
 McGreevy, Michael, XXXXXXXX
 McIntosh, Bruce A., XXXXXXXX
 McLaughlin, Robert, XXXXXXXX
 McShea, George M., XXXXXXXX
 Meabon, David L., XXXXXXXX
 Mehle, F. Douglas, XXXXXXXX
 Mellon, Daniel R., XXXXXXXX
 Mendoza, Felipe, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Merchant, Richard I., XXXXXXXX
 Metherall, Paul E., XXXXXXXX
 Mevis, Gary L., XXXXXXXX
 Michel, William L., XXXXXXXX
 Mikkelsen, Morris E., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Fred Q., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Freddy L., XXXXXXXX
 Minton, Roger O., XXXXXXXX
 Molkup, Kenneth M., XXXXXXXX
 Monahan, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Mooney, John F., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Robert P., XXXXXXXX
 Moran, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Morgan, Paul F., XXXXXXXX
 Moroney, John F., III, XXXXXXXX
 Morrison, Billy W., XXXXXXXX
 Morrow, Garcia E., XXXXXXXX
 Morton, Philip W., XXXXXXXX
 Moss, Jackson C., III, XXXXXXXX
 Moss, Melvyn, XXXXXXXX
 Mouw, John D., XXXXXXXX
 Moyer, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Moyer, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Murry, James H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Nefzger, Melvin E., XXXXXXXX
 Newman, Jerrol M., XXXXXXXX
 Nolan, William K., XXXXXXXX
 Nosker, James F., XXXXXXXX
 Nowakowski, Richard, XXXXXXXX
 Nunemaker, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Olson, Robe, XXXXXXXX
 O'Reilly, Charles A., XXXXXXXX
 Parker, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX
 Patulea, Gregory N., XXXXXXXX
 Peterson, Mary L., XXXXX
 Pierson, John C., XXXXXXXX
 Pochert, Lynn C., XXXXXXXX
 Pollard, Royce E., XXXXXXXX
 Poucher, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Primosch, Thomas A., XXXXXXXX
 Proulx, Norbert A., XXXXXXXX
 Raines, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Ransberger, Lawrence, XXXXXXXX
 Rausin, Ronald W., XXXXXXXX
 Read, Bruce, XXXXXXXX
 Ready, Peggy E., XXXX
 Reale, David T., XXXXXXXX
 Reams, Larry W., XXXXXXXX
 Reeves, Howard R., XXXXXXXX
 Rehberg, Clark F., II, XXXXXXXX
 Ressedorf, Horst, XXXXXXXX
 Rhame, Thomas G., XXXXXXXX
 Rhodes, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Riccabona, Steven V., XXXXXXXX
 Riley, Daniel C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Rivers, Robert D., XXXXXXXX
 Roberts, Janice I., XXXX
 Robinson, John C., XXXXXXXX
 Rocco, Domenic P., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Rogan, Donald M., XXXXXXXX
 Rovanseh, Raymond J., XXXXXXXX
 Rowe, Michael A., XXXXXXXX
 Rutland, Jackie E., XXXXXXXX
 Saffold, Albert W., XXXXXXXX
 Schott, Thomas A., XXXXXXXX
 Schroeder, Galen L., XXXXXXXX
 Schucker, David R., XXXXXXXX
 Sessen, George N., XXXXXXXX
 Settimo, Richard J., XXXXXXXX
 Severson, Daniel J., XXXXXXXX
 Siffrin, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Slayton, A. G., XXXXXXXX
 Slifka, John, III, XXXXXXXX
 Smith, David D., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Elijah H., Jr., XXXXXXXX

Sowell, Norman E., XXXXXXXX
 Sparkman, Ira H., XXXXXXXX
 Spearman, Ronald K., XXXXXXXX
 Sprouse, Marvin E., XXXXXXXX
 Stags, Jewel D., XXXXX
 Stamillo, Michael E., XXXXXXXX
 Stanton, James W., XXXXXXXX
 Starr, Donald J., XXXXXXXX
 Statz, John R., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Stawski, Edmund J., XXXXXXXX
 Stender, William H., XXXXXXXX
 Steele, Walter W., XXXXXXXX
 Steuer, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Stewart, Jerry D., XXXXXXXX
 Stewart, Samuel B., XXXXXXXX
 Stills, John D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Stonecipher, Roy L., XXXXXXXX
 Strehlow, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Stunkard, Larry E., XXXXXXXX
 Suchan, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Summerfeldt, David, XXXXXXXX
 Swain, Oren, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Sweet, Worth A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Szymanski, Ronald F., XXXXXXXX
 Tanaka, Richard M., XXXXXXXX
 Tarr, Richard C., XXXXXXXX
 Thomson, James L. H., XXXXXXXX
 Todd, Timothy O., XXXXXXXX
 Travis, Stuart B., XXXXXXXX
 Turner, Lewis T., XXXXXXXX
 Turner, Milton E., XXXXXXXX
 Tyson, Robert K., XXXXXXXX
 Usrey, Elgan H., XXXXXXXX
 Van Nest, John E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Vance, Gary W., XXXXXXXX
 Verdier, Bernard L., XXXXXXXX
 Veselka, Shelburne, XXXXXXXX
 Villasenor, Antonio, XXXXXXXX
 Wallace, Gerald O., XXXXXXXX
 Wallace, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Wamsher, Richard C., XXXXXXXX
 Wasielewski, Joseph, XXXXXXXX
 Watkins, David C., XXXXXXXX
 Watson, Wyckliff T., XXXXXXXX
 Wauford, Raymond J., XXXXXXXX
 Wayne, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Weaver, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX
 Weisman, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 Wells, James V., XXXXXXXX
 Wells, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 West, Johnny F., XXXXXXXX
 White, Eddie J., XXXXXXXX
 Whitlock, Dennis A., XXXXXXXX
 Wicki, Carol A., XXXXX
 Wigdahl, Leroy C., XXXXXXXX
 Wiggins, David E., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, Hugh A., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, Jerry C., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, Richard G., XXXXXXXX
 Williford, Sherman, XXXXXXXX
 Wilson, Lee H., XXXXXXXX
 Woodward, William B., XXXXXXXX
 Wyatt, William D., XXXXXXXX
 Wyrick, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Yates, Stanley F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 York, Ray E., XXXXXXXX
 Youell, Charles C., XXXXXXXX
 Youngblood, Norman, XXXXXXXX
 Zak, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Zehnder, Joseph L., XXXXXXXX
 Ziegler, Alfred J., XXXXXXXX

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 6, 1968:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Ernest Louis Massad, of Oklahoma, to be Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs.

IN THE ARMY

Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, XXXXXX, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, XXXXXX, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as Chief of

Staff, U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3034.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Waldemar F. A. Wendt, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Edwin M. Zimmerman, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Myron H. Bright, of North Dakota, to be U.S. circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Walter L. Nixon, Jr., of Mississippi, to be

U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi.

James B. McMillan, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

John H. Pratt, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

Halbert O. Woodward, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas.

William Wayne Justice, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas.

June L. Green, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Thomas A. Foran, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years.

Eldon B. Mahon, of Texas, to be U.S. at-

torney for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years.

Richard B. Hardee, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHAL

Roy L. Call, of Alabama, to be U.S. Marshal for the northern district of Alabama for the term of 4 years.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

George C. Roeming, of Maryland, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Sidney Freidberg, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the remainder of the term of 3 years from October 22, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 6, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Father Ralph J. Marlatt, St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Piscataway, Md., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. O God, we pray for the soul of Your servant, the Senator from New York. Grant him eternal life. We also pray for those remaining, his wife and children, that they might have the strength to see Your will as it escapes human understanding.

Bless and strengthen these Representatives. Help them realize that all government comes from You, and that civil authorities are appointed by You for the service of others.

May Your spirit give them understanding and wisdom to carry out the trust that has been given to them.

These lawmakers, O Lord, are working in the midst of darkness in the world. Let us pray that they might burn with Your light so that men everywhere might feel the warmth of freedom. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] has the floor at the present time and has been recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman, the minority leader, we plan to go on with the legislative program as announced, which includes the veterans bill and the Export-Import Bank bill. We hope to be able to concur in the Senate

amendment on the Treasury and Post Office Department bill and on the omnibus crime bill.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that since the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is on the floor, that after conferring with him and with the minority leader and the Speaker, it has been decided that the conference report on the tax bill will go over until the 19th of June.

Would the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I made this request of the majority leader, the Speaker, and the minority leader because I wanted the House to have at least a week in order to study the conference report and become advised with respect to it.

We have not yet reached the point where it is ready to be filed for printing under the rule, but we will, and notify the Members to that effect early next week so that the Members will have at least a week to go over it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my understanding that the ranking Republican member on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], is in agreement with this procedure?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield. Yes, I have reviewed and gone over it with the gentleman from Wisconsin and he is in agreement with this procedure.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I might advise the membership that we are waiting on legislative action from the other body. It seems that the other body is engaged in certain legislative and treaty matters today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

PRIVILEGED MOTION TO ADJOURN OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OTTINGER moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. OTTINGER. I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will protect the gentleman who is making the motion.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 70, nays 301, not voting 62, as follows:

[No. 167 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Adams	Fraser	Moss
Addabbo	Gallagher	Nedzi
Barrett	Glaimo	Nix
Bingham	Gonzalez	O'Hara, Mich.
Boland	Green, Oreg.	Olsen
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Ottinger
Burke, Mass.	Halpern	Philbin
Burton, Calif.	Hanley	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Wash.	Ronan
Clark	Hathaway	Rosenthal
Conyers	Hays	Roush
Corman	Hechler, W. Va.	Ryan
Culver	Heckler, Mass.	Saylor
Daniels	Hicks	Shipley
Dent	Jacobs	Tiernan
Diggs	Joelson	Udall
Donohue	Karth	Van Deerlin
Dow	Kastenmeier	Vigorito
Eckhardt	Kyros	Waldie
Edwards, Calif.	Leggett	Yates
Ellberg	Machen	Zablocki
Farbstein	Meeds	
Foley	Mink	
Ford,	Monagan	
William D.	Morgan	